

## ROEHAMPTON PARTNERSHIP

Minutes of the meeting of the Roehampton Partnership (RP) held on Monday 15<sup>th</sup> November 2021 at 7.00 p.m. in Roehampton Club, Roehampton

### Present:

Councillor Jeremy Ambache (Chair)	Wandsworth Borough Council (Roehampton and Putney Heath)
Deacon Kathy Johnson	Roehampton and Putney Methodist Church
Mr Steve Fannon	Western Area Housing Panel
Councillor Claire Gilbert	Wandsworth Borough Council (Roehampton and Putney Heath)
Mr Marc Newey	Roehampton Club (CEO)
Mr Tom Rowson	University of Roehampton (Chief Operating Officer)
Mr Matthew Tiller	Western Area Housing Panel

### In attendance:

Ms Jenny Yates	Labour Party Activist
Mr Graeme Henderson	Labour Councillor for Earlsfield
Mr Antony Arthur	Local Resident
Ms Nieves Carazo	Local Resident
Mr James Pickard	TFL (via Zoom)
Ms Mariya Vlaykova, Minute Taker	Roehampton Club

### 1. Welcomes, RP membership and apologies

Councillor Jeremy Ambache (JA) welcomed Partnership members to the meeting. All introduced themselves.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Sue Mckinney, Alberto Pelucchi, Joshua Rey, Joseph Langden, Kieron Earney, Pamela Harris, PC Lucie Smith, PC Shekil Barnett, Farrah Black, Sean Heanen and Natasha Beckwood.

The Chair reported that at the January Roehampton Partnership (RP) meeting the Partnership should choose a Chair and a Deputy Chair for the next year. JA informed the Partnership that he would not stand for re-election. Deacon Kathy Johnson was prepared to stand for re-election as a Deputy Chair.

### 2. Minutes of September 21<sup>st</sup> 2021

Minutes from the last meeting were agreed as a correct record of the meeting.

### 3. Matters arising

## Community Engagement

JA had written to the Offices to ask if the RP could be formally consulted before the Plan was put to the Committee but was informed that the Partnership would not be consulted. JA had circulated his comments as a Councillor.

## Community Grants

Information about the Community Week Grants has been previously circulated and many community groups have used it to apply for grants.

## Development of RP website

JA thanked MN and Roehampton Club staff involved for launching and maintaining the RP website. MN and Roehampton Club will look at the content and make sure that there is nothing rude or offensive. **If another RP member would like to volunteer to look after and promote the website with MN that would be helpful.**

**ALL**

The RP considered that the website should be promoted better (Roehampton Voice, notice boards, libraries) and suggested all members circulate the website address to their networks. The RP discussed that more local information should be added. For example, about the Community Week Funding and the Winter Festival. It was suggested including success stories and why they have been successful, information about the upcoming, sports and families' events.

## 4. Review and update on our Improving Transport Plan

The Chair asked the group to review progress on the proposed actions from the last meeting and the plan was updated.

Proposed Action	Note
1. Invite TFL to Roehampton Partnership meeting	Complete and JPi agreed to report back progress at future RP meetings.
2. Set up a fully accessible 'hopper' bus that picks people up from their doors and drops them off exactly where they need to go.	Fleur Anderson is following up with Heidi Alexander. Agreed that the Partnership would consider progressing at a later date. Jeremy noted that the partnership could put in a proposal. Agreed that Matthew would champion proposal/ conduct research with other local residents and identifying the needs of local residents on the estates. Matthew to discuss further with Fleur Anderson. MT reported on the possibilities of having 'hopper' bus. The trails in Sutton and Ealing have been very popular. It seemed that Government funding was available, however, he was not sure that TFL were eligible for the scheme. They had also looked at the possibilities of extending some of the current bus routes and queried if TFL would be more receptive to this option.

Proposed Action	Note
	<p>JPi said that it was something that TFL could look at. He was happy to take any details about the suggestions to the relevant TFL sections. More clarity by the next RP meeting when the new TFL Funding Agreement had been agreed with the Government and better clarity of the existing funding will be available.</p> <p><b>JPi to report back at the next meeting.</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>JPi</b></p>
<p>3. Develop a proposal for being able to catch a bus and take your bike on it</p>	<p>Fleur Anderson is following up with Heidi Alexander.</p> <p>CG raised this with TFL at the August meeting, asking if there could be a pilot programme to trial this in Roehampton. They noted that this is unlikely. Folding bikes are allowed on the current bus network - CG noted that these can be expensive to buy, and that there are many such services in other global cities - TFL agreed to keep Roehampton in mind if they ever trial such a service.</p> <p>JPi confirmed that there were not any plans to allow bikes (except folding) on the bus network, but if there were any plans for future trials, he would let TFL know that Roehampton had volunteered for a trial.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">CG and JPi</p>
<p>4. Develop a proposal for smart road charging</p>	<p>Noted that smart road charging was governed by national policy therefore Partnership Members agreed not take any further action.</p>
<p>5. Extend the ultra-low emissions zone to Roehampton</p>	<p>Noted that ULEZ was governed by national policy therefore Partnership Members agreed to not to action this.</p>
<p>6. Develop a proposal for a safe, high quality cycle lane on Roehampton Lane</p>	<p>JA and JR to work on 6 and 7 – see <i>box 7</i>.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">JA and JR</p>
<p>7. Develop a proposal for a network of cycle routes and better walking pavements linking Barnes, Putney, Roehampton, and Kingston</p>	<p>JR and JA and Miriam Howitt have met and we have other Roehampton cyclists being consulted on a proposed plan.</p> <p><i>The main areas for improving cycle routes and are as follows:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Priory Lane,</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Roehampton Lane linking to Red Rover Junction And Hammersmith Bridge.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Roehampton High Street linking Ashburton Estate Through routes to Putney rail and East Putney tube station (Crestway, Carslake and Junction at St John's Ave to allow bikes to cross).</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Crossing Roehampton Lane for pedestrians and cyclists.</li> </ul>

