

Fox Lane and Meadway Traffic Management Proposals

Prepared by David Bird for the Fox Lane area Transport Working Group – 12 February 2020

This note seeks to set out a suggested way of taking forward proposals to implement traffic management restrictions in the Fox Lane and Meadway Area. It has been prepared by David Bird and approved by FLATWG (Fox Lane Area Transport Working Group).

The note follows a meeting held between FLATWG representatives and Cllr. Barnes and Richard Eason of LBE on 27 January and a subsequent meeting of the FLATWG's steering committee.

Introduction

It should be recognised that FLATWG does not present itself as a group representative of views within the area affected by the traffic management proposals. However, they are a group of interested residents who are keen to see the best outcome for the residents of the area. They also wish to take a positive approach of working with the Council so that if/when a scheme is introduced it is optimum and has the most buy in from the local community and therefore the greatest chance of success.

This note covers three aspects as follows:

- Further Consultation;
- Assessment Criteria
- Preferred scheme

Further Consultation

The most recent consultation undertaken by the Council was at and following the Starbucks exhibition. It is probably fair to say that it is common ground that this consultation could have been handled better and that the scheme put forward was not optimum. A number of alternatives have been put forward and it may be that there can be more consensus around a scheme that achieves the same objectives as the "Starbucks" scheme but with more logical routes in and out of the area and less constraint on resident's movements.

However, to move straight to a trial of this scheme without some further consultation may not be optimum for gaining the support and trust of the local community. It is suggested that when LBE have developed their preferred scheme that consultation is undertaken with the various interest groups in the area and then a wider consultation undertaken with the local community – perhaps through a further exhibition and response leaflet. By showing that the council has listened to local concerns and amended the scheme and then giving a further opportunity for comments will help to build trust.

Assessment Criteria

It is considered important that appropriate assessment criteria are established to assess the effects of any trial. These should include the following as a minimum (there may be other suitable criteria):

- Equalities Impact Assessment
- Before and after traffic counts on the roads within the restricted area
- Before and after counts on the peripheral roads affected ie The Bourne/Bourne Hill and High St/Cannon Hill/Aldermans Hill and monitored air quality

- Before and after queueing and journey time surveys, particularly on the approach to Southgate Circus and also on The Bourne, Bourne Hill, High Street Southgate, Green Lanes and Aldermans Hill;
- Impact on bus journey times and service reliability (routes 121, 125, 298,299, 329, 382, W6, W9;
- Local consultation (although care will be needed in assessing the results of this since those who experience significant reductions in traffic are likely to be supportive and those on previously quiet roads may not be).

Preferred Scheme

It should be noted that when the Steering Group voted at their first meeting on whether they supported a scheme that restricted movements through the area a majority voted against. However, it is recognised that LBE are likely to proceed with a scheme and therefore the next task is to determine a preferred form of scheme.

Two questions arise: where should the restrictions be introduced and how?

In terms of **where the restrictions could be introduced**, the attached plan shows FLATWG's preferred solution. It reduces the number of restrictions to 10 but fulfils the objective of restricting the possibility of through movements.

There are some roads where there would seem to be a logical location for the restriction whilst there are others where there is more flexibility. All locations should be subject to detailed investigation before determining the optimum solution.

One point that has been made in discussions is that there is also the opportunity for placemaking where restrictions are introduced. However, even if a closure is not introduced at a particular location there are still opportunities for placemaking through reducing road widths, one way working etc. It should also be noted that it may be necessary for emergency vehicle provision to be provided at some/all of the restrictions and making that allowance may limit the placemaking opportunities.

Taking each location in turn:

Location 1: If located as shown this will have the following advantages:

- Pick up rat running using Bourne Avenue; Greenway and Parkway with one restriction point;
- allow turning movements for service vehicles etc at the triangle.
- There are sufficient areas of planting on the verges (ie where there are no drives) to allow a suitable location of barriers.
- The location is also clear of the commercial activities at the junction of Meadway and High Street (shops and Meadway Garage)

Location 2: The restriction should be between Oakfield Road and the entrance to Ye Old Cherry Tree. This is on the basis that the restriction needs to be west of Oakfield Road but it seems appropriate to allow access and egress to the pub/hotel car park from Cannon Hill.

Location 3: At a suitable location on Selborne Road (inc. at either end)

Location 4: It seems appropriate to locate this restriction at the east end of Conway Road since this then prevents the use of Harlech and Ullswater roads as well.

Locations 5-9: At suitable locations on these roads (inc. at either end)

Location 10: If this is located to the east of Cranleigh Gardens (the W9 bus route) then it would not appear to need to be a bus gate but could be a normal restriction.

It should be noted that there are no restrictions proposed on the roads between Fox Lane and Bourne Hill since there would be no need with the 10 locations identified above. It has been suggested that if queueing stretched back to this location on The Bourne, people may seek to rat run via one of these roads and Fox Lane. This is considered unlikely but could be monitored and if any issue arose further restrictions could be considered.

Turning to **the method of restriction** FLATWG strongly prefers an ANPR system that restricts through traffic but allows permit holders (local residents) to pass through the barriers rather than permanent barriers

Some of the issues identified by the council with this proposal are as follows:

Cost: This is difficult to comment on without firm costs and revenue projections and with no knowledge of the available budget. It should be for the council to investigate this since they will know how this can (or cannot) be integrated with their current systems etc. It should also be recognised that a resident would need to purchase a permit and this could generate significant revenue (potentially £150K per annum for 3000 vehicles at £50/annum).

Fairness: It has been suggested that in some locations in Enfield (assuming the scheme is rolled out elsewhere) then the cost of £50 may be prohibitive and therefore it would be unfair that people who could afford the permit would avoid the restrictions whilst others would not. It should be noted that the permit would only apply to car owners and an additional cost of £50 per annum onto car ownership for improved convenience would not seem unreasonable.

Who gets a permit? The question has been raised over the difficulty in deciding who does and does not get a permit. The suggested answer is that permits would be for residents only thus avoiding any decision making. Other local users (such as care workers), would still have access to every property and therefore would be no more or less inconvenienced than with the permanent barrier system. However, consideration could still be given to granting one carer permit to any resident needing long term care.

Placemaking: Cameras do not allow placemaking: This is not considered to necessarily be the case since, if a camera location was combined with a road narrowing, then placemaking opportunities would be created.

Therefore, none of the above issues appears fatal at this stage and we urge the council to investigate this option further so that it can be properly considered.

Peripheral Roads:

One issue that has been raised is the effect of the proposals on the relevant peripheral roads. The council are urged to consider mitigation measures on these roads such as additional pedestrian crossing points, 20MPH speed limit, the planting of additional trees and dense hedges to screen and absorb vehicle emissions etc.