

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE  
HELD ON TUESDAY, 10 JANUARY 2017**

**COUNCILLORS**

**PRESENT** Derek Levy, Abdul Abdullahi, Katherine Chibah, Joanne Laban and Edward SmithElaine Hayward

**ABSENT**

**STATUTORY CO-OPTTEES:** *1 vacancy (Church of England diocese representative), Mr Simon Goulden (other faiths/denominations representative), Mr Tony Murphy (Catholic diocese representative), Alicia Meniru & 1 vacancy (Parent Governor representative) - Italics Denotes absence*

**OFFICERS:** Ian Davis (Director of Regeneration and Environment), Bob Griffiths (Assistant Director Planning, Highways and Transport), David B Taylor (Head of Traffic and Transportation), Richard Eason (Cycle Enfield Consultation Manager) Glenn Stewart (Assistant Director, Public Health) Andy Ellis (Scrutiny Officer), Stacey Gilmour (Scrutiny Secretary)

**Also Attending:** Councillor Terry Neville OBE JP (Leader of the Opposition), Councillor Daniel Anderson (Cabinet Member, Environment), Councillor Vicki Pite (Associate Cabinet Member) and 35 members of the public.

**324**

**WELCOME AND APOLOGIES**

Attendees were welcomed to the meeting.

Apologies for absence were received from Simon Goulden and Tony Murphy. It was noted that Councillor Elaine Hayward was substituting for Councillor Joanne Laban.

The Chair then outlined how the meeting was to proceed. The meeting would focus on the reasons given on this occasion for two Call-ins – ‘Approval of Cycle Enfield – Proposals for Enfield Town’ and ‘Approval of Cycle Enfield – Proposals for the A1010 North’; questions likewise would be only taken on these items in relation to the ‘Reasons for Call-in’, cited reasons being the exclusive basis for this and any other particular call-in meeting.

The Chair also reminded members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee that they need to be fully committed to ensuring that scrutiny works in Enfield by being impartial and leaving party politics out of the scrutiny process.

## OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - 10.1.2017

As both Call-ins related to the same overall programme, The Chair gave Councillor Neville the opportunity to present both call-ins simultaneously, however, Councillor Neville declined, explaining that as there were subtle differences between the two schemes and the reasons for call-in, he would prefer to present them separately.

### 325

#### DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were received.

### 326

#### CALL IN REPORT OF: APPROVAL OF CYCLE ENFIELD - PROPOSALS FOR ENFIELD TOWN

The Chair invited Councillor Neville to outline and substantiate the reasons for Call –In.

Councillor Neville stated that there were 7 key issues relating to why the decision to approve the scheme should be reviewed, which were as follows:

- The specific details of the proposed scheme have not been subject to public consultation. Residents and businesses have not had an opportunity to comment on the proposals as this scheme was removed from the initial consultation process.
- The locality of the cycle lanes should be reviewed in line with The Mayor of London's comments who states that cyclists should be diverted away from main roads on to quieter routes.
- There has been no proper consultation with bus companies who operate approximately 15 bus routes which pass through Enfield Town. TFL have confirmed that they do not consult with bus companies.
- To state that the emergency services have 'No Objections' is not strictly correct when you consider the detail of the responses received. Emergency Services have expressed concerns about increased congestion and journey times.
- It is always useful to have detail on youth engagement, however, this was absent from the report.
- Traffic analysis undertaken in July 2014 warns of delays and we regularly see delays through the centre of town, especially during the winter months.
- The air quality report is very ambiguous. There will be some improvement in certain areas however there will be increased levels of poor air quality at junctions as traffic builds up. The National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) Guidelines 2016 state that cyclists shouldn't travel along main roads as they will inhale car exhaust fumes.

## OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - 10.1.2017

This should be about the health benefits for cyclists, however, the exhaust fumes being generated will have an adverse impact.

Councillor Neville requested that the decision be referred back to the Cabinet Member for Environment for reconsideration.

