

THE LONDON BOROUGH OF CAMDEN

At a meeting of the **LEADER OF THE COUNCIL** held on **WEDNESDAY, 27TH JUNE, 2018** at 6.00 pm in Committee Room 4, Town Hall, Judd Street, London WC1H 9JE

CABINET MEMBER TAKING THE DECISION

Councillor Georgia Gould

The minutes should be read in conjunction with the agenda for the meeting. They are subject to approval and signature at the next meeting of the Leader of the Council and any corrections approved at that meeting will be recorded in those minutes.

MINUTES

1. DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY AND NON-PECUNIARY INTERESTS IN RESPECT OF ITEMS ON THIS AGENDA

There were no declarations.

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were no announcements.

3. DEPUTATIONS

Deputations were heard from the following:-

Item 6 – Brunswick Square Walking and Cycling Improvements

John Hartley, Camden Cycling Campaign/London Living Streets

Item 7 – Midland Road and Judd Street Walking and Cycling Improvements

Jo Wright, Patisserie Deux Amis, Judd Street

Fiona Dealey, Wicklow Street

Charles Scully, Lord John Russell Public House

Andy Nichols, RMT

John Chamberlain, Camden Cycling Campaign/London Living Streets

Both items

Debbie Radcliffe, Bloomsbury Residents Action Group (BRAG)

Leader of the Council - Wednesday, 27th June, 2018

Tom Reed, Marchmont Association
Elizabeth Paul

In response to the comments made by deputies and to questions from Councillor Gould, officers made the following remarks:-

- The suggestion that only one or two roads had been consulted was not accurate and details of the area consulted was provided as an appendix to each report.
- Comments received had been quite evenly split between concerns about congestion in the area and concerns about the access implications of the proposals.
- Opening up Mabledon Place had been considered but would not help with congestion in the area.
- There would be demountable bollards in Judd Street to allow emergency access. The emergency services had been consulted but had made no comment on the proposals. However, there was regular liaison between the Council and the emergency services which would enable them to raise any concerns that might arise.
- It would be possible to provide a left turn into Mabledon Place but it was recommended to monitor the impact of the changes before making a decision on that.
- It was acknowledged that there was some negative impact from the proposals, and that might be exacerbated for those with some protected characteristics in that access would take longer and be less direct, but there would also be positive impacts such as improved pedestrian safety for those visiting the RNIB.
- 79% of local residents in the area did not have access to a motor vehicle although it was acknowledged that some did need one.
- Businesses would still be accessible on foot and would benefit in that traffic free streets were more attractive places for people to spend time and money.
- Congestion would reduce and air quality would improve, with traffic confined to strategic routes such as Euston Road.
- The report outlined the impact of various scenarios, including in combination with the Tavistock/Torrington scheme.
- There would be monitoring of the impact of both schemes, including traffic counts and air quality monitoring. The monitoring package would be agreed with Transport for London (TfL).
- Assessing air quality impact was quite challenging as there was no linear relationship between traffic and air quality. However the Council had a legal duty in relation to air quality and it was considered that these schemes would lead to an improvement.

The representative from TfL remarked that the aim from TfL's perspective was to encourage people to switch to more sustainable modes of transport. He confirmed that the idea of a resident liaison group to support the monitoring of the impact of the scheme could be considered.

- In relation to HS2, there was no detail of the construction programme as yet so it was difficult to predict what impact that might have on the area. However, officers were in continuous liaison with HS2 and were fully aware of the need to mitigate any impacts.
- The option of using a technological solution to allow some vehicles access was not something that had been done in Camden as yet and, in any case, would be more suited to a smaller area due to the resources and infrastructure required to implement it.
- Reducing the number of short distance vehicle trips was proving challenging and 42% of trips in Camden were less than 2 kilometres. Non-resident traffic needed to be kept on the strategic road network as much as possible.
- Camden wanted to provide high quality infrastructure to encourage modal shift to sustainable transport options. These schemes were part of a wider package of measures in pursuit of this.

In response to a question from Councillor Gould, deputy Jo Wright remarked that local residents walked to her shop but she had completely lost trade from taxis as a result of traffic schemes in the area. The Tavistock/Torrington scheme had also affected her business.

