

Meeting date	25 July 2017
Time	19:00
Issue date	August 2017
Venue	Committee RM 1&2, Haringey Civic Centre
Attendees	<p> Cllr Peray Ahmet (Cabinet Member for Environment) Cllr Gina Adamou (Haringay ward) Cllr Zena Brabazon (Haringay ward) Cllr Emine Ibrahim (Haringay ward) Cllr Barbara Blake (St Ann’s ward) Gardens RA Haringey New River RA Haringay Cycling Campaign Haringay Traders Association Haringay United Church-Baptist Islington Council Ladder Community Safety Partnership Living Wightman London Islamic Cultural Society Salisbury Road RA Sylvia Hair Care The Gospel Centre TT1 (Wightman Road) Wightman Road N4 Residents Woodlands Park RA Various local residents Peter Boddy (LB Haringey) Razak Mahama (LB Haringey) David Sutanto (Steer Davies Gleave) </p>
Apologies	<p> Lee Deacon (Steer Davies Gleave) Cllr Adam Jogee (Hornsey ward) Fred Fernandes (LB Haringey) Cllr Caroline Selman (LB Hackney) Brian Foxtan (LB Hackney) </p>
Circulation	To be posted on website
Project	Green Lanes Area Transport Study

Steering Group meeting #6

1. Welcome

- Cllr Ahmet opened the meeting, noting that it would be the final Steering Group meeting for the study.

She noted that as it was the final meeting, a number of additional attendees had been invited to the meeting.

- Cllr Ahmet reminded attendees of the Terms of Reference for the Steering Group, in particular that it is an advisory body only, and does not have a decision making role.
- Cllr Ahmet also noted that the duration of the study had been longer than planned, due to the impacts of two councillor by-elections (which took place in the St Ann's and Haringay wards in 2016) and the general election in 2017.

2. Round 2 engagement

- SDG provided an overview of the outcomes of the Round 2 engagement. It was noted that the engagement results were documented in the draft community engagement report, which had been circulated prior to the meeting.
- It was noted that there was an inconsistency in the draft report between the text and graphs regarding the proportion of respondents within the study area for one of the petitions that was received. SDG will correct this error and finalise the report.
- SDG emphasised that the Round 2 engagement was not a voting process. Rather, the feedback received from the engagement will need to be considered alongside other factors. It was also noted that it is also not valid to compare the number of signatures included in the two petitions against the number of responses received in the online survey.
- Living Wightman pointed out that their petition was submitted earlier, and that during the Round 2 engagement they had focussed on encouraging people to respond to the online survey (rather than collecting additional signatures for their petition). They also noted that the geographical distribution of signatories to their petition was a reflection of the streets that they were able to cover.
- Some attendees also commented that they were dissatisfied at not being included in the engagement process. SDG explained that every property in the study area had been delivered a copy of the study newsletters. Haringey also noted that study-related emails were also sent to a larger group of stakeholders, that included places of worship and schools. In some cases, the email addresses used were taken from contact details posted on these organisations' websites.
- Comments were also made regarding the original purpose of the study. Cllr Ahmet noted that the study had been started by her predecessor, and that these questions had already been discussed repeatedly at previous Steering Group meetings and therefore wasn't worth revisiting.

3. Options and way forward

- SDG provided a brief summary of the options development process that had taken place, in order to arrive at the options that were included in the Round 2 engagement. It was noted that the number of options included in the Round 2 engagement sought to strike a balance between comprehensiveness and the complexity of the survey used to collect feedback. Some of the feedback received through the online survey was that it was too complex. It was also noted that an assessment framework (that was discussed at previous Steering Group meetings) had also been used to inform the options development process.
- SDG also provided a re-cap of some of the most pertinent findings that emerged from the evidence base that was compiled, and how these mirrored some of the challenges and complexities in the study area. It was also noted that not only were existing conditions taken into account as part of the study, but that the impacts of planned future developments were also taken into account.
- SDG noted that there were a range of other factors that needed to be considered, such as feasibility and deliverability, acceptability, equity, costs and funding and timescales. A question was asked regarding developer funding. It was noted that contributions from developers could only be sought to mitigate impacts connected with the development in question, and that these contributions could

potentially be for both transport and non-transport facilities.

- SDG explained how the recommendations were shaped not only by feedback received through the Round 2 engagement. The criteria in the assessment framework had also been taken into account, as well as the evidence base that had been collected. A balance was sought between being ambitious and aspirational, against the fact that the study area is not a blank slate.
- SDG described the options that would be recommended, and answered a number of questions on the details of some of the options. In general, it was noted that the details of the options would be subject to more detailed design work.
- Various comments were received regarding the range of options included in the Round 2 engagement. These included questions regarding why the removal of existing road closures was not included in the engagement; the balance of measures between the parts of the study area to the east and west of Green Lanes; and why alternatives such as congestion charging or timed closures were not included. It was noted that these matters had been discussed repeatedly at previous Steering Group meetings.
- Attendees had a particular interest in the Wightman Road options. A number of attendees made comments on the negative impacts that they experienced during the Wightman Road closure in 2016. SDG noted that the evidence collected as part of the study quantified these impacts. A question was asked regarding the impact that the recommended Wightman Road alternative would have on Wightman Road traffic volumes. SDG replied that it was not likely to have any impact on traffic flows (given that Wightman Road is always likely to be a quicker route than Green Lanes), but that traffic calming measures included in the recommended alternative would help to moderate vehicle speeds.
- There was an inconsistency in the timeframe for the implementation of the option relating to Warham Road. It was clarified that this would be a short term measure.
- SDG also noted that the options recommended are not an exhaustive list of measures relating to transport in the study area. Rather, they complement other council measures that are outside the scope of the study, as well as initiatives promoted by other bodies (such as Transport for London).

4. **Next steps**

- SDG outlined the next steps for the study. Firstly, the community engagement report would be finalised. A final study report would then be prepared to document the recommendations emerging from the study.
- The way forward will then be considered by Cllr Ahmet in collaboration with ward councillors, together with advice from Haringey officers. In many cases, implementation would require further work, including consultation, design, traffic modelling and engagement with other parties.
- Finally, SDG thanked the Steering Group members and other attendees present for their interest in and involvement with the study.