

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
HELD ON WEDNESDAY, 1 MARCH 2017**

COUNCILLORS

PRESENT Derek Levy, Abdul Abdullahi, Katherine Chibah, Edward Smith and Nneka Keazor, Michael Rye OBE and Edward Smith

ABSENT Joanne Laban

STATUTORY CO-OPTees: *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 Daniel Anderson (Cabinet Member for Environment)
Councillor Lee Chamberlain
Jon Judah, Cycle Enfield Project Director
18 members of the public

367

WELCOME & APOLOGIES

The Chair welcomed attendees to the meeting.

Apologies for absence were received from Simon Goulden and Alicia Meniru It was noted that Councillor Michael Rye was substituting for Councillor Joanne Laban.

The Chair then outlined how the meeting was to proceed. The meeting would focus on the reasons given for the Call-in – ‘Approval of Cycle Enfield – Proposals for the A1010 South’; 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.

368

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were received.

369

CALL-IN OF REPORT: APPROVAL OF CYCLE ENFIELD PROPOSALS FOR THE A1010 SOUTH

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

- Councillor Chamberlain referred to one of the main areas of concern, which was parking for residents and local businesses. The report fails to mention how the final plans allow for flexibility mentioned in 5.2.8 of the report where the operation of parking bays will be monitored post implementation and adjustments made to the number of bays/method of control.
- The London Ambulance Service needs 24/7 access, the proposed scheme's infrastructure could impede that access. The LAS is currently not meeting its response times so any restriction will not help them achieve them which is of detriment to residents. This particular scheme is on the doorstep of North Middlesex Hospital and any delays caused by this scheme could be critical.
- There is not much information in the report to justify the journey delay times stated and it was feared that journey times would get worse.
- The report fails to mention how the communication will be delivered in terms of explaining how bus borders work to residents especially the elderly, the blind and others with additional needs.
- The report fails to state the number of driveway crossovers that might be requested and the costs associated with providing them.
- The report mentions that air quality will worsen at certain junctions as NO2 will increase yet the report fails to recommend additional air quality monitors be used in order to monitor this so that improvements can be made.
- The decision does not comment upon the regeneration of the area including the White Hart Lane Stadium and Edmonton Heartlands Housing Zone and how the upscale in the development will affect the number of people using the A1010 and its impact on the scheme.
- The level of engagement has been extremely low. Out of 20,000 leaflets sent out the consultation only received 30 responses and they were mainly online. The scheme does not seem to justify value for money and appears to have been based on blind hope rather than evidence.

Councillor Chamberlain 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 many of the arguments raised, in particular Air Quality and the London Ambulance Service had been responded to and addressed at previous Cycle Enfield Call-Ins.

OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - 1.3.2017

- The A1010 Cabinet Report had not been called in, which was interesting seeing as many of the substantive points raised by Councillor Chamberlain were covered in this.
- Although there were not a substantial number of responses to the consultation, it was a good response for this area which normally has a very low respondent rate.
- Evidence from similar schemes, for example in Camden, showed a 15/20% reduction in poor air quality and pollution. Air quality monitoring and modelling are currently undertaken and this will continue in the future.
- The London Ambulance Service did not object to the proposals for the A1010 South, and offered support for schemes that reduce the potential for and severity of collisions.
- It was not accepted that there would be a negative impact on journey times for emergency service vehicles. The width of roads would increase as there would be no parked cars on either side due to the cycle lanes. Drivers could also move into the bus lanes to allow Emergency Service vehicles to pass.
- Car parking provision is being provided, as well as loading for businesses and this was detailed in 5.28 of the report. Surveys carried out demonstrate that sufficient parking will remain to meet existing demand.
- No representations or objections were made on the basis of additional traffic that may be generated from future development in the area and this was therefore not addressed in the report.
- Likewise, no representations or objections were made on the basis that there was insufficient information regarding the Council's plans to communicate with residents about use of the new bus boarders. However, explanations of how new types of infrastructure will be used will be disseminated via a range of channels including the Cycle Enfield website and newsletter. Visits can also be arranged for local groups (such as sheltered housing) along the route.

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

Councillor Abdullahi asked whether an Economic Impact Assessment had been carried out. David Taylor confirmed that it had, and had been considered as part of the original Cabinet Report.

Councillor Rye asked for days, dates and times of the traffic surveys that had been carried out. He also requested details on the number of Blue Badge Holder places that would be lost.

David confirmed that the surveys had taken place between 7am and 7pm on Thursday 29/1/2015 and Saturday 31/1/2015. He would provide details of any Blue Badge Holder losses outside of the meeting.

Action: David Taylor

OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - 1.3.2017

Richard Eason further added that as part of the detailed design process they would be looking at providing more Blue Badge spaces. Councillor Anderson agreed that there would be a commitment to increase Blue Badge bays. Councillor Rye said that increasing congestion at junctions and decreasing the quality of air would have a detrimental effect on the area and therefore felt that this was a substantial point to consider.

