

FLATWG Meeting Feb 4th 7.45 Cherry Tree Pub

Working Group Members present

Ayfar Hakki, Caroline Hennebry, Cheryl Powling, Christina Scordelis, Davd Abrahams, Dave Melkman, David Bird, Elizabeth Devine, Haluk Hakki John Phillips, Jon Daniels, Liz Partridge, Nando Obertelli, Paul Mandel, Peter Powell, Stephen Blomberg,

1. Apologies received from

Angela Wharton, Becky Beach, Dan Maier, Danni Manzi, James Lawn, Jeremy Hay Campbell, Richard Mapleston, Rob Wilson, Sue Younger

2. The minutes of the last meeting were approved.

3. Matters arising – none

4. Feedback from the previous week's meeting with Cllr Barnes and Richard Eason.

David Bird's perspective was that the meeting was constructive and handled with a friendly atmosphere. Cllr Barnes, he felt was genuine, but had definite objectives in mind.

The representatives of our group reported that our meeting voted overall for no road closures, and was very concerned with the effects of the scheme on the surrounding roads.

The council's initial scheme was agreed to be not going ahead as planned.

FLATWG then discussed the 'Green leaflet' scheme, which was felt had more support than the council's initial plans. It was felt to be more comprehensive with fewer cut off roads. The positioning of the physical closures (at the end or in the middle of the roads) was then discussed. DB said that it would probably be a 'road by road' decision.

ANPR – the meeting had no fundamental objection to this scheme, but there were worries about it, if extended borough wide. The capital cost seemed an issue with the council, but estimates of this varied by 25K per camera. The meeting wondered if it would be too difficult politically, also if the cost of permits would be divisive and whether the council would veer towards the ease of physical barriers.

The meeting decided not to close the door on efforts to get ANPR as a preferred solution, and to be strong on any trial scheme needing a grounding in proper assessment criteria. What would be the criteria – air quality on boundary roads, journey times, equalities impact, increased volume of traffic? More data was felt to be needed.

NEXT STEPS

Enfield Council's healthy streets team is expected to publish the results of its public engagement in shortly with revised plans.

The group wanted to find out if Cllr Barnes had accepted that the whole council have to be involved in the scheme. It seems not, and that it is CB's sole decision as he is the council representative responsible for the matter. Other Councillors cannot call anything in to Overview and Scrutiny until the decision on how to proceed has been made, by Cllr. Barnes.

Agreed by meeting - that the 20mph speed limit is acceptable by all. It seems that it may be a possible 'borough wide' plan. It was also taken as read that certain streets felt much more in need of closure. The holistic approach to the scheme was also agreed by the meeting. .

JP felt that the Council have had their fingers burnt, but that they are listening and responding. All at last week's meeting agreed that lack of communication was the main issue. The council plan of consultation - plan-trial-statutory consultation was a felt to be possible box ticking exercise by our group.

The floor was concerned that there was also a lack of awareness from residents.

DB spoke about speed reduction plans, council decisions and the implementation process.. The meeting wanted more information on the Council's budget for the Fox Lane Area LTN. However DB, PM and JP reported back that Cllr Barnes had advised them, there was none!

The floor asked about legal ways of stopping the Council's plans. PM explained that traffic schemes can often be held up by a public enquiry. However, his understanding is that if the scheme is implemented using Experimental Traffic Orders, there is no mechanism for calling a public enquiry

John spoke about the budgeting, re political considerations, the cost of ANPR and Cllr Barnes feeling that ANPR would not discourage car use by residents and by obviating the need for barriers would prevent the creation of placemakers (pocket parks). However, DB also pointed out that this was debatable as the junctions have much scope to be narrowed, creating the necessary space.

DB said that it would be better for all if the Council could take the community with it. As well as some 750 individuals 15 groups have fed back on the plans.

We felt that the council should have carried out a survey of residents opinion (similar to PM's but more professional and extensive) instead of allowing only narrative comments on their scheme. Their consultation had not done enough exploration of data. DB has the traffic count data collected by Enfield Council last year..

There was a discussion of pollution and traffic levels. The ULEZ is starting in Oct 2021 with limits at the N and S circular roads. May this have a benefit for our area, both in a reduction of traffic and pollution?

The group needed to find a compromise plan. Could Zip car points, or opening barriers be included in this? If road closures do happen, we should discuss how best to influence the outcome to get the best results for all. There is division among residents. However, the agreement points seem to be the acceptance of speed as a problem and the wish for a holistic solution.

5. PM spoke of his survey, and one group member commented on GDPR issues. (Payment was apparently not needed but dissemination on use of the data was.) He suggested that the council should do their own survey before doing any trial scheme. He then explained the results of his survey to the group, and suggested that they were a temperature check of residents' opinions, and the best we have at the moment

According to PM's survey, residents are fairly equally divided on whether traffic speeds and volumes are too great in the area. Though it is probably fair to say that in terms of traffic volume, residents of the busier roads, such as Old Park Road, Fox Lane, The Mall, Amberly road and the Meadway will have the greatest concerns

Traffic Calming is a less unpopular solution to the problem than road closures involving physical barriers. However, road closures using smart technology (ANPR) has more support.

6. There was then a detailed discussion about what to present to the council.

Speed humps were felt to be a nightmare for ambulances. Southgate Circus is a big concern, re the amount of and possible increase in traffic. It is already congested and the possibility of the Southgate Village development will only worsen this.

The Fox Lane Area LTN is a trial for an idea that Cllr Barnes would like to roll out throughout the Borough. Would similar schemes in neighbouring parts of the borough make the main roads more congested or would there be traffic evaporation? Encouraging the continued and increased use of district centres for shopping and recreation was felt to be vital.

DBs drafts ideas for a council consultation.

PM spoke on another low cost option – a `no entry except for access ` scheme, with 20mph and traffic calming. DB thought that the council were unlikely to take up a scheme that was likely to be abused, without strict enforcement.

It was agreed that David Bird would prepare a note to send to LBE setting out the suggested way forward. This would comprise 4 elements as follows: That the council should undertake a further consultation on the finally proposed scheme

*That if/when a trial is implemented there should be agreed criteria for assessment of the effects of the trial
Suggestions to be included in the note)*

FLATWG's preferred scheme

Some information on costs of ANPR cameras.

7. A.O.B None

Date of next meeting – Tuesday 25th February 7.45 ye Olde Cherry Tree Pub.

Meeting ended 21.45.