

# ROYAL BOROUGH OF GREENWICH

## HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE

WEDNESDAY, 3 FEBRUARY 2021 AT 7.10 PM

### MINUTES

#### PRESENT:

##### Members:

Councillor Bill Freeman (Chair), Councillors Peter Brooks, David Gardner, Sizwe James, Mick Hayes, Aidan Smith and Matthew Clare (from Item 7)

##### Officers

(Interim) Assistant Director Transportation; Head of Traffic Group; Principal Road Safety Officer; Cycle Training & Projects Coordinator; Committee Services Officer

##### Other Members in Attendance

Councillor Spencer Drury

#### Item

#### No.

#### 1 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Christine May.

Apologies for lateness were given by Councillor Matt Clare.

#### 2 Urgent Business

There was no urgent business.

## **Declarations of Interest**

In relation to Item 7, Councillors Peter Brooks stated that he was a member of the London Cycling Campaign, but that it did not constitute an interest.

### **Resolved -**

That the list of Councillors' memberships as Council appointed representatives on outside bodies, joint committees and school governing bodies be noted.

## **4 Minutes**

### **Resolved -**

That the minutes of the meeting of the Highways Committee held on 9 September 2020 be agreed and signed as a true and accurate record.

## **5 Request for Speed Table in Wilmount Street - Response to a Petition**

The Head of Traffic Group presented the report.

In response to questions from the Committee, the Head of Traffic Group and the (Interim) Assistant Director Transportation confirmed that the road was not currently part of a 20mph speed zone area, that could be looked at but the traffic data would need to be considered; however, if progressed it would be more likely to result in speed cushions or sinusoidal humps rather than a speed table. With regard to putting in width restrictions they would have to take into consideration both the turning circles for a refuse collection vehicle, and also the need for emergency service vehicles to pass through. While the width of the footpath was below the London pavement standard it was not uncommon to find other footpaths below that standard in various locations throughout London and it was DDA compliant. It would be very difficult to put in a give-and-take widening of the footpath and narrowing of the road at the point next to the Tramshed because of the geometry of the junction; widening the footpath would not be expected to result in speed reduction. An issue for a drop kerb was it might mean a steep drop off.

The Committee was addressed by the lead petitioner and three attendees of the Temple. They highlighted there had been many near miss incidents with speeding cars, and they did not want to wait until some fatality happened before something was done. The path in front of the Temple was a public safety hazard, the pavement was very slippery and needed upgrading; it was barely suitable for a disabled person. The path was so narrow that sometimes people had to step into the road to get by which could be dangerous if a car then sped into the road. It was asked if consideration could be given to reducing the footpath on the other side and adding it to the Temple's side. It was explained that the reason they had requested a speed table was that it would address both the speeding and the narrow width of the pavement.

In response to a question from the Committee, one of the attendees of the Temple recalled that there had been incidents of people tripping on the footpath outside the temple.

There was a discussion of the matter. The history of the road was commented on. It was noted that the speakers had highlighted issues about the width and slipperiness of the pavement and the kerb height. It was recognised that they had to keep in mind that the area was being developed.

The Committee requested Officers to consider the matter of the pavement, and that a site visit be conducted with Members when that became possible after lockdown.

### **Resolved –**

That the proposed petition response presented in the report, and that it will be reported to Council on 25 February 2021, be noted.

## **6 Response to a Petition regarding improving pupil safety at Deansfield School**

The report was presented by the Principal Road Safety Officer.

In response to questions from the Committee, the Principal Road Safety Officer and the (Interim) Assistant Director Transportation replied that experimental traffic orders were initially for six months but could run up to eighteen months; it was normal to review it at six months but it would be monitored all the way through however long it ran for. They would seek feedback from the school at regular intervals; they had already received some feedback from the school to indicate that the 'pop-up' school street was

working well and was supported by the school community. It was difficult to monitor the impact of the 'pop-up' school street due to the current pandemic. There would be fairly extensive costs involved with a zebra crossing, the big one would be the electrical supply, and then there was the cost of notification of a crossing point. A potential cheaper alternative to a zebra crossing would be a kerb build out, but they needed to consider the results of the experimental scheme.

The Committee was addressed by the lead petitioner who was the Head of School at Deansfield School. She said they were grateful for what had been done. The scheme was fully supported and run by the parent community at the school. It was recognised it could not be correctly judged during the lockdown as there were fewer people coming to the school. It was suggested that the school might be able to make a contribution towards a zebra crossing, otherwise a width restrictor was a good compromise. She emphasised the impact of traffic cutting through to Rochester Way.

The Committee was addressed by Ward Councillor Spencer Drury. Councillor Drury noted that the petition had received widespread support and that he not received a single objection against it. It was felt that the 'pop-up' school street had been a success. It was suggested that a zebra crossing would make for a formal crossing and one that was easily visible, but a width restriction would be a step forward.

In response to a question from the Committee, Councillor Drury clarified that while there was universal support for the petition there might not be such support to blocking off roads as a way of stopping rat running, and he could not comment on such a suggestion unless local residents had been consulted on it.

The Chair suggested there could be a discussion between Officers and the school over the costs of a zebra crossing or a built out kerb.

### **Resolved –**

That the proposed petition response presented in the report, and that it will be reported to Council on 25 February 2021, be noted.

## **Response to a Petition for an additional bike hangar in the Gurdon Road area**

The report was presented by the Cycle Training & Projects Coordinator. He added that subsequent to publication funding had become a bit clearer for the financial year and so they would be able to commence in accordance with Option 2 rather than Option 3 in the report.

In response to questions from the Committee, the Cycle Training & Projects Coordinator confirmed the hangar would now be expected to be in place in April. He indicated the likely cost of the installation. He explained that there was an agreement to subsidise the spaces to make them more affordable to residents. The cost of the spaces varied from borough to borough; Officers could research how other boroughs did their pricing, and what other options for funding, including means testing, there were. Whether there could be a retrofitting programme to replace the basic metal cycle hoops on estates could be looked at. He detailed the funding they received from TfL but pointed out it was not necessarily ring fenced to street cycle parking though they had prioritised that at the moment due to demand.

The Committee was addressed by the lead petitioner. He said there was huge demand for the hangars. As there was a shift towards sustainable transport the hangars would be fully utilised. New developments in the area meant extra demand for cycle parking. He commented that with regard to the issue of subsidising the spaces residents already subsidised car parking spaces but there were health benefits to more people cycling and less infrastructural damage from cycles.

In response to a question from the Committee, the lead petitioner said he would be happy to support lobbying for the extension of Santander bikes into the borough. He suggested introducing a docking station in Greenwich might tackle some of the cycling that went on through the Greenwich Foot Tunnel

There was a discussion on the general matter of the hangars. As the cycle hangars received general support it was queried if petition requests for such hangars could be dealt with without the necessity of a report to the Highways Committee. It was felt that there needed to be more resourcing for the provision of hangars. It was wondered if a planning condition could be added to new developments to have such hangars. It was suggested that they needed to take a strategic look across the borough as it seemed only certain areas of the borough got them but it was recognised that old streets might not have the facility for them.

Members also commented on the desirability of extending the Santander bike scheme into the borough. A request was made for a report on the proposed crossing for cyclists and walkers at the Thames Barrier, either to the Highways Committee or another meeting.

**Resolved -**

That the proposed petition response presented in the report, and that Option 2 is now the preferred Option, and that the response will be reported to Council on 25 February 2021, be noted.

The meeting closed at 8.31pm

---

Chair