



CO-DESIGN WORKSHOP FOR A1010 SOUTH AND A1010 NORTH

22nd SEPTEMBER 2016



Co-design workshop for A1010 South and A1010 North

Project no: B240G001
 Document title: Co-design workshop for A1010 South and A1010 North
 Document No.: B240G001-REP-02_V4
 Revision: 01
 Date: 8th November 2016
 Client name: Enfield Council
 Client no:
 Project manager: Alex Stebbings
 Author: Nivedita Vijayan, Lucy May, Alex Stebbings, Richard Lambert and Julia Crear.

Tower Bridge Court
 226 Tower Bridge Road
 London SE1 2UP
 United Kingdom
 T +44 (0)20 7403 3330
 F +44 (0)20 7939 1418
www.jacobs.com

© Copyright 2016 Jacobs U.K. Limited. The concepts and information contained in this document are the property of Jacobs. Use or copying of this document in whole or in part without the written permission of Jacobs constitutes an infringement of copyright.

Limitation: This report has been prepared on behalf of, and for the exclusive use of Jacobs' Client, and is subject to, and issued in accordance with, the provisions of the contract between Jacobs and the Client. Jacobs accepts no liability or responsibility whatsoever for, or in respect of, any use of, or reliance upon, this report by any third party.

Document history and status

Revision	Date	Description	By	Review	Approved
01	08/11/2016	Final Issue	LM	NV	AS

Contents

1.	Introduction	3
1.1	Attendance list	3
2.	Design Feedback	5
2.1	A1010 South Corridor.....	5
2.2	A1010 North Corridor	8
2.3	Additional Notes	10

1. Introduction

This report presents a summary of the proceedings and outcomes of the co-design session held by Enfield Council to discuss public realm design ideas for A1010 South and A1010 North Corridors.

Local residents and business owners were encouraged to participate in the co-design workshop. The opportunity to participate was included on a flyer that was distributed to homes and businesses along the route. Individuals were encouraged to apply via a simple form on the Cycle Enfield website, submitting their name and contact details and stating why they would like to be considered for a place at the event.

This co-design session was facilitated by Julia Crear and Richard Lambert from Living Streets, the UK charity for everyday walking. Living Streets is experienced in supporting public realm consultations – having done surveys, street audits and workshops for various schemes around the UK. Their expertise in walking and places to walk enables them to effectively guide and focus discussions in a way that are understandable to lay people and professionals.

The co-design workshop was held at the Enfield Business Centre, Enfield on 22nd September 2016 from 6.30pm to 9pm.

Methodology

The event consisted of an introduction by Living Streets, followed by a presentation of key design thinking so far by Jacobs and a light introduction to the session by Richard Eason. The local representatives were then split into two groups, one for the A1010 South corridor (Edmonton Green) and the other for A1010 North corridor (Green Street and Enfield Wash). As a group they captured and later communicated various design issues and ideas that were developed for each area.

Each member at the table used an A4 plan of the scheme to sketch out their key routes through the area and then a general consensus was achieved and presented on an A1 sheet. There was a laminated A2 coloured base on each table over which the teams explored public realm design elements such as trees, seats, sign posts, lighting etc. using plasticine, model trees, felt paper etc. This turned out to be an engaging session and people seemed to react very enthusiastically and were able to communicate their design more effectively using three dimensional thinking.

After the individual table sessions the whole group caught up to present the design ideas and comment on the design principles of both areas to arrive at a general design consensus about the design approach. The Jacobs design team will then take these design ideas forward to the detailed design stage.

1.1 Attendance list

This consultation event stand was attended by the following people:

Enfield Council: Richard Eason

Jacobs: Nivedita Vijayan, Alex Stebbings and Lucy May.

Living Streets: Julia Crear and Richard Lambert.

Members of the public: Heather Wallace, Amy Pyle, Franco Spoto, Pamela Doyle, Allan Millwood, Mrs Virani, Miss Virani, Andrea Bailey, Jeremy Foot, Despina Johnson and Oliver McKiernan.



Images of the Co-design workshop

2. Design Feedback

2.1 A1010 South Corridor

The majority of people in the A1010 South group felt that the public realm at Edmonton Green looks a bit tired and is in need of upgrading.

