

Response ID ANON-11TF-GBKH-R

Submitted to **Hackney Local Implementation Plan (2019-2022) Consultation**

Submitted on **2019-01-06 17:00:17**

Introduction

1 About you

Name (optional):

Brenda Puech and Emma Griffin

House/flat number:

44 Lavender Grove

Postcode:

E8 3LS

Email address (optional):

emma.j.griffin@gmail.com

2 Are you a:

resident in Hackney, other (please specify below)

Other:

Representing Hackney Living Streets and London Living Streets

How much do you agree with and support the objectives outlined in the following sections of the LIP?

3 Outcome 1: Hackney's streets will be healthy and more Hackney residents will travel actively

strongly agree

Please use this space to explain why:

We welcome objectives and targets that encourage active travel in Hackney, in particular its objectives for Healthy Streets, Liveable Neighbourhoods (pg 27); active travel (pg 28) and child-friendly streets (pg 31).

4 Outcome 2: Hackney's streets will be safe and secure

strongly agree

Please use this space to explain why:

We welcome Hackney's road danger reduction and Vision Zero approach; its focus on vulnerable groups and its work with local policing team to enforce 20mph limits (pg 47).

However, we believe policing needs to go further than tackling speeding and address intimidating driving. We would like to see explicit mention of enforcement of stopping at pedestrian red lights and zebra crossings, giving way to buses, stopping aggressive driving, giving way to pedestrians at side road junctions, safe parking, not blocking pedestrian crossings etc. We would also like to see explicit targets for ANPR to address the huge amount of uninsured cars and unlicensed drivers.

Emphasis should be also placed on the hazards posed by HGVs to pedestrians. There must be restrictions on the roads HGVs are permitted to travel on, consolidation of freight delivery to reduce the use of HGVs and encouragement of cargo bike deliveries in Hackney.

5 Outcome 3: Hackney's streets will be used more efficiently and have less traffic on them

strongly agree

Please use this space to explain why:

We welcome the council's objectives to challenge the dominance of private motor vehicles, promote more sustainable modes, reduce the amount of through-traffic not originating in the borough, its objections to the Silvertown Tunnel and its proposed Freight Action Plan.

However, we believe targets for reductions in motor traffic should be more ambitious than maintaining 2015 traffic levels until 2021.

We also urge more ambitious targets for lowering car ownership. These should link with clearer and more ambitious targets for car clubs. Car clubs in Hackney should also widen appeal to families via supply of larger cars and the provision of car seats.

We would also like to see clearer targets and initiatives that target traffic that does not originate in the borough. City of London has proposed a Street Hierarchy in its draft Transport Strategy that defines the function of each street in order to encourage drivers to use the right street for the right journey. We believe this could better define which streets are unsuitable for through-traffic and suitable for filtering.

We are encouraged there is an objective to reduce car parking, but we are concerned there are no targets to accompany this objective. We would like to see explicit targets to reduce provision of car parking in the borough, increase CPZ coverage and increase in parking charges, particularly for 2nd and 3rd vehicles registered at the same address.

Alternative uses of parking spaces should be encouraged via expansion of the Hackney parklet programme, introduction of Greening permits for public spaces (more detail below), and wider roll-out of bike hangars.

But there needs to be clearer definition of what “accessible to most households” means in T11 (g47). The installation of a cycle hangar on a street or estate does not guarantee accessibility to all residents. Currently demand far outstrips supply, even on streets where hangars are installed.

We would also like to see a review of kerbside parking in order to reduce parking at corners of streets where vehicles obscure the sightlines of people crossing roads. Most collisions take place at junctions where sightlines are obscured by parked vehicles. As in Camden, parking should not be permitted within 10m from a junction.

In terms of freight, we would like to see specific mention of encouragement of cargo bicycles for last-mile deliveries.

