

CYCLE ENFIELD PARTNERSHIP BOARD MEETING

MONDAY 15 JUNE 2015

CONFERENCE ROOM, ENFIELD CIVIC CENTRE

Attendees:

The meeting was attended by the following stakeholders:

Cllr. Bambos Charalambous (Chair)	Mark Smith, London Cycling Campaign
Cllr. Alan Sitkin	Costas Georgiou, Green Lanes Business Assn.
Cllr. Edward Smith	Dave Skinner, Enfield Cycling Club &UCI
Cllr. Ertan Hurer	Paul Mandel, Fox Lane & District Residents' Assn. (FLDRA)
Cllr. Claire Stewart	David Hilliard, LCC/ECC
Cllr. Dinah Barry	Ann Humphrey, Grange Park Residents' Assn.
Cllr. Derek Levy	Hugh Humphrey, N21.net
Helen Osman, N21 on line/N21 Live Local Spend Local	Atholl Noon, Jacobs
Mark Rudling, Enfield Business & Retailers' Assn. (EBRA)	Alex Stebbings, Jacobs
Mark Leaver, EBRA	Rezawan Hussain, Jacobs
Tahsin Ibrahim, EBRA	Nivedita Vijayan, Jacobs
Olly Prigmore, EBRA & Business owner	Bob Griffiths, Enfield Council
Susan Younger, FLDRA	David Taylor, Enfield Council
Graham Beech, Southgate District Civic Trust	Liam Mulrooney, Enfield Council
Tony Kingsnorth, BPRA	Richard Eason, Enfield Council
Rosie Downes, London Cycling Campaign	Rachel Buck, Enfield Council
Mel Cazzato, TfL	Ned Johnson, Enfield Council
Allison Lee, WHRA	Paul Rogers, Enfield Council
Karl Brown	

1. WELCOME AND APOLOGIES

Councillor Charalambous, Chair of the Partnership Board, welcomed everyone to the meeting. Each attendee introduced themselves.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Vicki Pite, Councillor Lee David-Sanders, Robert Taylor, David Hughes, Adrian Lauchlan, Mary Fowler, Roger Kingsnorth and Glenn Stewart.

2. MATTERS ARISING

All actions arising from the previous meeting had been completed.

3. ROLE OF THE PARTNERSHIP BOARD

Bob Griffiths explained the role and purpose of the Board to those present. A job description for the work of the Board had been agreed at a Cabinet meeting held in September 2014. The role was to look in detail at the proposals being put forward in consultation with Council staff and to add comments (through post-it notes and verbally at the meeting).

The formal consultation process would start within the next few weeks and would last for 12 weeks; the outcomes of the process would be fed back to the Partnership Board in due course.

The last meeting discussed the general principles and now the Council was submitting more detailed designs, parking arrangements, how the routes might look and schematics around streetscapes.

4. CYCLING AND PUBLIC REALM PROPOSALS FOR THE A105

Alex Stebbings from Jacobs delivered a presentation about the cycling and public realm proposals for the A105. The key issues within the presentation and raised by those present included:

- In response to a question from Councillor Edward Smith regarding possible alternative proposals for the Green Lanes route, it was confirmed that others had been looked at and discounted because TfL would not fund them through the Mini Holland Programme;
- The presentation included information on:
 - Design development;
 - Why the A105?;
 - Key comments, issues and concerns;
 - A105 proposed designs;
 - Next steps.

- **Back to the Drawing Board**

Over 320 people had attended the first exhibition where various concerns and matters were raised. Proposals have been developed and now further comments and feedback was being requested.

- **Why the A105?**

- Enfield was one of five outer London boroughs identified with the potential to increase cycle trips, particularly along the A105;
- Nearly 80% of car trips in Enfield are of a cycleable length;

- **Key Comments/Issues**

- Keep Palmers Green Triangle;
- Alternatives to the A105 route;
- Shared space;
- Parking and loading.

- **Parking and Loading**

- Palmers Green would retain all its loading bays;
- There would be a net parking increase of approximately 13 spaces.