The following issues and design ideas were highlighted to be considered for the revised design development of the Edmonton Green area:

No.	Design Issue/Comment	Designer's Response
1	There are a number of overgrown trees and grass south of the train station that could be removed in order to open up the space and make it less overshadowed and enhance perception of safety for users. The station entrance could be moved to the south of the station in order to open the station onto the park making it a more attractive arrival into Edmonton Green.	Moving the entrance into the park was considered, but unable to be developed further as there is a proposal to include a cycle parking hub south of the station. The removal of the existing trees will be part of the detailed design for this cycle parking hub.
2	Create a better forecourt environment outside the station entrance, forming a social seating area and a more attractive arrival combined with better way finding as the station entrance currently fails to create a sense of arrival.	These design ideas were incorporated into the revised design. Seating, planting and way finding have been suggested in the design of the station forecourt area.
3	Use the archways for retail and leisure purposes, furthermore creating spill out onto the park with seating from the archways to create better passive surveillance of the park compared to the current isolated ambience.	The idea to refurbish the arches could potentially be taken forward outside of the Cycle Enfield programme. The arches are owned by TfL but the redevelopment of the arches is supported by Enfield, who will continue to engage with TfL on the delivery of this.
4	In addition to redeveloping the arches, it was also suggested that pop-up markets and stalls in the park area could be considered to prevent the occurrence of anti-social behaviour.	This will be considered as part of the wider regeneration programme.
5	Increase lighting provision in the park to enhance the perception of safety.	This has been incorporated in further design development but implementation may be part of a separate parks related scheme.
6	Move the pathway in the park to the middle, as currently the path is near the back of the park where it is darker and there are groups of people loitering. This way more people would be encouraged to walk through the park and not the pavement.	This has been incorporated in further design development and the path has been moved to a more central location. However, implementation may be part of a separate parks related scheme.
7	Clean up the alleyways around Balfour Mews as the takeaways shops currently throw rubbish making this area and park unsightly. If this area was tidied up then community may respect their area more	This suggestion will be referred to the Council's street cleansing team.

	and keep it clean. One suggestion was to have increased anti –littering signage in the area.	
8	Increase the number of bins in and around the station and park. There are currently two recycling bins outside of the station and they are always overflowing and not with recyclable materials, showing the need for non-recyclable bins also. Alongside this, the community need more encouragement and education in anti-litter thinking, perhaps through signage.	This suggestion will be referred to the Council's street cleansing team.
9	There should be more trees and lighting to the eastern side of on Fore Street, around the Leisure Centre, as it seems to always have a cold draft and trees may help reduce that. However the trees should not be too big to encourage anti-social behaviour or prevent accessibility. There was an additional note that people wanted visually interesting trees, for example Cherry Blossom trees.	These design suggestions have been incorporated in the revised design by providing new trees and benches along the Leisure Centre interface.
10	It was suggested that there should be more seating and planting at the concourse outside the shopping centre. This would stop it being used only to walk through and encourage people to stop and socialise. However there was concern over the large open space being used for Christmas markets and temporary events. Therefore any new seating and planting should still lend flexibility to this space. Rubbish bins should be placed in the area to cater for additional rubbish.	This design suggestion has been considered and implemented in a further design iteration including a tree and benches which enhances amenity but does still maintain flexibility of use in the shopping centre area. It is to be noted that this area is not public highway and is under the control of St Modwen.
11	The pedestrian links between the station, park and the shopping centre need to be improved. There were suggestions that the park links with the shopping centre should be encouraged as a way to create more pedestrian movement though the park.	An improved pedestrian crossing has been introduced in the design that provides signalised crossings instead of zebra crossings to improve links between the shopping centre, station and park.
12	The Smythe Close crossing east was noted as a hectic area and unsafe for crossing. Therefore design should look at how cars will slow down for pedestrians to cross safely. Potential for surface treatment to enhance pedestrian priority.	The crossings have been improved in the design. Surface treatment could be considered in detailed design based on feasibility and maintenance cost consideration.
13	Many felt that the Church Street exit of the roundabout was an unsafe and undesirable area and crossing point and should be improved. People felt that the path was very narrow when one is under the bridge on Church Street, with limited pedestrian space. The	This area is constrained with limited scope to improve the footways, due to the bridge structure. The relocation of the crossing to the mouth of the junction was considered but this resulted in queues blocking back through the junction and was therefore not considered viable. The removal of the guard railing will be investigated to improve the effective width of the footways. Lighting and surface painting may be