In response to a question from Councillor Gould, the representative from TfL commented that there would be a new signalised crossing at the junction of Euston Road and Midland Road, with extended kerbs and more room for pedestrians, which would make the crossing much safer. It might be possible to extend the crossing time but the potential impact of that on traffic would need to be modelled.

In response to a question from Councillor Gould, deputy Debbie Radcliffe remarked that residents did not mind some inconvenience at the crossing and she had never seen an accident there. The problem was more to do with pollution. Residents needed to live ordinary lives but these schemes would mean they could be cut off.

In response to a question from Councillor Gould, deputy John Hartley remarked that the crossing at the Euston Road/Midland Road junction was a key one for cyclists and would be much safer as a result of these proposals, which in itself might encourage modal shift. The capacity for pedestrians crossing the Euston Road was a real problem and this change would be of huge benefit to pedestrians.

4. NOTIFICATION OF ANY ITEMS OF BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIR CONSIDERS URGENT

There was no notification.

5. MINUTES

RESOLVED –

THAT the minutes of the meeting held on 21st June 2017 be approved and signed as a correct record.

- 6. CENTRAL LONDON GRID, BRUNSWICK SQUARE - PROPOSED CYCLING AND WALKING IMPROVEMENTS (SC/2018/19) &**
- 7. PROPOSED WALKING AND CYCLING IMPROVEMENTS: MIDLAND ROAD AND JUDD STREET JUNCTION (SC/2018/18)**

As the schemes were linked, the reports were introduced consecutively. Officers added that since the publication of the agenda, 6 further written submissions had been received, as follows:- one objecting to the Midland Road/Judd Street scheme; two in support of both schemes; and 3 objecting to both schemes. No new issues were raised by these submissions.

Having considered the deputations and the comments of officers, Councillor Gould remarked that she recognised that these were difficult issues and that there were strong views on both sides of the argument. However, she had to consider the wider context of the safety of all road users and the air quality in the area. Safety for those crossing the Euston Road was a key issue and she welcomed the change to the crossing arrangements there. She was also satisfied that there were suitable emergency access arrangements. She was content to agree the recommendations in relation to both schemes, but wished to see a steering group set up with interested parties, including residents and local businesses, to monitor the impacts. She also wished Transport for London to investigate providing straight across pedestrian crossings on Euston Road and report back to her on its findings.

**ACTION BY: Director of Regeneration and Planning /
Transport for London**

It was then

RESOLVED –

Central London Grid, Brunswick Square – Proposed Cycling and Walking Improvements

- (i) THAT the results of the public consultation on cycling and walking improvement proposals to the Brunswick Square area in the context of surrounding schemes be noted;
- (ii) THAT the assessment of the traffic impacts of the scheme, as set out in Appendix C of the report, be noted;

- (iii) THAT the legal comments of the Borough Solicitor be noted and the Equality Impact Assessment which is appended to the report be considered and noted, having had due regard to the needs set out in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010; and
- (iv) THAT approval be given to proceed with the implementation of the scheme as recommended in Option 2 (Section 3) of this report, subject to detailed design and compliance with statutory processes.

Proposed Walking and Cycling Improvements: Midland Road and Judd Street Junction

- (i) THAT the results of the public consultation on cycling and walking improvement proposals to the Midland Road project area in the context of surrounding schemes be noted;
- (ii) THAT the assessment of the traffic impact of the scheme as set out in Appendix C of the report be noted;
- (iii) THAT the legal comments of the Borough Solicitor be noted and the Equality Impact Assessment which is appended in this report under Appendix D be considered and noted, having due regard to the needs set out in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010;
- (iv) THAT approval be given to proceed with the implementation of the scheme as recommended in Option 2 (Section 3) of the report, subject to detailed design and compliance with statutory processes; and
- (v) THAT approval in principle be given for those elements of the proposals under the remit of Transport for London as Highway Authority to enable works under the remit of the London Borough of Camden as Highway Authority.

ACTION BY: Director of Regeneration and Planning

Reasons

For the reasons set out in the reports.

8. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THE CHAIR CONSIDERS URGENT

There was no urgent business.

The meeting ended at 7.21pm.

CHAIR

Contact Officer: Vicky Wemyss-Cooke

Telephone No: 020 7974 5726

E-Mail: vicky.wemyss-cooke@camden.gov.uk

MINUTES END