

## **Call in Fox Lane and Surrounding Streets Quieter Neighbourhood Meadway Filter Survey and Bowes Survey**

### **1. Inadequate and sham Consultation**

A text box for comments and suggestions was not available with the online survey. Online surveys disadvantage the elderly and the vulnerable.

Not all the responses for the Meadway survey were analysed, only 746 out of 816 that were submitted online through the council website.

73% of those responding supported opening up the Meadway to all traffic, 23% were not in favour. The council went with the 23%. The petition from Wynchgate residents was ignored.

The council's explanations for not opening up the Meadway are nonsense:

- A) it is contrary to the aims of the Quieter Neighbourhood- yet Bourne Hill and other boundary roads are clear evidence of the non-quieter roads created, bearing the brutal catastrophic traffic jams from the overspill of these failed schemes
- B) HGVs would travel through this road- signage can prevent that
- C) Negatively affect the locals- the residents declared the opposite is true
- D) People would revert from cycling to driving- residents never opted for cycling
- E) Other councils removed LTNs due to residents' fierce opposition to them (Wandsworth, Harrow, Ealing, Redbridge)

62% of respondents to the Bowes survey prefer to see access from the south. Currently access is from the north. Yet the council refuses to make these alterations. Conclusion is the council is rejecting the residents' views so it is a wonder why they bother asking.

### **2. The scheme's failures and lack of support from residents**

The residents are better placed to understand the impact.

1. Quieter Neighbourhood Schemes have not achieved their key objectives and traffic has not reduced.
2. Many emergency services have been delayed impeding life/death situations, specifically impacts the vulnerable.
3. Cars parked in front planters blocking bollards for emergency services.

4. Longer journey times have increased pollution and displaced cars onto traffic choking congestion.
5. No proper risk assessment on the economic impact on local shops. The council ignore the fact that many businesses rely on road transport.
6. Residents on surrounding roads struggle to sell their houses as potential buyers pull out once they witness the long traffic queues. The administration should visit these residents who are stuck in hell.
7. No assessment on the impact of crime- Quiet streets make people feel unsafe from no passing traffic which acts as natural surveillance.
8. Failed to carry out ongoing speed surveys.
9. Failed to address the daily impact for ALL disabled people.
10. Does not explain why specific roads will have cameras and others will not. eg Old Park Road, Grovelands Road, Derwent Road. What explanation is there to choose Maidstone Road, Selbourne Road, Oakfield Road and The Mall? What study was done?
11. Council refuse to consider crime, air quality, congestion, traffic displacement and signage as relevant to the proposed amendments.

### **3. Council propose more inadequate traffic counts**

The traffic surveys carried out by Enfield post LTN applied a filter which did not count vehicles moving less than 10km per hour.

The traffic report did not show a single vehicle on any road doing less than 10km per hour. This is impossible as traffic now crawls through Green Lanes causing gridlock.

The Council deliberately under-reported traffic increases to make these unpopular schemes permanent as their data was false and inaccurate.

These low figures were used to generate pollution data. The problem is these pollution tubes are recommended for free-flowing traffic.

Therefore, the road closures were implemented based on lies.

### **4. Cameras Revenue earner**

The camera enforced roads have struck gold for the council, raking in over £4.5m to date, with over £2m on the Meadway alone.

This explains the real reason for wanting to add more cameras on other roads like Selbourne Road, Maidstone Road, Oakfield and The Mall.

More financial hardship for residents.

#### **5. 10,000 Blue Badge Holders disadvantaged**

Public travel is not a realistic option for most residents with disabilities.

Only special exemptions for blue badge holders living within the Fox Lane area, namely 200, will benefit from this proposal and 250 living in the Bowes area. They will only be allowed a permit for one nominated vehicle, so carers and family of the disabled are not considered.

There are over 10,500 blue badge holders in Enfield.

Many struggle to attend hospital visits and make essential journeys.

#### **6. No impact equality assessments carried out for these proposals**

**No impact assessments carried out on those living directly outside the Quieter Neighbourhood Schemes that are mostly affected**

Parents with disabled children are specifically impacted causing a tremendous strain on their lives.

It is also affecting women much more as they tend to be the main carers.

Social injustice has been created by pushing traffic and the traffic fumes from affluent areas onto poorer areas. These proposals will continue to deepen the social economic divide.

#### **7. Failed on Climate Change Agenda**

Failed to reduce pollution. The council admits that there are now concentrated levels of pollutants on Alderman's Hill, Bourne Hill, Cannon Hill, High Street and Green Lanes.

Failed to introduce wide scale electric charging points.

Failed to promote green alternative modes of transport, ie bike hire.

Failed to make cycle lanes safer.

Failed to fix uneven pavements.

Failed to add more pedestrian crossings to encourage walking.

#### **8. No Alternative Solutions**

Road humps and street rain gardens to reduce speeding

Speed cameras/ speed reducing signage

## **9. Cost of proposals**

The cost of the Bowes LTN was £371,263 and Fox Lane LTN was £387,454, way above the original costings.

The new proposals amount to £444,000, of which £156,000 represents Bowes and £288,000 for Winchmore Hill. TFL will fund £159,000 of this and the other £285,000 will come from the council's capital expenditure. A waste of money for unwanted schemes.