

Meeting date	20 February 2017
Time	19:00
Issue date	22 February 2017
Venue	Haringey Civic Centre
Attendees	CLlr Gina Adamou (Haringay ward) CLlr Zena Brabazon (Haringay ward) CLlr Emine Ibrahim (Haringay ward) CLlr Barbara Blake (St Ann's ward) Gardens RA Haringay Cycling Campaign Haringay Online Haringay Traders Association Hermitage Road RA Ladder Community Safety Partnership Living Wightman Salisbury Road RA Woodlands Park RA Peter Boddy (LB Haringey) Razak Mahama (LB Haringey) Fred Fernandes (LB Haringey) Lee Deacon (Steer Davies Gleave) David Sutanto (Steer Davies Gleave)
Apologies	CLlr Peray Ahmet (Cabinet Member for Environment) Wightman Road Residents
Circulation	To be posted on website
Project	Green Lanes Area Transport Study

## Steering Group meeting #5

- CLlr Ahmet sent her apologies to the meeting, as she was unable to attend due to a family emergency. In her absence, Lee Deacon chaired the meeting.
  - The meeting commenced with a recap of the options identification process, and how the shortlist of options has been arrived at based on the agreed assessment framework.
  - This was followed by a presentation on the draft materials describing the options short list. Whilst the materials are voluminous, they aim to strike a balance between providing a reasonable level of detail whilst not overwhelming the reader. Various comments were made, and for clarity these are organised by topic under the following items.
- General comments**

  - Some attendees felt that their comments on the medium list had not been taken into account; the study team explained that whilst all comments had been considered, it was not possible to follow all of them as comments from different organisations often contained opposing viewpoints.

- It was requested that the engagement materials make the traffic impacts of the options clear – this will be indicated based on the results from the strategic modelling results where possible or otherwise professional judgement.
- The Haringey Traders Association requested that it be noted that they do not agree with the assessment framework.

*A number of comments were made by attendees, either agreeing or disagreeing with the options included on the shortlist. Whilst these have been noted by the study team, Steering Group members were advised that the main channel for receiving comments on the options themselves would be during the Round 2 engagement.*

*Post-meeting note: A question was received via email from the Wightman Road Residents representative who was unable to attend the meeting. The question concerned the apparent designation of Wightman Road as a 'primary route' on some maps in the Wood Green AAP consultation document. This question has been passed onto the relevant council officers.*

### 3. Area-wide improvements

- A concern was expressed that the options included in this package had the potential to distract from more meaningful options in other packages. The study team replied that the Round 2 engagement would aim to gauge which options the community sees as priorities.

### 4. Area-wide pedestrian and cycle network

- A comment was made that it should be emphasised that the New River Path would be a leisure (rather than a commuter) route.
- Concerns were raised about potential new links through the St Ann's Hospital site. The study team noted that these would be subject to consultation and careful design (to avoid creating anti-social behaviour issues) if they were taken forward. It was also noted that new links would help to encourage new residents to walk and cycle, hence reducing car use, as the route to attractors (such as the Arena Retails Park, Finsbury Park, etc.) would otherwise require lengthy and circuitous trips.
- There was support for the introduction of a new pedestrian crossing on Turnpike Lane at the northern end of the Haringey Passage.
- One attendee stated that it was felt that the filtered permeability of Wightman Road would achieve similar results to many of the Area-wide pedestrian and cycle network package of improvements
- The Council stated that although the recent improvements to the Alroy Road / Endymion Road intersection had not included a new pedestrian crossing facility it has always been the intention to revisit this as part of a post-implementation review.
- Better access to the northern end of Finsbury Park was supported by another attendee.

### 5. Green Lanes package

- It was noted that the Green Lanes Stakeholder Group had previously examined parking arrangement on Green Lanes over a period of a number of years.
- A question was asked regarding whether St Ann's Road could be made two-way, to redirect traffic away from Salisbury Road. The study team noted that there were options that would reduce (although not eliminate) traffic on Salisbury Road. However, making St Ann's Road two-way at Green Lanes was considered but not taken forward. This is because it would require a substantial reconfiguration of the current layout, having a major impact on the plaza that was recently built, and that it would also reduce capacity at this junction thus increasing delay and congestion. It was noted that reconfiguring the St Ann's Road / Green Lanes junction (to make St Ann's Road two-way) had previously been examined as part of the corridor scheme, but that this had been rejected by TfL.

- A request was made for the engagement materials to make it clear that parking hours and arrangements would be subject to further investigation, and that this may include additional pay-and-display parking on side streets. Similarly, any new or revised facilities that have operational hours (essentially bus and / or cycle lanes) will be considered further if taken forward.
- Some discussion followed on the definition of a residential street, the council confirmed that the provision of bus services on any street is not considered to be a defining factor.