6 Outcome 4: Hackney’s streets will be clean and green

neither agree nor disagree

Please use this space to explain why:

We object to T20 to ensure 80% of residents are within 500m of an electric charging vehicle point by 2022, and all residents by 2025. We believe this is a highly misplaced and damaging target that will cause considerable damage to the cause of active travel, Healthy Streets and reducing car ownership and usage in Hackney.

EV charge points (EVCP) are already taking too much footway space in Hackney, making life difficult for those walking, especially those with sight impairments, pushing buggies and children. Lamp post charging also creates trip hazards and unnecessary clutter on streets.

We oppose all subsidies for private electric car ownership and believe they will continue to lock us into a future of car dependence. Public funds should instead be directed at shared car use, the use of electric bikes and cargo bikes for delivery and passenger transport.

London Living Streets calls for councils and TfL to give priority to EVCP locations in the following order:

1. Off-street locations for overnight charging, such as car parks, supermarkets, shopping centres, leisure facilities, ideally for car clubs.
2. The carriageway on well-designed build-outs the enhance the street environment
3. The footway if a 2.5 metre clear width remains. (Lamp post charging still presents a trip risk to people walking and playing on streets.)

For Healthy Streets, we would like to see explicit commitment to community involvement in the greening of streets through the expansion of the parklet programme, pocket parks, and resident public garden permit schemes.

We note the emphasis on cycle and electric car parking. We would like to see equivalent emphasis and investment into regular pedestrian rest spaces on streets with seating and shelter provided.

7 Outcome 5: The public transport network will meet the needs of Hackney’s growing population

strongly agree

Please use this space to explain why:

8 Outcome 6: Public transport will be safe, affordable and accessible to all

strongly agree

Please use this space to explain why:

9 Outcome 7: Journeys by public transport will be pleasant, fast and reliable

strongly agree

Please use this space to explain why:

10 Outcome 8: Active, efficient and sustainable travel will be the best option in new developments

strongly agree

Please use this space to explain why:

11 Outcome 9: Transport investment will unlock the delivery of new homes and jobs

strongly agree

Please use this space to explain why:

Sustainable Transport Targets and Additional Comments

12 Do you have any comments on the sustainable transport targets in the Transport Mix section of the LIP?

Please use this space to explain why.:

The targets in the Transport Mix section are positive and welcome. Particularly welcome are the targets to achieve 91% sustainable transport share through a reallocation of road space to cycling, walking and bus infrastructure; promoting modal shift to walking; and reducing the dominance of private vehicles.

However, as outlined above, we are concerned that the emphasis on electric vehicles is at odds with this target. The EV target (T20) is also not aligned with the council's aspirations for Healthy Streets, its plans to reduce on-street car parking and pavement parking and T13 to reduce levels of car ownership.

We believe the ambition to maintain overall walking mode at 40% of all journeys in Hackney by 2025 is not ambitious enough. The 70% walking-to-school target is also not high enough in a borough where pupils live so close to their schools.

We note with concern:

- a third of the borough exceeds the Mean National Air Quality objective for NO₂;
- the fall in use of buses;
- the recent drop in numbers of children walking to school in Hackney;
- and the high rates of obesity in Hackney.

These issues require urgent actions.

While we welcome the measures proposed for creating Walkable Streets (pg 22), we would like additionally to see:

- rigorous ongoing audits and removal of footway obstructions and clutter;
- use of raised table crossings;
- continuous side road crossings;
- pocket parks at road filters;
- programme of planting street trees and bushes;
- community involvement in greening and use of street space for parklets and gardening (more detail below).

We welcome the Traffic Reduction strategies (pg 25) but would strongly encourage a road pricing programme rather than wait for an all-London scheme.

We would like to see a workplace parking levy introduced in Hackney as being consulted on in

Hounslow https://haveyoursay.hounslow.gov.uk/traffic-and-transport/workplace-parking-levy/supporting_documents/WPL%20Consultation%20LB%20Hounslow.pdf

13 Do you have any additional comments on the transport schemes and initiatives in the Delivery Plan described in Chapter 3 of the LIP?