- **Winchmore Hill**

- 100% loading bays retained;
- Net increase of 54 retail parking spaces;

- Ford's Grove car park would be converted to pay and display.
- **All routes from A105**
 - A hierarchy of routes was needed;
 - The need to direct access to key town centres;
 - Enhance the town centre;
 - Greater sense of place.
- **Keep the Triangle**
 - There were options to retain the Triangle and also a roundabout option.
- **Shared Space**
 - Town centre designs use shared space;
 - Scope to consider 20mph zones at key locations along the route.
- **Potential for Cycling in Enfield**
 - Nearly 40% of people have indicated that they cycled or would consider cycling – indicating that there was a demand;
 - Main barriers – safety;
 - Lots of support for supportive measures;
 - 80% of trips in the borough were of a cycleable distance;
 - 50% of households in London have at least one bicycle (in response to a question, it was confirmed that this figure did not indicate whether the number included children).
- **Congestion on the Corridor**
 - Puts a pressure on roads and some loss of capacity junctions;
 - TfL reviewed results of modelling;
 - Changing the nature of the road to make it more town focussed;
 - Might increase 20mph zones;
 - Reduction in traffic.
- **Residential Parking**
 - Survey showed that maximum occupancy along the A105 was 57%, with an average of 34%;
 - Formal spaces will be provided for 82% of the average;
 - Some parking would be relocated to side streets.
- The town centre cross section diagrams depicted the different style of materials.
- The residential area cross sections showed slightly different set ups due to the turnover in spaces being lower.
- The consultation drawing examples would change after taking on board comments and would be re-submitted as part of the consultation.
- **Next Steps**

- Business event 16 July
- Public exhibition 17 and 18 July
- Public consultation 17 July for 12 weeks
- Enfield scheme approval December 2015
- TfL scheme approval March 2016
- Detailed design December 15 – May 16
- Construction May 16 – October 16

- **Consultation**

The consultation would take the form of online consultation – the process was outlined.

- **Events Channel**

- 16 July Business event at the Fox Public House
- 17/18 July Public exhibition at the Fox Public House
- August Pop-up event at the Triangle
- 6 September Palmers Green Festival
- 12/13 September Enfield Town Show

- **Digital Channel**

- Youth Cycle Champions
- Promotion on Twitter and Facebook
- Photo competition
- E newsletter
- Cycle Enfield website
- Enfield website

- **Print Channel**

- Our Enfield
- JD Decaux boards 14 – 18 July
- Posters in public buildings and schools
- Bus sides 13 – 27 July
- Internal bus panels 6 July – 2 August
- Half page newspaper ads July

- **Consultation Channel**

- Write to all business along the route (within 300 to 400 metres of the route)
- Write to all residents along the route
- 12 week online consultation

In response to a question on the available increase in parking, it was confirmed that the 83 spaces was along the Fox Lane – south route;

A concern was raised about the difficulty in downloading the material from the web. It was confirmed that the physical events would give clearer images, which would include the exhibition at the Fox Pub. Hard copies could be made available upon request.

Councillor Smith suggested that some of the schemes, particularly at junctions could be depicted through models; he thought that despite a little more expense, this would be worth considering. In response, attendees were informed that there were various artistic impressions available to view at this meeting.

A concern was raised that at some bus stops passengers would be required to cross cycle lanes which would prove difficult for many people.

5. FEEDBACK ON QUIETER NEIGHBOURHOODS

- (a) The scope of the project was to look at residential roads bounded by main roads, railways and rivers; 33 areas have been identified throughout the borough and these were being reviewed at a rate of four to six areas per year;
- (b) The project was borne out of Cycle Enfield in terms of cycle safety;
- (c) It was hoped the measures would encourage more people to walk and cycle;
- (d) Questionnaires had been sent to residents. They have been invited to attend design workshops, held locally. Full public consultation was intended;
- (e) Issues to be Tackled
 - Rat running
 - Speeding
 - The school run
 - Commercial vehicles
 - Local parking
- (f) Kinds of Measures
 - Road closures
 - No entries
 - Traffic calming
 - One way streets
 - Play and home zones
 - Parking restrictions
 - Suggested measures would be trialled.

Councillor Smith outlined his primary concern that there were various measures to be in place throughout the year however it was his view that during the winter months few people would cycle. Meanwhile these measures would lead to increased congestion benefiting very few cyclists at certain times of the year. He suggested that the measures for Quieter Neighbourhoods might be restricted to avoid the winter months. Various responses were made to the concern that cyclists would only use their bicycles in more clement weather, in the main to assure those present that they cycled throughout the year.

