

CYCLE ENFIELD PARTNERSHIP BOARD (ENFIELD WEST)

Notes of Meeting held on 21 January 2016

1.	MEETING PROTOCOL	Action
	<p>Cllr Bambos Charalambous (BC) welcomed everyone to the meeting. He explained there would be a number of presentations and asked participants to wait until presentations were finished before asking questions.</p> <p>David Burrowes MP (DB) asked four questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is scheme progress contingent on political and community support?</li> <li>• In light of his referendum should scheme be paused?</li> <li>• Today's correspondence from the Mayor of London asked for a stop to the scheme until more consultation was carried out.</li> <li>• Will item 9 (recommendations to Cabinet) be removed from the agenda?</li> </ul> <p>BC read out today's letter from the Mayor which stated he was not proposing a halt just suggesting more engagement. Therefore will progress as per the agenda.</p> <p>DB – This is a Partnership Board but feels there is no partnership working and will therefore withdraw from the Partnership Board.</p> <p>Bob Griffiths (BG) explained that today's Partnership Board will hear details of what will be presented to Cabinet and have the opportunity to comment. Detailed report will be circulated one week before Cabinet meeting and again people can comment on this. TfL will then need to approve the scheme and then people will have another chance to comment at the statutory consultation stage.</p>	
2.	CONSULTATION RESULTS	
	<p>Richard Eason (RE) presented the results of A105 consultation and the changes to the design.</p> <p>Helen Osman (HO) stated that consultation was not robust as respondents could enter any postcode. RE explained that our online consultation has quality assurance checks but that all forms of consultation including leaflets or postcards can be manipulated. The main thing was we got a good response with</p>	

lots of useful feedback to inform the design.

Cllr Alessandro Georgiou (AG) – why did we ask the yes / no question then? RE – It's useful feedback, especially if they go on to explain why they do not support the scheme.

Anne Bishop-Laggett (ABL) – Only 1.6% of Wards concerned responded to consultation and only 0.44% of borough.

BG – We will feedback view that you do not think enough people responded to consultation but we think we got a very good response.

Cllr Terrence Neville (TN) – He has submitted various Fols and it is apparent from the answers that if you only consider Enfield responses and discount partial responses you are left with the slimmest of majorities. A mandate cannot be claimed and the Mayor required real support for the scheme not just a majority of 1 or 100.

Paul Mandel (PM) – Consultation should have required full name and address. 100 of the responses were gathered at Town Show when the Council gave a good sell. If partials are looked at in detail most objected to the scheme. He lives 500 metres from the A105 and will be affected by the scheme but had not received a scheme flyer. He asked for an assurance that the Council will not sell-off Lodge Drive car park in the future. BC – The Council will decide for itself how to use its assets.

Jeff Rodin (JR) – How many cycle trips in Enfield now and what would be a measure of success? RE – 4,800 cycle journeys a day now and our medium term aim is to achieve a fivefold increase.

JR – Concerned about cost. Spending hundreds of pounds per cycle trip at a time when the Council is making cuts elsewhere.

Susan Reuss (SR) – Concerned about relocating a bus stop from Fox Lane. RE explained that new location is nearer than originally proposed but not as near as current location. SR believed the merging of these bus stops will result in overcrowding.

Adrian Lauchlan (AR) – People from all over work, visit or pass through Enfield and we should not restrict responses to the consultation to Enfield residents only.

Clare Rogers (CR) – Delighted with consultation and referred to study that showed that if we achieved Danish levels of cycling in the UK health would improve and the NHS would save £17bn.