Please use this space to explain why.:

The Hackney LIP Delivery Programme (2019 -2022) section is well written and summarises the necessary strategy, actions and programmes to bring about Hackney's transport aims and objectives. This is all very welcome, particularly the section on road traffic reduction.

It is good to see so many schemes in the pipeline, many with secured TfL funding such as Old Street Roundabout, Stoke Newington Gyration mitigation, Green Lanes and Shoreditch Triangle.

We also welcome the work on the Hackney Central Liveable Neighbourhood programme, including removal of traffic from Amhurst Road, that addresses the three most dangerous junctions in the borough and improves walking and cycling routes through the area. It is also great to see Mare Street getting £450K of funding to improve the pedestrian environment, particularly at its crossings.

It is encouraging that 'Borough wide traffic reduction' is dated 2022, but we note there is no funding allocated against it.

We are concerned the following local schemes seem to have been pushed into the long grass to 2030:

- Removal of Lea Bridge roundabout (2030)
- South Hackney one-way review (2030)
- Regents Canal parallel cycle route (very important for pedestrians) (2025)
- Improving walking and cycling permeability around Dalston. (private funding)

It is fantastic to see ongoing funding for pocket parks and parklets. But it is not good to see £3m allocated towards expansion of EVCP across the borough until 2041 and £60,000 in the LIP 3-year delivery programme, versus just £15,000 for car clubs. As previously explained, electric car clubs will go much further in reducing car usage and ownership, thereby improving air quality, reducing road danger and improving the street environment.

We do not believe the London Fields area-wide traffic management plans go far enough. These should be expanded to reduce rat running in the entire area including Haggerston and Scriven Street.

The delivery programme mentions £100,000 funding for Broadway Market, but we would like to see some indication of what this involves. At the very least, on-street parking should be removed on this street to create more space for people walking and greater visibility of bicycles moving through the street.

With regards to maintenance (pg 98), we would like to see footways being proactively maintained with ongoing improvements to ensure dropped kerbs are

provided at all crossings at the very least, and the condition of the footway remains smooth, level and firm. Footway obstructions must be regularly inspected and removed.

We strongly welcome plans for Healthy Streets (pg 98) and new ways of utilising kerbside space such as community parklets and cycle hangars. In addition, we advocate a new programme of gardening permits for residents to plant public spaces (such as in Paris <https://greeninfrastructureconsultancy.com/the-greening-permit-in-paris/>.) We believe it is important for residents to have a stake in the public realm in which they live and a reason for being on the street.

We welcome the widespread use of countdown timers and advocate trials of audible timers that also provide the name of the street being crossed.

Legible London signage needs to be supplemented with tactile signage or speaking signs that provide information to visually impaired people. Or development of telephone apps that allow navigation around Hackney by visually impaired people.

We would like to see road safety education targeted at drivers, including parents that drive kids to school (via posters, workplace training, etc) rather than just school children.

There is much to applaud in this document and in the council's recent work to increase active travel and create healthy, living streets. Many of our suggestions build on this excellent work. But one anomaly are the targets for electric vehicles. We would like the opportunity to discuss our views with the council on this.

Equalities monitoring

14 Gender: Are you...

Female

If you prefer to use your own term please provide this here::

15 Gender: Is your gender identity different to the sex you were assumed to be at birth?

No it's the same

16 Age: what is your age group?

35-44

17 Ethnicity: Are you...

White or White British

Other (please state if you wish)::

18 Religion or belief: Are you or do you have...

Atheist/no religious belief

Other (please state if you wish)::

19 Caring responsibilities: A carer is someone who spends a significant proportion of their time providing unpaid support to a family member, partner or friend who is ill, frail, disabled or has mental health or substance misuse problems. Do you regularly provide unpaid support caring for someone?

No

20 Disability: Do you consider yourself to be disabled?

No

21 Sexual orientation: Are you...

Heterosexual

Other (please state if you wish)::