A concern was raised that the projects were trying to introduce non hard-core cyclists who would only cycle occasionally. It was the view that the measures were way off the scale and were a fantasy. Again, a cyclist present refuted the suggestion that the measures were focussed on non hard-core cyclists and that everyone would be encouraged to cycle in the winter if conditions were made safer.

A view that cycling was enjoying an enormous uptake across London and stretched throughout the year. Enfield was lagging behind and there was now an opportunity to make cycling safer and the environment cleaner and to make town centres places of destination.

A concern how the proposals would change residential areas as the parking arrangements would badly affect business along the routes e.g. churches, surgeries, offices, shops etc. Drivers needed to park to attend these facilities for a short time. A question was asked whether a risk assessment had been undertaken in respect of these facilities and businesses in the event of them losing only 10% of their customers. Assurance was given that this issue would be looked at through developing a business case.

It was confirmed that as much parking as possible has been included within the project; and more than originally planned at the last meeting. An undertaking was given that there would be a further review during the next phase of consultation.

6. IMPACT ON AIR QUALITY

The impact of the scheme on air quality was on the agenda in response to requests made at the last meeting.

- Data was due next month on the current pollutants;
- Proposals would be submitted to measure the impact of Cycle Enfield and the effect in the reduction of traffic;
- It would take around one month to produce a model.

Councillor Smith said that the key objective was to improve air quality. He was concerned that although there would be fewer car journeys, the resultant congestion as an outcome of the measures might result in higher pollution. It was confirmed that the cycle lanes would initially increase congestion but this would be less once the schemes had been embedded.

A concern was raised that the route accommodated heavy through-traffic and that there was insufficient capacity in the proposals to accommodate HGVs and buses as the schemes would produce a 'tight squeeze'. In response, it was confirmed that the roads would be able to cope. The attendees then put forward a scenario that at the current time, there was just sufficient room to manoeuvre around a broken down bus; this would not be the case once the scheme had been implemented. It was the view that this area would be gridlocked.

There was a suggestion that smaller lorries/vans should be used for deliveries or that access for HGVs should be restricted along the route. Councillor Hurer responded that the use of multiple vans would be needed for deliveries in the area if larger lorries were restricted.

In terms of the alternative routes, it was confirmed that two additional routes were looked at but as previously stated, these would not be funded by TfL through the Mini Holland funding. Some routes were already being reviewed and funded through other funding streams.

A video was shown at the meeting which depicted a cycle ride along the New River which runs parallel with Green Lanes. The video graphically showed the obstacles confronting

cyclists e.g. steps, 90 degree bends, trees, fences and kissing gates etc. and that this was not a continuous route.

Councillor Smith said that the Enfield Town – Green Lanes stretch was underused and was wide enough and had limited impediments to accommodate cyclists; he thought that this route should not be written off. Officers agreed that there were parts that were accessible but to develop the whole route would be too costly. There was also a significant slope in one part of the route. It was suggested that a slope could be engineered out of the route and that other areas could be made accessible through negotiation with Thames Water. Councillor Hurer reminded those present that such a scheme would not be funded by TfL.

One person thought that it would be a shame to take cyclists away from the businesses along Green Lanes. Councillor Barry said at a previous meeting, it had been confirmed that a continuous route could not be provided. In response, Councillor Charalambous thought that the Enfield Town to Grange Park would be worth looking at.

There was a suggestion that this route could also be promoted as a walking route and that its promotion as aesthetically pleasing would encourage cyclists. Officers did suggest that in the winter months cyclists would feel less secure along this dark and wet route.

The meeting was informed that there was a greenway route project running parallel to the A105 due to be delivered as part of the LIP programme. This would be developed over the next few years but could not be funded through the Mini Holland project.

The Chair brought to an end the first part of the meeting by emphasising that tonight was a preview of the official public consultation and there was a chance for people to write down their views on the post-it notes provided. A break of 35 minutes was taken to allow attendees to scrutinise the drawings and to question officers on the detail.

Upon resumption, Councillor Charalambous reiterated that the official consultation was yet to commence. The comments and discussion at this meeting would be fed into the consultation process which would start next month. The Chair thought the suggestion of a permanent exhibition was a good idea and could be situated at either the Civic Centre of the Dugdale Centre.

This was the first scheme to be implemented and the next step, after the 12 week consultation period, would be to reconvene in October to review the feedback and how the plans have been shaped.

Councillor Charalambous thanked everyone for attending and contributing their various comments.