3.	<b>TRAFFIC MODELLING &amp; PARKING</b>	
	<p>Alex Stebbings (AS) gave a presentation on the effect of the cycle proposals on parking and the capacity of junctions. This included an assessment of the impact on end to end journey times.</p> <p>SR – Response from FOI on bus journey times was that modelling would be done. AS – This has been done and can be provided. There will be some delay to buses.</p> <p>Mark Rudling (MR) enquired what is happening to the parking at Bush Hill Parade. AS - People will be able to park adjacent to the shops as they do now.</p> <p>PM – Parking surveys were done in January and traffic surveys in July, this is a poor time to do surveys. No mention of loss of night time parking. Security concerns around Lodge Drive car park.</p> <p>Robert Taylor (RT) – Evening parking very important, 51 spaces being lost. Bus stand at Green Lanes / Hedge Lane being lost, therefore buses will no longer be able to turn round. Bush Hill Parade is shown as shared space, is parking being retained? AS – In regular discussion with TfL about bus stand and solution being identified. Parking is all retained at Bush Hill Parade.</p> <p>TN concerned about bus boarders and delays to following vehicles. AS explained that traffic modelling took bus dwell times into account.</p> <p>Cllr Edward Smith (ES) – Buses and cars will be substantially delayed and figures quoted are bogus.</p> <p>AG – What is total loss of parking? AS referred to slides for high streets and residential sections.</p> <p>Jennifer Williams (JW) – Some side roads have had pedestrian refuge islands removed, making it harder to cross. AS – Corner radii have been tightened up to slow turning traffic down and mitigate this.</p> <p>RT – Predicted effect on journey times includes introduction of SCOOT but this does not work well on spaced out junctions. AS – Measures also include introduction of UTC which will allow signal timings to be monitored and improved.</p> <p>Someone asked if the Council would pay for vehicle crossovers. BG - No</p> <p>Someone asked how emergency service vehicles would get through when responding to an emergency. RE explained that it would be possible for emergency service vehicles to drive</p>	

	<p>between/over the traffic separators in an emergency. Officers have met with the Metropolitan Police and London Fire &amp; Rescue Service and no concerns were raised about response times. London Ambulance Service has turned down repeated requests to meet. However, there will be further opportunity for them to feed in comments during the statutory consultation.</p> <p>Someone raised concerns about the distance of Lodge Drive Car Park from Bourne Hill area and the vulnerability of people using Lodge Drive car park late at night.</p> <p>Someone raised concerns about the impact on East/West routes</p>	
<p><b>5.</b></p>	<p><b>AIR QUALITY ASSESSMENT</b></p>	
	<p>Paul Rogers (PR) presented slides prepared by consultants CERC.</p> <p>Cllr Ertan Hurer (EH) asked about effect of delays to traffic on air quality. AS – CERC modelling based on traffic modelling so delays taken into account.</p> <p>DB – Have we monetised health improvements due to improved air quality? PR – No. We will feedback to consultants to see if an estimate can be made.</p> <p><u>Post meeting note</u></p> <p>The question about the monetary value of air quality improvements is a difficult one which is currently being addressed by the Committee on the Medical Effects of Air Pollutants. However, guidance issued by Defra <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/460401/air-quality-econanalysis-nitrogen-interim-guidance.pdf">https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/460401/air-quality-econanalysis-nitrogen-interim-guidance.pdf</a> includes estimates of damage costs for different parts of the country based on tonnes per year of emitted NOx (rather than concentrations of NO2). The coefficient for NO2 is £64,605 per tonne of NOx emitted for transport in outer London. In this case CERC estimate a saving of about 2 tonnes per year resulting in an estimated monetary value of approximately £120,000.</p> <p>DB – What health improvements will result from these modest air quality improvements? BG – We will feedback to consultants to see if an estimate can be made.</p> <p><u>Post meeting note:</u></p> <p>The breakdown for Enfield is as follows:</p> <p>NO2: 2,999 life years lost (total of 88,113 for the whole of</p>	

	<p>London)</p> <p>PM10: 1,944 years lost (total of 52,630 for the whole of London)</p> <p>DB – How will that be reported to Cabinet? BG – We will send Partnership Board’s comments to Members to enable them to be considered as part of the decision making process.</p> <p>Karl Brown (KB) advised that deaths due to air pollution are available on a ward by ward basis and for Enfield the figure is about 200 premature deaths per year.</p> <p>DB – If Council closes its mind to consultation responses this could become a legal matter.</p> <p>JR – We need better quality engines to improve air quality. This scheme only achieves minor improvements saving one or two lives. Council has taken a dismissive attitude to DB referendum.</p> <p>HO went to GLA Transport Committee where it was stated that there had been no modal shift from cars in central London just public transport.</p> <p>PR – The Council is promoting cycling by a number of supportive measures, including free cycle training for anyone that lives, works and studies in Enfield; the £10 bike loan scheme and Dr Bike sessions etc.</p> <p>Dave Skinner (DS) has been involved in a number of schemes across Europe and the air quality improvements described are huge.</p> <p>CR – Surprised at the view of many that improvement is only small so not worth it. This is irresponsible. This scheme is the start of something big that will benefit generations to come.</p> <p>TN – No evidence that there will be an increase in cycling. Halfords bike sales dropped by 7% last year. Many ethnic minorities wouldn’t be seen dead on a bike.</p>	
<b>6.</b>	<b>ECONOMIC IMPACT</b>	
	<p>Consultants from Regeneris (CR) presented their findings. Impacts assessed at town centre level, rather than for individual businesses.</p> <p>HO – How much time was spent thinking about who uses town centres? Main customers are busy women who need a car and they need stop and shop bays. Concerned that loss of parking impact is underestimated, particularly in Winchmore Hill.</p> <p>HO – How many businesses did you speak to when conducting</p>	