Councillor Anderson responded by stating that too many cars in the borough were creating too much pollution, which would only get worse with the increase in population. Therefore the aim was to decrease car usage in the borough by introducing cycle lanes. 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.

Councillor Chibah asked whether there had been any conversations with the Enfield Disability Action Group.

Richard confirmed that there had and that site visits had also been offered to look at bus borders in other areas of the scheme. Richard has also visited a bus border with a wheelchair user to gauge their views and comments.

Councillor Anderson commented that the Mayor for London had reinstated his commitment to these schemes. This is not an Enfield Council Scheme primarily, but a Mayor for London scheme, looking predominantly to provide healthier and better streets for London. More of these programmes will be rolled out across London, with Camden, Kingston and Waltham Forest also introducing these schemes.

Councillor Smith requested further details on the consultation figures and these were confirmed by Richard.

Further clarification was sought from members on the proposed car parking provision in the area, and this was explained in more detail by David Taylor and Bob Griffiths. Full details were also included in the original report.

Councillor Smith asked how the process would work for residents requesting crossovers to their properties. He requested information on the number of crossovers that were likely to be asked for and the costs involved.

David advised that in terms of crossovers Enfield Council would do its best to help residents and provide off street parking where possible. Any crossover request would however require an assessment process and would be subject to the usual planning requirements. At this stage it is not known how many residents will want crossovers. However the cost would be covered as part of the scheme and would come out of the Cycle Enfield funding. It would not be borne by Council Tax payers in Enfield.

The Chair Councillor Levy asked whether there had been any dialogue with Tottenham Hotspurs Football Club and the London Borough of Haringey regarding their impact assessment in terms of the impact of this scheme. David confirmed that Enfield Council have regular contact with Haringey on how to connect the schemes.

OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - 1.3.2017

Tony Murphy, Co-opted member raised concerns about the possible increase in journey times as well as congestion at bus stops particular around school closure times.

Councillor Anderson said that in other schemes already in place this type of argument had not come into fruition. The evidence that is there does not support these types of arguments.

Richard further added that a Youth Engagement activity had taken place last summer by way of a pop up Cycle Enfield scheme providing plans, maps and other information on the scheme. Over 1,000 young people had been spoken to (aged 8-21). 79% of those young people spoke to had said yes to the scheme. Many said they were keen to cycle now, but would not do so as they did not feel that the roads were safe. They were therefore very excited to see the introduction of cycle lanes in the borough.

Questions and comments were then invited from the floor. These included:

The Southern part of the Hertford Road has an extremely busy evening economy after 7pm on various days of the week including Sundays; therefore the traffic surveys carried out would not capture these statistics.

David explained that in addition to the surveys automatic traffic counters had been put down to collect data 24/7 for a period of one/two weeks. Therefore we are collecting the traffic volume at all times. Surveys have also been carried out to capture the movement of parked vehicles.

In response to a concern about diverting traffic away from the main road to side streets David Taylor advised that modelling work undertaken suggests that the scheme is not going to hugely impact on diverting traffic elsewhere.

Members and residents alike felt that the Quieter Neighbourhood Pilot Programme had not been sufficiently promoted. It was therefore agreed that all Ward Councillors should make their residents aware of what the programme entails. Councillor Smith also felt that the policy on crossovers should also be promoted by Council Officers and Councillors.

Another resident asked if the Cycle Scheme would have an adverse effect on the flow and usage of buses in the area.

David Taylor advised that there had been considerable dialogue with London buses to look at mitigation measures.

A resident raised concerns regarding the inadequate bus/rail interchange at Edmonton Green and said there was a real need to reinstate a South Bound bus stop for Edmonton Green Train Station.

David Taylor explained that the scheme being taken forward was not considering reinstating a bus stop at this location as it was felt there was more of a need for a coach drop off point in this area.

The following recommendation was put forward by Councillor Rye and the Overview & Scrutiny Committee agreed:-

That consideration be given to developing a bus stop within the existing layby outside Edmonton Leisure Centre. The outcome of this recommendation will be monitored by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

Action: O&SC Cttee/David Taylor

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

In summary, Councillor Chamberlain raised concerns regarding the impact of the scheme on local businesses. He felt that the evidence was available to support these concerns; it just needed to be collected. In conclusion he said that if our high streets are damaged irreparably it cannot be fixed. Councillor Chamberlain requested that 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 Rye and Smith voted to refer the decision back to the Cabinet member.

The Chair **CONFIRMED** the decision.

370

DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

NOTED the dates of future meetings:

Provisional Call-Ins:

Wednesday 8 March 2017

Wednesday 12 April 2017

Business meetings of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee will be held on:

Tuesday 21 March 2017 (Additional meeting)

Thursday 27 April 2017