

Item No: 4	Classification: OPEN	Date: 19 July 2016	Meeting Name: Overview & Scrutiny Committee
Report Title:		Call-in: Cycling Quietway 14 - Blackfriars Road to Tower Bridge Road	
Ward(s) or Group affected:		Cathedrals, Chaucer Grange	
From:		Head of Overview & Scrutiny	

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. On 15 June 2016 Councillor Ian Wingfield, Cabinet Member for Environment and Public Realm took a key decision regarding a report on Cycling Quietway 14 – report attached at Appendix A
2. The Cabinet Member’s decision was as follows:
3. Agree to the implementation of the cycle route proposals A, B and C as detailed in the report, subject to the outcome of the necessary statutory procedures. With regard to cycle route proposal D, officers to look in more detail at the issues relating to Tanner Street and Bermondsey Street and prepare a further report for consideration
4. The cabinet member also noted that with regard to cycle route proposal D, he took into account the concerns raised in the consultation responses, and the need for officers to consult further with Transport for London about the possibility of amending their road network in light of their recent consultation relating to Tower Bridge Road.

REASONS FOR CALL-IN

5. On 23 June 2016 councillors Al-Samerai, Linforth-Hall and Shimell called in the decision.

I would like to call in this decision because it does not display the required “proportionality”, “due consultation and the taking of professional advice from officers” or a “presumption in favour of openness” as required by the Council constitution:

- *paragraph 10 of the report **does not include all the issues raised by ward councillors** regarding sections A and B of the Quietway route.*
- *the **report fails to respond to residents’ and ward councillors’ concerns** about specific aspects of the proposals and, despite **no majority support for two of the three sections** of the Quietway route, **not a single alteration has been made to the original scheme.***
- *in light of the Cabinet Member’s Record of Decision, it is **not proportionate to make a decision on just sections A-C when section D may change and impact on the rest of the route.** The proposals should be considered as a whole.*
- *it is **not clear why a decision is required now when discussions with TfL and residents are still ongoing.** Funding timetables/deadlines should not be the principal driver in*

making this decision and could lead to a poorly executed Quietway scheme that does not enjoy local support.

- *given the range of unresolved or unanswered issues, **it is not logical to push for approval of just sections A-C now.** Many resident concerns about the Quietway 14 proposals in the report are deemed 'design issues' when they are more fundamental. Other Quietway schemes are also being questioned currently at the London Assembly*

They also submitted the following additional comments alongside the constitutional reasons for call-in

Nicholson Street (Section A) - while the report makes little or no mention about much of the detailed local opposition to aspects of the proposals, Appendix B highlights how "residents of Edward Edwards House on Nicholson Street opposed the proposed one-way on Nicholson Street, the loss of parking bay and the increasing of waiting and loading restrictions" yet the report still recommends no changes to the scheme. Edward Edwards House is a block specifically for older residents and recent comments on the SE1 Forum online highlight concerns for their safety on leaving their homes to reach the shops or get an ambulance.

Appendix B, page 5 states: "Officers visited Edward Edwards' House as part of the consultation and the consensus is that they are opposed to the one-way system. This is as a result of the residents in Edward Edwards' House being concerned that the one-way system will encourage more cyclists travelling at a higher speed thus endangering the elderly residents...Three respondents questioned the suitability of Nicholson Street as a cycle route." The Council's response is that it still believes Nicholson Street is the most appropriate route without offering any evidence or investigation of alternative routes.

Great Guildford Street junction with Copperfield Street (Section A) - paragraph 30 of the report states that the junction is "outside the scope of this scheme" in response to residents' concerns and comments made by the Better Bankside BID (Appendix B, page 17, para 2.4.2). This does not seem a reasonable approach when the impact of the Quietway will add to existing traffic problems at the site just a block away.

Great Suffolk Street (Section A) - Some key aspects of the proposals are referred to in the report as merely 'design issues' to be resolved at a later stage. This does not give an impression of openness or that the consultation has been taken seriously. For example: "Two respondents commented about an existing U-turning problem on Dolben Street as it is not clear from Great Suffolk Street that Dolben Street is a no through road (Chancel Street is one-way southbound only, except for cyclists). Response: Officers will consider this issue when detailed designs including signage are developed, should the scheme proceed to implementation."

Comments by the Better Bankside Business Improvement District about Great Suffolk Street and Roupell Street not being included in the scheme have been dismissed as simply "out of scope" (Appendix B, page 17, para 2.4.2).

