

## 1) Reason why decision is being called in:

1. The proposals set out in the Cabinet Report have manifestly not been the subject of any proper consultation. It is asserted in the report and also by Councillor Anderson at the meeting, that consultation on these proposals took place in 2015 and therefore consultation had taken place. The reality is that the exercise undertaken by the council in 2015 was one which offered several different options for Enfield Town with a clear preference for what became known as Option 1. Moreover, at the Project Board on the 24 November I specifically asked the officer, Richard Eason, whether there had been consultation on these proposals and he emphatically answered "no". The current proposal was originally known as Option 4 and was subsequently removed from the list of possibilities leaving the main consultation to go forward on the old Option 1 i.e. taking the cycle lanes through Church Street and removing almost all other traffic. That proposal was overwhelmingly rejected by the residents and businesses in the consultation exercise that followed.

The proposals that have now been approved by Cabinet for further work and statutory consultation have never therefore been the subject of any detailed consultation, and as such the public, both residents and businesses, have been denied an opportunity to express a view at this stage. The statutory consultation that is scheduled to take place in the spring of next year is not the same for this purpose in as much statutory consultation can only deal with issues which are to be the subject of Traffic Management Orders. Clearly some of the work proposed will not be the subject of Traffic Management Orders.

2. I have consistently argued that cycle lanes should be diverted away from main roads. The Cabinet Member for Environment and the Administration generally, have tended to dismiss this view as being anti cyclist, something that I have always denied. In the week leading up to Christmas the London Mayor, Sadiq Khan took part in a LBC Phone In, in which the subject of cycle lanes in Outer London was raised. The transcript of that broadcast reads as follows

*"Congestion is a serious issue... this is why I have appointed a cycling and walking commissioner and one of the things he is going to be doing is to make sure that we learn the lessons from cycle superhighway. We are making sure we **speak to the councils and try and divert cyclists away from main roads** onto what I call quiet ways in order to encourage people **particularly in outer London** to cycle rather than have all our eggs in the Embankment cycle superhighway previous generation basket... **the bad news is that as a consequence of the congestion not only is it leading to worse air quality but people are stopping using certain buses because they can't rely on getting from A to B**, so it is in everyone's interest to sort out congestion in London".*

So now we have the London Mayor emphatically saying that cyclists should be diverted away from main roads onto what I would call "quiet ways". He says he intends to speak to the councils concerned, which must include Enfield, to prevail upon them to change tack. Against that background, if no other, this decision must be reconsidered.

3. There has been no proper bus consultation with bus companies, although it is asserted that there has been discussion with TfL. As I pointed out at the meeting however, TfL have, by way of responses to Freedom of Information Act requests, confirmed to me that they do not consult with the bus companies, who are of course the ones who have to operate the passenger services following any scheme of this kind, and who will therefore be most directly affected in terms of provision of those services.

4. The consultation with the emergency services seems to have been at a fairly low level and the responses from each of the services continue to express concern, particularly that they cannot be sure of the impact as they have not been consulted on the detail. Specific attention be drawn to paragraphs 4.19, 4.20 & 4.21 which are to say the least guarded in their responses, the police in particular raise a number of issues which are plainly yet to be worked through, while the Fire Brigade have concerns about road humps and the effect on its vehicles when carrying a full tank of water and the London Ambulance Service reiterates its concerns expressed during the A105 consultation. At the Cabinet Meeting Cllr Brett asked a specific question about this, although the response was hardly satisfactory the matter was not pressed.

6. Much is made in the report of "Youth Engagement" whilst we recognise the usefulness of such engagement the report is sparse on the detail of this engagement so far as this or any other scheme is concerned, preferring instead to write up a generic response which of course is predictable

7. The traffic analysis (albeit conducted as long ago as 2014 - although this fact conspicuously is not mentioned in the report) warns that there will be delays to journeys. Anybody knowing the town centre will realise that there are already long and significant delays at peak hours particularly during the winter months. That is significant because the analysis was undertaken in July 2014 when we know that traffic volumes are much lower because of holiday arrangements, and at that time per a very recent report from the Department of Transport we were still recovering from the 2008 financial crisis.

8. The air quality report also demonstrates that there will be absolutely no gain from this exercise and the expenditure of up to £8 million, in terms of improved air quality. In some cases in fact, the air quality will be worse according to the expert analysis. In particular, attention is drawn to paragraphs 5.10.7 & 5.10.8 which disclose some real ambiguity. It is clear from those paragraphs that the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) is not in agreement with the council officers on this point at all, in as much as there is a clear recommendation for cyclists to be taken off road or along quiet streets. While this recommendation is casually dismissed in the report with the words that implementing it would mean "cycle routes will inevitably take a circuitous route to destinations thereby encouraging car use and pollution". There seems to be no rationale for this assertion other than the fact of course that it doesn't agree with what the council want to do. But we say that irrespective of the NICE research and guidelines, it is surely a matter of pure common sense that if cyclists do in fact use cycle lanes which run alongside long queues of heavy traffic belching out fumes that they are having to inhale:

a) It is not good for their health

and

b) they will be disinclined to use the cycle lanes. Anyone doubting this rationale has only to look at the properly segregated cycle lane along the North Circular Road A406 installed as part of the upgrade carried out in 2008/9, to see that no matter what time of day or night one passes it there is never a cyclist to be seen!

For all these reasons it is our view that this decision is palpably wrong and should be returned to Cabinet for reconsideration.

**(2) Outline of proposed alternative action:**

Return the decision to Cabinet for reconsideration.

**(3) Do you believe the decision is outside the policy framework?**

No


**(4) If Yes, give reasons: n/a**

**FOR DST USE ONLY:**

Checked by Proper Officer for validation –

Name of Proper Officer:

Date:

Asmat Hussain  


29-12-2016