	<p>the economic vitality assessment? Six businesses, Green Lanes Business Association, North London Chamber of Commerce, Enfield Business &amp; Retailers Association and N21 online.</p> <p>MR echoed HO's comments and found it amusing that consultant's report noted importance of town centre management but Council had made the town centre teams redundant.</p> <p>EH complained that no time had been given to analyse the report and comment in detail.</p> <p>DB – Has northern section of Palmers Green been segmented to see what impact is there? CR – No.</p> <p>TN – Why was report commissioned so late?</p> <p>Someone asked about cash collection/delivery to banks and local businesses.</p> <p>Someone asked about off-peak parking on yellow lines at Green Lanes, particularly around the triangle.</p>	
<b>7.</b>	<b>EQUALITIES IMPACT ASSESSMENT (EQIA)</b>	
	<p>PR presented a summary of the predictive EQIA.</p> <p>Franklin Brady (RNIB) – What strategies are we employing to reduce hazards? PR – In the detailed design phase we will incorporate a range of measures to help people with impaired vision to navigate their way around including contrasting paving, tactile paving and kerb upstands.</p> <p>Franklin – Cyclists move fast and his condition means he struggles to see them.</p> <p>JR – Were there any difference in responses from different ages and how many disabled people responded to consultation? PR and RE - in the 0-59 age group 64% of respondents support the proposals and in the 60+ age group 34% of respondents support the proposals. 48 respondents are limited a lot by a health problem or disability and 109 respondents are limited a little by a health problem or disability</p> <p>AG – How many disability groups were consulted? PR – Three disability groups were consulted as follows: Enfield Disability Action, Enfield Vision and RNIB</p> <p>HO expected a risk assessment.</p> <p>PR explained ongoing process.</p>	

<b>8.</b>	<b>COMMENTS OF CRITICAL FRIENDS</b>	
	<p>PR explained that the critical friends were UDL and the Metropolitan Police Traffic Unit and outlined the responses they gave to the scheme design.</p> <p>SR – Did we take on board UDL request for better pedestrian facilities only we have removed some signal pedestrian crossings? AS – We have actually increased signal crossings and zebra crossings.</p> <p>KB – What did other emergency services have to say? PR – No concerns raised by London Fire &amp; Rescue Service on response times. London Ambulance Service turned down several meeting invites but there will be other opportunities for them to influence the proposals during the statutory consultation.</p> <p>ABL – Did we consult local emergency services? PR – Yes, Metropolitan Police Traffic Management Unit and the Station Commander at Edmonton Fire Station.</p> <p>Concern was expressed about uncontrolled crossings and loss of central refuges.</p>	
<b>9.</b>	<b>PROPOSED RECOMMENDATIONS TO CABINET</b>	
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To note the results of the public consultation.</li> <li>2. That approval be granted to undertake detailed design, statutory consultation and implementation for lightly segregated cycling facilities and public realm improvements along the A105 between Enfield Town and Palmers Green.</li> <li>3. That subject to TfL’s Surface Board releasing the next tranche of Mini Holland funding, approval be granted for capital expenditure of £5.9m for detailed design, statutory consultation, implementation and client costs.</li> <li>4. That delegated authority be granted to the Cabinet Member for Environment to approve and implement the final design of the scheme subject to consultation and completion of all necessary statutory procedures.</li> </ol>	

<b>10.0</b>	<b>FEEDBACK</b>	
	<p>DB doesn't believe that he has been able to comment properly. Scheme does not have the necessary support. More extensive consultation is required. Recommendation should not go forward.</p> <p>TN believes the latest letter from Boris to Doug Taylor requires a 2 months pause to enable more engagement to be carried out. TN enquired about the questions/issues to be considered in the statutory consultation.</p>	