Proposed Action	Note
	<p data-bbox="754 197 1449 257">☐ We also raised the new walking access to the Richmond Park.</p> <p data-bbox="655 264 1473 365">On 9<sup>th</sup> October we had a helpful meeting with Cllr John Locker (Cabinet member) to suggest all the above and he will discuss with Officers and come back to us.</p> <p data-bbox="1289 394 1473 423" style="text-align: right;">JA/JR/JH/MH</p> <p data-bbox="655 452 1473 696">Claire reported that a location had been agreed for the additional gate at Richmond Park and reminded members that there is a shuttle bus that runs on Wednesdays from Alton School through the park. She encouraged that such information should be circulated in local forums and newsletters. Agreed that Joshua and Mathew would write an item in the newsletter.</p> <p data-bbox="1382 725 1473 754" style="text-align: right;"><b>JR/MT</b></p> <p data-bbox="655 784 1461 853">JA reported that Cllr Locker had been sympathetic to the idea for improving cycling routes.</p> <p data-bbox="655 882 1442 1198">Regarding improving pedestrian crossing on Roehampton Lane, JPi reported that an engineer had inspected the crossings on Medfield Street and Roehampton High Street and had confirmed that both crossings had six seconds periods considered sufficient time for people to cross. JPi informed the Partnership that unless the number of people crossing the route or the number of the reported incidents increased substantially, six seconds were deemed sufficient for such type of crossing to let the traffic flow.</p> <p data-bbox="655 1227 1473 1547">The Partnership members commented that there were several schools on Roehampton Lane and there were times when a vast majority of people were crossing plus people with disabilities were also crossing and six seconds was not sufficient for them. In addition, the only way for the less mobile pedestrians to cross was to stop in the middle of the road, in the oasis, but the oasis was not secure enough. CG queried if TFL would consider enforcement measures to prevent cars from speeding in the area.</p> <p data-bbox="655 1576 1461 1821">Partnership members were concerned that many pedestrians were not confident to cross Roehampton Lane/ Danbury Avenue and was avoiding doing that, therefore TFL figures about the number of people crossing those roads were not accurate. TR suggested organising pilots by extending the crossing times for a month and they collect the data about the time that takes different groups to cross.</p> <p data-bbox="655 1850 1461 1989">JPi confirmed that there were some fundings for investigation works to improve pedestrian facilities on Roehampton Lane. When the designs are ready, they will be presented to the local residents and consultations will take place.</p>

Proposed Action	Note
	<p>JPi would pass on the comments about crossings and speed enforcement measures and considered that TFL could look at some of the crossing times and potentially alter them during peak periods, but it was a fine balance between letting the traffic flow on the Roehampton Lane and extending the crossing time.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">JPi</p> <p>Concerning reporting Near Misses and Incidents while crossing, JPi advised that the residents could contact TFL Customer Service, plus, he would also investigate on behalf of the Roehampton residents.</p> <p>Regarding a cycling route to Hammersmith Bridge, JPi reported that the suggestion needed further investigation when there was better clarity on available funding.</p> <p>JA informed the Partnership that following the proposal about the cycling routes to the National Rail and Putney Tube Station, Cllr Locker and his office were positive that the routes could be marked and improved.</p> <p>SF reminded that it was important that the Stations had enough bike's parking spaces as there were restrictions when people can have their bikes on the train.</p>
8. Start a community car club	<p>TfL is supportive of Community Car Clubs. Car clubs are short-term car rental services that allow member's access to locally parked cars and pay by the minute, hour or day. Car clubs offer an alternative model to private car ownership for individuals and businesses. Car clubs reduce the need for private parking and can help more Londoners give up their cars while allowing for occasional car travel within London. London is full of car clubs, ranging from traditional 'back-to-base' returnable models to flexible one-way models, with dedicated parking bays and areas. More details can be found here: <a href="https://tfl.gov.uk/modes/driving/car-clubs">https://tfl.gov.uk/modes/driving/car-clubs</a></p> <p>Agreed that no further action would be taken.</p>
9. Develop more safe cycle parking spots in Roehampton	<p>CG gathered a petition on this issue in 2019, and the Council is still working through the consultations required to put in the cycle hangers. Three have already been put in, at Cadnam Point, Overton House and Putney Vale. Several more were approved at the last Western Area Housing Panel (WHAP), and they will be installed by September - three at Sheffield Gardens, and one at Arnewood. (two are being put in on the Ashburton Estate in West Putney ward). NB the new Chair of the WAHP Cllr Jane Cooper queried the four in Roehampton and was apparently against Council funding being used to put such hangers in place. CG will continue to advocate for both funding sources, i.e. TFL and WBC, to be optimised. WBC's</p>