	<p>area feels cramped and is not pleasant in appearance.</p> <p>Suggestions to removing the barriers to increase the feel of space on the road – but only if it fits with safety for pedestrians and is combined with reducing the speed of drivers exiting and entering the roundabout generally.</p> <p>Improved lighting was also important to feel safer since the space under the bridge is quite dark.</p> <p>Ideas of painting the bridge were suggested to improve the level of brightness and feel of it. Perhaps the words ‘Edmonton Green’ or ‘Church Street’ could be stencilled / painted large on the side of the bridge that faces the roundabout to brighten / liven up the space and create a better sense of place – thoughts that this could link into the branding of the green area. See examples of ‘Camden Road’ ‘Camden Town’ and ‘Camden Lock’ bridge signs.</p>	<p>considered in detailed design stages based on cost and maintenance considerations.</p>
14	<p>People were in support of the raised table and improved crossings on Fore Street to reduce the speed of cars exiting the roundabout and improving the safety for pedestrians. However, people were concerned over the impact on buses going over all the bumps.</p>	<p>The impact on buses has been accounted for in the traffic modelling assessment of the scheme and is reported in the A1010 South Traffic Modelling Report. Enfield has worked closely with TfL and London Buses to mitigate the impact of bus delays, as a result of the scheme.</p>
15	<p>There was a general consensus over leaving the roundabout as a memorial, as there isn’t much need for improvement. It doesn’t serve a public realm purpose as there is no direct access to it.</p>	<p>Pedestrian access to the war memorial was investigated but the impact of introducing a crossing resulted in significant queueing which blocked up the roundabout and therefore it was not considered viable.</p>
16	<p>All felt the branding of the Edmonton Green area could be improved and linked to better way finding (in addition to the name stencilling on the Church Street bridge –see no. 14). At the moment there are a lot of different styles of wayfinding and signage in the area, some old and some not very good.</p> <p>People liked the Legible London style of totem signage but also liked the finger pointer style, especially for outside the station entrance to give you a sense of place and direction. So a mix of these was supported for use across the Edmonton Green round about area.</p>	<p>These comments will be considered in the way finding strategy at the detailed design stage.</p>
17	<p>There were thoughts on cycle lanes running contraflow to motorised traffic. They felt that</p>	<p>Comments were noted but safe access to and from a contra-flow cycle lane is problematic and often requires the use of signals, which impacts journey times for all</p>

	this was safer.	road users and therefore this is not considered viable.
--	-----------------	---

2.2 A1010 North Corridor

The A1010 North group, covering Green Street and Enfield Wash focused mainly on parking and traffic issues.

Green Street

The following issues and ideas were highlighted to be considered for the design development of the Green Street design concept:

No.	Design Issue/Comment	Designer's Response
1	There was a suggestion by some of the group to keep the roundabout on Green Street, as they believed it was too cycle orientated and that traffic lights would cause too much delay on the road. However some did agree traffic lights were the safest option for the cyclists.	This has been looked at and the modelling shows that a signalised junction can operate with reasonable levels of capacity and provides the safest layout for cyclists along with signalised crossings for pedestrians.
2	There were suggestions of additional trees, if they were low maintenance and local varieties.	This design idea is being incorporated in the revised design.
3	The group called for minimal seating to be provided as this area has high levels of anti-social behaviour currently. Therefore loitering should not be encouraged.	Concerns regarding anti-social behaviour have been passed onto LBE officers. The level of seating in the design will reflect the comment.
4	Seating should be benches with handles in order to discourage rough sleeping.	To be considered in further detailed design while selecting products.
5	It was suggested that island between the service road and main road could be better used by reducing the width to provide sufficient space for cyclists on the main road and to avoid them having to use the service road.	Further investigation was undertaken but there are a number of utilities running under the island and the cost of relocating these to accommodate a cycle lane would be significant and therefore it is not considered viable

Enfield Wash

The following issues and ideas were highlighted to be considered for the design development of the Enfield Wash area:

No.	Design Issue/Comment	Designer's Response
1	There were a number of comments on the existing Enfield Wash resurfacing and signage, which removed parking spaces which led to the closure of two businesses. The group called the sign unattractive and now useless as the businesses have now shut, so there is no opportunity for spill out onto the public space. There was	These suggestions will be considered in further design iterations and in discussion with LBE.

