

OBJECTION TO TRAFFIC ORDER REF TG/52/1314 EXP

At its Annual General Meeting on 31st March 2016 the **Winchmore Hill Residents Association (WHRA)** approved the following motion:

The Winchmore Hill Residents Association is opposed to the London Borough of Enfield's current proposals for cycle lanes and other associated measures on that part of Green Lanes (A105) which are within the Association's area of interest.

The Association calls on the Council to enter into serious discussions with residents associations and other interested parties in order to produce alternative measures which would improve facilities for cyclists whilst not having severe detrimental effects on residents, businesses and all other road users.

In view the fact that such discussions were never held the WHRA now objects to the content of the published Experimental Traffic Orders for the proposed A105 cycle lanes scheme in general.

In 2016 L.B. Enfield's proposals for waiting and loading restrictions, which form an important part of the scheme, were not published in the usual manner as permanent Traffic Orders. Instead L.B. Enfield announced that it is intended that these restrictions would be enacted using Experimental Traffic Orders.

This was of very dubious legality because the proposed scheme, which has been constructed in permanent materials, obviously is not experimental in any sense of the word. In fact the "experimental" waiting and loading restrictions on the west side of the section Green Lanes between its junctions with Compton Road and Station Road relate to kerb lines that have been relocated so as to provide space for the construction of a cycle lane – and this has been done using permanent materials.

If the ban on loading at any time on this section of road had been introduced in the usual manner, using a permanent Traffic Order, there would have had to be a Public Inquiry into that aspect of the proposed scheme. This is clearly specified in the relevant sections of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996.

However in order to avoid the holding of a Public Inquiry L.B. Enfield decided not to use a permanent Traffic Order and to use an Experiential Traffic Order instead. The reason for this decision was obviously

because the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 does not require Public Inquires to be held for this type of Traffic Order.

Like all Highway Authorities, L. B. Enfield has discretionary powers, under the above motioned highway legislation, which would enable it to hold a Public Inquiry into any scheme that requires a Traffic Order.

In view of the very high level of controversy about this scheme WHRA believes that it is essential that such a Public Inquiry should now be held.

In view of the above, the WHRA **very strongly objects** to the "At any time" waiting and loading restrictions which have been introduced "experimentally" on the west side of the section Green Lanes between its junctions with Compton Road and Station Road.

The reduction in the number of on-street parking places in this shopping centre has had severe adverse effects for local businesses and severely us inconveniences user of these businesses.

The additional short term parking spaces that have been provided in the Fords Grove public car park certainly has not compensated for this. These additional short term parking spaces are so remote from most of the shops and other business for people to use them - particularly in inclement weather or if they are carrying anything that is heavy. This can clearly be seen at any time on working days when there are rarely more than two cars in these free parking spaces.

Instead of making these "experimental" Traffic Orders for "At any time" waiting and loading restrictions on the west side of the section Green Lanes between its junctions with Compton Road and Station Road WHRA proposes they should not be made permanent and that one of the following alternative schemes should be constructed.

(a) The proposed northbound cycle lane should be terminated at the junction with Compton Road and it should resume after the junction with Station Road. There would then be sufficient road width available (just) to provide parking facilities on the west side of Green Lanes between the junctions with Compton Road and Station Road in addition to those current proposed for the east side of the road.

This change would contravene the scheme design requirement that the cycle lanes should be continuous - to which those organisations representing cyclists apparently attach a considerable amount of importance. However this principle has already been breached by L. B. Enfield's decision to modify the design of the proposed scheme in part of London Road, Enfield. At this location the modified design shows that no northbound cycle lane would be provided on the west side of London Road between the junction with Lincoln Road and the northern end of the scheme at the Sydney Road Multi Storey Car Park exit road.

(b) The proposed southbound cycle lane should not be installed on the east side of the section of Green Lanes between the junctions with Fords Grove and Queens Avenue and it should be replaced with a conta-flow cycle lane in Queens Avenue.

The design of this contra-flow cycle lane should be exactly the same as the one in Devonshire Road in Palmers Green. Therefore there would be cycle symbols marked on the road surface, at frequent intervals, but no continuous white line between the cycle lane and the on-coming general traffic.

L.B. Enfield has stated that this design has passed a Stage 1 Safety Audit – so it seems that there is no reason whatsoever why it could not be used at this location, as well as at Devonshire Road!

This design would ensure that there would be would then be sufficient road width available (just) on Green Lanes to provide parking facilities on the west side of the road between the junctions with Compton Road and Station Road in addition to those currently proposed for the east side of the road.