Proposed Action	Note
	<p>housing department is still working on a hangar at Highcliff Drive, but I was told recently that planning permission is needed for a hangar at this site. WBC is working on consultations on cycle parking at Woking Close and on the Lennox Estate.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>CG/SH</b></p> <p>CG reported that the best way to get additional cycle parking spots was to demonstrate that there was a demand for them from the local residents and signed petitions.</p> <p>It was noted that areas with active residential associations had better success with letting Council prevent people storing their bikes or parking their cars in inappropriate places.</p>
<p>10. Present our Roehampton Partnership on transport to the new developer (when appointed) and the Council's regeneration team</p>	<p>Agreed that proposed action would remain on hold until the new developer had been confirmed.</p>
<p>11. Write letters to Minister / TFL / Mayor re Roehampton Partnership view on Hammersmith Bridge</p>	<p>MN and JA have written supporting the swift reopening of Hammersmith Bridge to the Minister Baroness Vere and to the Mayor of London Sadiq Khan.</p> <p>JPi reported that they were in discussion with Richmond Borough about solutions. Ministers were involved and meet on monthly basis to discuss the reopening of the Hammersmith Bridge. JPi was not aware about the £26m funding from Hammersmith and Fulham Borough and TFL for the reopening of the Hammersmith Bridge. <b>JPi will report back about the matter at the next meeting.</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>JPi</b></p>

Regarding the frequency of the buses 85 and 430, JPi reported that pattern survey had been done in late September and the results were that the capacity and the frequencies were sufficient for the demand in the area.

It was suggested that measuring by oyster cards uses were not accurate considering that the buses were coming full in the area and many people were left behind (for example at 6.30am in Putney Heath; or at 4.30pm in Putney Station). In addition, the cards provide data only when the people get on the bus, but not when they get off, plus some passengers (young children, prams/ wheelchairs) were not required to tap in but were deducted from the bus capacity.

**The RP members will continue monitoring any specific problems with the transport and report back to JPi.**

**ALL**

**JPi will report to the network team about cycle and pedestrian routes from A3 to Roehampton Lane and they will look at solutions.**

JPI left the meeting at 8.40pm.

## **5. Alton Regeneration Plan**

The Chair welcomed comments from the Partnership concerning plans for the Alton Regeneration Plan and the paper to Housing and Regeneration on Wednesday (17<sup>th</sup> November).

CG drew attention to the recommendation page 11 subparagraph 9 d.

*“(d) authorise the Director of Housing and Regeneration, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Housing and Regeneration, to take any steps considered reasonable to try and secure planning permission for the Alton regeneration scheme.”*

CG was concerned about the vague rest of the statement and what were the steps that could be taken. She wanted greater clarity and to know what it would allow the Council to do?

RP members expressed concerns about some of the wordings and the vagueness of the plan. They considered that some specifications were needed. TR was not against some actions to be taken so the deadlock could break after two years of inactivity.

### Community engagement

The Chair welcomed comments on the Community Engagement section of the paper.

Many RP members felt that the action plan was too vague without objectives and targets. It was thought that local residents had been excluded from the whole strategy and action plan process. The paper stated that the people affected by the Regeneration were engaged, however the RP members considered that the whole of Roehampton and its residents should be consulted. Some of the members felt that the Regeneration label was used with a little commitment to the Roehampton community and that without a clear strategy in place would not progress. There was concern that the Council was not interpreting Community Engagement as effecting the whole Roehampton Community and not just engagement with the proposed ‘Intervention’ Area.

**The RP asked JA to collate the members’ comments about the Alton Regeneration Plan and Community Engagement Action Plan to convey them to the Housing and Regeneration OSC (committee members) before the meeting on Wednesday.**

**JA**

## **6. Discussion of RP membership**

As we ran out of time this item was deferred to the next meeting.

**JA**

## **7. AOB**

Michael Hill has notified JA that those of them involved with the Roehampton Response Network had been invited by Javed Bhunoo from Ahmadiyya Community for a thank you dinner on Tuesday 23<sup>rd</sup> November at 6.45 in Alton Community Hall.

**The meeting concluded at 9.30pm**

**8. Date of the next meeting – 17<sup>th</sup> January 2022 at 7pm at University of Roehampton**