	encouragement for the sign to go and parking to be reinstated.	
2	<p>There was a significant debate on the need for parking to remain, as they stressed they already struggle with the amount of parking available.</p> <p>Many of the shop owners said they wanted the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Defined kerb lines; • 30 minutes free parking for customers (potentially near Caterhatch Lane); 	Scope for additional parking on Longfield Avenue will be considered in conjunction with the proposed public realm enhancements in this location.
3	Many business owners were concerned over the public realm and cycle pathways and the lack of opportunity for loading due to the design. They called for a change in design so that they would still be able to off load their deliveries.	A review of side road provision has been carried out to provide additional loading were possible. For the cycle scheme to be successful the cycle lanes need to be clear, so it is not viable to have part time cycle lanes on the main road, to accommodate loading within the lanes.
4	The service road south of Longfield Avenue is currently used as a rat run in both directions and therefore not considered a safe environment for cyclists.	The service road is to be converted to one-way northbound for general traffic to remove risk of northbound cyclists conflicting with southbound vehicles. Other design suggestions will be considered further in discussion with LBE.
5	<p>Participants asked for formal pedestrian crossings where people want to cross. They also wanted signals with audible warnings.</p> <p>Others were not convinced that the raised tables worked for better visibility crossings.</p>	Enfield have sought to provide a consistent measure across all corridors, when linking with a greenway, these have taken the form of a parallel pedestrian and cycle crossing, as shown in the plan at this location, replacing the informal crossing. This is considered the appropriate type of crossing for this area. Where signalised crossings are being implemented, countdown timers are to be used with audible signals where possible.
6	The participants said there are a lot of pinch points for pedestrians in the built up areas. They had concerns about the cycle lane near Longfield Avenue which was referred to as "rat runs".	Decluttering will form part of the scheme, to improve footways in the high street areas.
7	A few members of the group commented the area feels better where the streets are 20mph and hence that should be	These comments have been incorporated into the public consultation comments. Quieter neighbourhood schemes are being developed as part of the Cycle Enfield project, which look at residential areas adjacent to the main corridors and 20mph zones will be considered at all these locations.
8	<p>Some people suggested that any additional trees should be indigenous species and low maintenance.</p> <p>There was a suggestion that Silver Birch trees could be used or species native to England.</p>	These suggestions will be considered in the revised design.
9	This group called for minimal seating to be provided as this area has high levels of anti-social behaviour therefore loitering	Concerns regarding anti-social behaviour have been passed onto LBE officers. The level of seating in the

	should not be encouraged.	design will reflect the comment.
10	Seating should be benches with handles in order to discourage rough sleeping.	To be considered in further detailed design while selecting products.
11	It was suggested that the island between the service road and main road could be better used, by reducing in width, to provide sufficient space for cyclists on the main road, to avoid them having to use the service road.	Because of the location of the bus stop it is not possible to accommodate cycle facilities within the extent of the existing island, without removing the bus shelter and parking on the east of the footway and therefore this is not considered viable.
12	There were requests for bins near residential streets but also more and better maintenance so rodents and foxes would not be able to access the rubbish easily. There was also a request for better lighting near the surgery and in area known for crime and prostitution related issues.	These suggestions will be conveyed to LBE.

2.3 Additional Notes

Additional comments were received about locations on the A1010 North corridor, outside of those being discussed at the Co-Design session, such as bus stop boarders and specific properties. These comments have been passed onto the team reviewing the A1010 North public consultation and will be included in the design review following the public consultation analysis.

The following notes include suggestions for LBE to consider further:

- The A1010 North group raised concerns that the area would not improve unless there was an increased police presence to deter anti-social behaviour, particularly at night in the vicinity of Albany Leisure Centre.
- Many of the participants from Enfield Wash commented that they had found out about the consultation from a 3rd party and suggested the following for future consultations:
 - Advertise and promote the consultation in different ways. Letter drop information can appear to look like junk mail; it doesn't get delivered to the correct address or doesn't get delivered at all.
 - Create multiple platforms for people to ask questions such as phone lines, specifically for older people, drop in centres and on online queries.
 - Promote consultations through community venues like the police station, community centres, parks, leisure centres, libraries and other community resources.
 - The consultation should be more inclusive, specifically offering shorter links on the computer and different language options to include Bengali, Romanian, Somali, Urdu and Vietnamese.

CO-DESIGN WORKSHOP FOR
A1010 SOUTH AND A1010 NORTH
22nd September 2016