Comments by the London Cycle Campaign about Great Suffolk Street have also been dismissed: "LCC is concerned about the lack of information on Great Suffolk Street." (Appendix B, page 17, para 2.4.3) Comments by Southwark Cyclists have also not been answered: "They have commented on the lack of proposals on Great Suffolk Street which is narrow and heavily trafficked." The response once again is simply that "...this issue will be reconsidered at detailed design stage." (Appendix B, page 17, para 2.4.4)

Real concerns about the appropriateness of the route expressed by Southwark Living Streets are not addressed either: "Great Suffolk Street is not acceptable as part of a Quietway route as vehicle volumes and speeds are too high. The levels of intimidation for pedestrian and cyclists remain extremely high and will deter people from using the route." (Appendix B, page 17, para 2.4.4) The report states in answer: "Response – noted and to be considered at detailed design." These are fundamental issues about the actual route, not design issues.

Union Street (Section B) – This is another example of the report not responding with any change despite majority opposition to the proposals: "Do you support the proposed closure of Union Street between Great Guildford Street and Southwark Bridge Road to traffic except cycles and access? 52% of the responses opposed the proposal while 47% of the total responses supported the scheme."

An alternative proposal from Southwark Cyclists that the route should instead continue along Union Street and on to the North-South Cycle Superhighway (CS6) rather than via Dolben, Chancel and Nicholson Streets (Appendix B, page 17, para 2.4.3) is simply answered again with "...this issue will be reconsidered at detailed design stage."

Newcomen Street (Section C) - the concerns raised by Guy's Hospital about the plans (paragraph 24) have not been addressed and the response in paragraph 28 merely restates the original proposal. In addition, while the report highlights support for the proposed Newcomen Street closure at "55% overall with 37% objecting," Appendix B shows that support among local residents for the proposals dropped to 49% while 43% opposed this proposed change and that: "Almost all of the respondents opposed to the scheme live or work on the streets in the vicinity of the scheme such as Tennis Street, Bowling Green Place, Crosby Row, Mermaid Court and Long Lane."

In Appendix B, page 17, para 2.4.4 the report states that the Tabard Gardens North Tenants' and Residents' Association is concerned about the impact on surrounding network, in particular Crosby Row, Bowling Green Place, Mermaid Court, Tennis Street. They complained that there was no consideration of cycle safety or pedestrian safety on residential streets off Newcomen Street. The Treasurer of the T&RA suggested that the project be put on hold until more information becomes available. Yet these concerns are not addressed and the response merely states officers are certain that the proposals will lead to most through-traffic being removed from the area without any evidence or traffic modelling offered.

Failure to respond to locations raised by ward councillors - issues raised by Cathedrals ward councillors in their meeting with officers last year regarding sections A and B of the Quietway route that are not addressed in the report are: proposed banned turns off the Cycle Superhighway into Nicholson Street; how cyclists can turn right into Great Suffolk Street from Dolben Street; potential traffic displacement to Copperfield Street which has an existing rat-running problem; and whether Flat Iron Square needs additional interventions to make the existing shared space work.

Lack of joined-up thinking - the report acknowledges (paragraph 32) that the planned one-way operation in Tanner Street will require a statutory consultation. These are among the most controversial aspects of the proposals and if residents were to reject them the overall Quietway 14 plans would be thrown into doubt. Officers already acknowledge that their ideal scenario may not be feasible and are in ongoing discussions with Transport for London. The Cabinet Member has now recommended in his Record of Decision that this part (Section D) of the route be considered separately. It cannot be right to consult on and seek Cabinet Member approval for only part of the proposals (sections A-C) when the final section may change and impact on the rest of the route. The proposals should be considered as a whole to allow a proportionate response.

Lack of finalised proposals to allow a clear decision - it is not clear why a final decision is required now when discussions with TfL and residents about the detail are still ongoing. Paragraph 46 states: "If any objections to the consultation cannot be informally resolved, then consideration of those objections and a decision as to whether or not to proceed with that part of the scheme will be the subject of a further IDM report to the Cabinet Member for Environment and the Public Realm." The proposals in the report do not seem a proportionate response when so many elements of the scheme are still to be resolved.

Flawed consultation

Some residents have expressed a concern that no weighting appears to have been given to those living along the proposed route. Given that all people living or working in the same postcode area could respond, some residents fear this means the consultation results may have been skewed.

CALL-IN MEETING

6. The committee will consider the call-in request and whether or not the decision might be contrary to the policy framework or not wholly in accordance with the budget.
7. If, having considered the decision and all relevant advice, the committee is still concerned about it then it may either:

- a) refer it back to the decision making person or body for reconsideration, setting out in writing the nature of its concerns, or
 - b) refer the matter to council assembly if the decision is deemed to be outside the policy and budget framework.
8. If the committee does not refer the matter back to the decision making person or body, the decision shall take effect on the date of the scrutiny meeting.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held at	Contact
Attached		

APPENDICES
Cabinet member decision – Record of Decision, Report and Appendix

Audit Trail

Lead Officer	Shelley Burke, Head of Overview & Scrutiny	
Report Author	Shelley Burke, Head of Overview & Scrutiny	
Version	Final	
Dated	11 July 2016	
Key Decision?	No	
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / EXECUTIVE MEMBER		
Officer Title	Comments Sought	Comments included