The Chair invited Councillor Anderson to respond, as follows:

- Councillor Fonyonga, Cabinet Member for Community Safety and Public Health had wanted to attend the meeting but was unable and sent her apologies.
- He disagreed with Councillor Neville's comments relating to a lack of consultation and confirmed that Richard Eason would provide further detail.
- In response to the comments from the Mayor of London, Councillor Anderson wished to emphasise that these comments related to cycle super-highways and not mini-cycle schemes and David B Taylor would refer to a communication received from the Mayor of London's Office.
- Councillor Anderson referred to consultation with bus companies and disagreed with Councillor Neville's opinion. All bus companies will be involved in the consultation stage of this specific scheme.
- As the scheme has developed, many views have been considered.
- Richard Eason gave details of the consultation that will be undertaken, including workshops with residents and local businesses allowing them to influence final designs. A series of public exhibitions will be held also.
- Glenn Stewart provided clarification relating to the NICE Guidelines 2016 referred to by Councillor Neville. The Assistant Director for Public Health confirmed that the Nice Guidelines are only draft and the content has caused issues with many health professionals.
- Glenn Stewart further commented that with a projected population of 400,000 in Enfield by 2032, there will be a large increase in the number of cars in the borough.
- In response to Councillor Neville's comments on the Mayor of London's view, David B Taylor read out a communication received from the Mayor's Office *'In his interview the Mayor stated that he wants to work with Councils to build Quietway routes - which do not follow main roads - "where they can". Quietways are an important part of our overall strategy for encouraging more people to walk and cycle. However, Quietways are not the only type of cycle route that we are pursuing. A mixture of routes both on main roads and quieter roads is required to create a comprehensive cycling network. We are therefore also continuing to build Superhighway style cycle routes, on main roads, segregating cyclists from traffic.*
- Councillor Pite (Chair of the Cycle Enfield Partnership Board) commented that Members should attend the meetings when possible to hear about the detail of the work being undertaken.

## OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - 10.1.2017

The following questions and comments were then taken from Members of the Committee:

Councillor Keazor asked if we would see a new design after the consultation? Richard Eason reiterated that as part of the consultation process, views would be considered and reflected in the final design.

In highlighting an issue for disabled residents within the proposals for the A105 Cycle Enfield scheme, Cllr Hayward asked if facilities for people with mobility issues would be considered within the Enfield Town scheme? David B Taylor replied that similar issues would be considered and reflected in the final designs.

Councillor Chibah asked how long the consultation would last? Richard Eason confirmed that the consultation would last for 4 weeks during spring with opportunities for residents to influence the final design at co-design workshops. Thousands of leaflets will be distributed to ensure as many people as possible are aware of the opportunities to contribute to the design of the scheme.

Councillor Smith commented that air quality improvements would be marginal if any at all and considered that more information would be needed in this area. In addition, Councillor Smith asked how the Council would mitigate drivers trying to avoid Enfield Town and possible traffic congestion?

Councillor Abdullahi asked if there would be any areas where air pollution will increase?

In response to questions on air quality and traffic congestion, officers confirmed that both would be monitored.

A member of the public asked a question relating to the economic effect of the scheme, and what support could be provided to retailers?

Councillor Anderson confirmed that the Regeneration Team will be addressing these issues and engaging with retailers.

Before asking Councillors to summarise, the Chair obtained confirmation from Officers that Arriva, Go-Ahead and all other bus companies would be consulted before the final design is devised.

In summarising his response to Call-in, Councillor Anderson reiterated that there would be further consultation with the public, emergency services and bus companies. In addition, there would be workshops held to allow stakeholders to influence the final design of the scheme.

Councillor Neville then summarised the reasons for call-in and added that the Cabinet report should have been explicit in the need to consult with the people

## OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - 10.1.2017

to gain their views. Councillor Neville requested the decision be referred back to the Cabinet Member for Environment for reconsideration.

The Committee then voted on the decision as follows:

Councillors Chibah, Abdullahi and Keazor voted in favour of the decision.

Councillors Hayward and Smith voted to refer the decision back to the Cabinet member.

The Chair **CONFIRMED** the decision.