#### 6. **Wightman Road / Ladder area package**

- For the options that involve reversing Willoughby Road so that it is one-way southbound, a question was asked whether right turns from Turnpike Lane into Willoughby Road would be permitted. It was replied that this right turn would be banned; otherwise an alternative ‘rat-run’ would likely open up. Traffic waiting to turn right at this point may also impede following traffic and impact junction throughput at the Turnpike Lane junction with Wood Green High Road / Westbury Avenue / Green Lanes.
- Concerns were expressed regarding how the Wightman Road alternative packages would impact on pedestrians crossing Wightman Road, particularly to and from school. The study team explained that this was an important issue that would need to be examined further as part of more detailed design work.
- A question was asked regarding the traffic model used for the study. The study team explained that the North London Highway Assignment Model (NoLHAM) had been used for this study, and that the time period modelled was the weekday PM peak hour. On the traffic impact maps, traffic increases greater than 100 vehicles have been classified as ‘significant’, whilst those between 50–100 vehicles have been classified as ‘moderate’. Further details on this model can be found at: <https://tfl.gov.uk/corporate/publications-and-reports/strategic-transport-and-land-use-models>
- A question was asked regarding whether part-time closures, enforced by cameras, were considered. It was replied that this would be possible, but that if these were to operate during peak hours, they would still cause the same issues and impacts regarding displaced traffic as full-time closures.
- Various questions were asked regarding whether a camera system, to allow only access to Haringay and/or Haringey residents to certain roads would be possible. Council officers commented that this would be illegal.
- A question was asked regarding current enforcement of the HGV ban. Council officers replied that following the bridge works an additional camera was installed at the southern end of Wightman Road to improve monitoring and enforcement activities to discourage inappropriate use by the HVGs.

#### 7. **Hermitage area package**

- A question was asked regarding why the removal of existing closures in the Hermitage area were not on the short list. The study team explained that the option of removing existing closures had been included on the long list, but had not been taken forward to the medium based on the agreed assessment framework. It was also noted that this issue had been discussed at previous Steering Group meetings. It was agreed that should councillors wish to discuss this further then they should raise the issue with Cllr Ahmet.

#### 8. **St Ann’s / Gardens area package**

- There was widespread support for a scheme that would help to reduce traffic speeds at the St Ann’s Road / Salisbury Road junction; the current layout features a wide entrance from the east and does little to slow traffic which is considered to be a safety concern for pedestrians and cyclists.
- A query was asked regarding whether other options for reducing north-south traffic through the St Ann’s area (between West Green Road and St Ann’s Road) had been considered. The study team

explained that they had been. However, a full closure had not been taken forward, due to the distance between Green Lanes and Seven Sisters Road. More minor measures had also been considered, but had generally not been taken forward due to their tendency to concentrate north-south traffic on fewer corridors. Option SA-06 had been included, as it is likely to displace traffic onto Green Lanes, rather than onto other roads within the St Ann's area.

- A question was asked regarding whether parking arrangements on St Ann's Road outside the study area could be reviewed. Council officers replied that this could be reviewed, but that this would be done separately to the study.

## 9. Funding

- Following a question on funding the council explained that, subject to TfL's annual funding review, the Council expects to receive £350k for the study area over each of the next three financial years. It was also noted that this is a very substantial portion of the council's transport budget. Other funding opportunities may also be explored and could include:
  - S106 – developers' contributions towards the costs of providing community and social infrastructure, the need for which has arisen as a result of a new development taking place
  - Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) – an alternative method of securing generalised contributions from developers
  - Other Council / TfL opportunities (TfL's bus priority or cycle infrastructure funding for example)

## 10. Round 2 engagement

- The study team outlined plans for the Round 2 engagement. The purpose of the Round 2 engagement is to gauge the level of support for each option, as well as which options should be a higher priority for implementation.
- The Round 2 engagement will be similar to the Round 1 engagement. It will consist of a letter drop to all residents. This will provide details of three drop-in sessions, and a link to an online questionnaire. Whilst the online questionnaire will be the primary method of collating feedback, a paper-based alternative will also be offered. In addition, a technical meeting will be held with technical stakeholders (various TfL and Council departments, etc.).
- A question was asked regarding whether anyone would be able to respond to the engagement, and whether this had the potential to skew responses. The study team are aware of this issue, and are in discussions with the council's consultation team regarding this. The proposed approach will be to ask respondents to provide their address, which should discourage duplicate responses.
- The timetable of the engagement is still to be confirmed, but the period is likely to be from early April to early May. The period may be longer than four weeks, to account for the bank holidays and school holidays that fall within this period. The Steering Group will be advised once dates are confirmed.
- The responses from the engagement will therefore be ready in early May, after which they would be analysed by the study team.

## 11. Next steps

- The next steps for the study were outlined by the study team.
- It was requested that Steering Group members review the draft materials describing the options shortlist for the purposes of the Round 2 engagement, with any comments sent through by **Friday 3 March**. It was reiterated that these comments should be focussed on the presentation of the options, and whether they are presented in a clear way that will enable the public to understand them and comment meaningfully. Comments on the options themselves should be made during the Round 2 engagement period. Any feedback provided in support of or opposition to the options in advance of

formal engagement period will not be considered.

- The next (and final) Steering Group meeting is likely to be in June; once a date is confirmed, an invitation will be sent to Steering Group members. The purpose of the next meeting will be to present the draft study report.
- The study report will set out the advantages and disadvantages of each option on the shortlist, and the feedback received as part of the Round 2 engagement.
- The study team explained that following the finalisation of the report, it would be up to the Cabinet Member to decide which options (if any) would be taken forward, informed by advice from officers.