### 327

#### **CALL IN REPORT OF: APPROVAL OF CYCLE ENFIELD - PROPOSALS FOR A1010 (NORTH)**

The Chair invited Councillor Neville to outline and substantiate the reasons for Call –In.

- Councillor Neville referred to the main area of concern, the response to the consultation exercise, detailing that of the 663 responses, only 43% supported this scheme. Cabinet should have considered these figures in more detail. He added that this lack of support is presumably as a result of the upheaval that will be caused. The A1010 North is a narrow road, with a high volume of traffic, often heavy vehicles and lots of buses.
- The Cabinet report does not give any results from the ‘business walk’ and this lack of clear evidence of support is due to the impact that the scheme will have on retailers.
- With a number of bus routes along this road, there should have been direct consultation with bus company operators. This is a bus dependent area but buses will be delayed. The emergency services are more in agreement with this scheme than Enfield Town but the London Ambulance Service have noted that minutes will be put on response times and they would prefer hump-free roads.
- The impact on parking for residents and businesses must be considered further. Almost half of the resident’s bays will be removed and approximately a quarter of all loading and waiting bays which are highly utilised. Free footpath cross-overs are to be offered to residents who require one, however, officers have been unable to quantify this number.
- The economic impact must be carefully considered. Many of the shops along this corridor are suffering and further disruption could see them go under.
- In relation to air quality, Councillor Neville asked that the issues raised in relation to the Enfield Town scheme be applied to the A1010 north.
- Councillor Neville concluded by saying that a dramatic modal shift is required but in his opinion that will not be achieved.

## OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - 10.1.2017

Councillor Neville requested that the decision be referred back to the Cabinet Member for Environment for reconsideration.

The Chair invited Councillor Anderson to respond, as follows:

- Councillor Anderson stated that the points raised in both call-ins were similar and he would ask Officers to respond on specific issues.
- In addition to the 663 people who responded directly to the consultation, Officers spoke to over 1,000 people as part of a survey. This was discussed at the Cabinet meeting
- Engagement is often challenging in the Eastern part of the borough so to mitigate this the business walk was carried out to ensure that businesses along the A1010 were aware of the opportunity to engage with the process of design and proved to be a useful event.
- The Council and relevant TfL stakeholders (including representatives from London Buses) meet regularly to discuss all Cycle Enfield schemes. As the detailed design for the A1010 North progresses, further engagement with TfL and the bus operators will continue.
- Figures quoted by Councillor Neville in relation to loss of parking were refuted and statistics given showing more detail of the impact on parking along the A1010.
- Cllr Pite commented that people are likely to start using bicycles when safe bicycle lanes are available.
- Modal shift may be a challenge, however, not impossible. In Holland, 25% of journeys by people over 75 are by bicycle.

The following questions and comments were then taken from Members of the Committee:

Councillor Smith asked Councillor Anderson to give an undertaking to measure some of the issues, for example, air quality and journey times once the scheme is implemented.

Cllr Anderson replied that he agreed in principle as evaluation is very important.

In response to a question it was confirmed that design changes following public consultation will be highlighted in an exhibition to illustrate that consultation has been considered.

The Chair asked Councillor Anderson to summarise but Councillor Anderson stated that he had nothing further to add.

In summary, Councillor Neville reiterated concerns regarding support available to struggling businesses and commented that Cabinet should have challenged detail on the economic impact and mitigation issues. Councillor Neville requested that the decision be referred back to the Cabinet Member for Environment for reconsideration.

## OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - 10.1.2017

The Committee then voted on the decision as follows:

Councillors Chibah, Abdullahi and Keazor voted in favour of the decision.

Councillors Hayward and Smith voted to refer the decision back to the Cabinet member.

The Chair **CONFIRMED** the decision.

### **328**

#### **MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD 10 NOVEMBER 2016**

The minutes of the 10 November 2016 were AGREED.

### **329**

#### **DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

The next business meeting is scheduled for 17<sup>th</sup> January 2017, with the OSC Budget meeting following on 19<sup>th</sup> January 2017.