

QHNF Barnet monthly coordination meeting

-minutes-

Date & Time	Monday, 02/09/2019, 15:00
Location	LB Barnet offices, Colindale
Present	LB Barnet: [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], Cllr Barry Rawlings, Cllr Geoff Cooke, Cllr Anne Hutton Sustrans: [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED]
Apologies	Cllr Pauline CoakleyWebb

Minutes

Item	Notes	Actions
1	<p><u>Public consultation</u></p> <p>[REDACTED]: -Presented latest version of analysis report. Further location based analysis to take place based on where people live in relation to the scheme. The most objection is to the proposed diagonal filter, and the location based analysis will allow us to see the effect of people's views on the filter on their view of the cycleway. Next iteration of report expected late September.</p> <p>Cllr AH: -Survey results look consistent with views expressed by attendees to event at Wren Academy during public consultation.</p> <p>[REDACTED] presented origin destination infographic, showing perceived worst-case scenario of traffic displacement onto Torrington Grove, based on current traffic flow (as surveyed 7am-7pm on 28/06/2018) from Woodhouse Road along Bramber Rd, Lewes Rd, Petworth Rd and Ashurst Rd through the Ashurst/Buxted mini-roundabout towards Friern Barnet Lane.</p> <p>Cllr AH: -there are concerns around the junction of Woodhouse Rd/Colney Hatch Lane. Has this been looked into?</p> <p>[REDACTED]: There's a separate proposal for that. Design process will be completed this year for [please insert exact proposal]. Will want to look at this with the added numbers of the diversion due to filter. It is something that could be communicated to residents to reassure them of additional measures being looked at in the area.</p> <p>[REDACTED]: Reminder about the engagement a couple of years ago regarding attitudes to traffic in the area. The results of the engagement was combined with the traffic data, which showed a need to remove traffic. This was the rationale for the</p>	<p>Sustrans to undertake additional analysis on consultation report</p> <p>Sustrans reviewing all traffic data collected to date, to establish baseline prior to experimental trial</p>

	<p>proposed filter (other options looked at would address speed only). The percentage of objection to the proposed filter during Consultation represents concerns with the filter on its own (without complimentary measures to address traffic displacement). There are ways to address these real concerns. There are reservations and perceptions about this intervention that could be addressed/allayed by a trial.</p> <p>■: Useful to remember that this is a cycle scheme. Good reason for it to be on Ashurst Rd rather than Torrington Park. Torrington Park is also a bus route. Purpose of the scheme – ensuring cyclists can safely navigate through the area. Causing more congestion on the main road network is the function of the main roads rather than the residential roads (which are designed for access to residential properties). The main signalised junction was the other concern – if we were to have a scheme to increase capacity at the junction, the solution would only work short-term as the junction would reach capacity again. Required method of dis-incentivising driving through the area. Barnet has no other measures (i.e. fiscal) to act as suppressant to driving. More mitigation measures are needed to support the measure. We will still receive objections from residents. The question is how we deal with them / reduce them.</p> <p>■: It was looked at what could be done and there were no other proposals that came out of that. Modelling of the left turn to FB lane and the right turn to Woodhouse Road looks like there is spare capacity on those roads.</p> <p><u>To address potential displacement of rat-run onto Torrington Grove</u></p> <p>■: Do an additional measure of no entry on the south side of Torrington Grove at junction with Lewes Rd and Buxted Rd. This would address the concern however would entrench the issues of residents' complaints around access. Grove Road could be deemed too far west to become new rat-run.</p> <p>■: -There is the issue of compliance to be looked into during design.</p> <p><u>Nature of experimental trial (as defined in traffic order)</u></p> <p>■: -The trial is the diagonal filter and any mitigation e.g. Torrington Grove point no entry.</p>	<p>Sustrans to review mitigation measures? (Budget permitting)</p>
--	---	--

Other discussion

Cllr BR: -Is the Ashurst/Buxted Rd section the only part of the route where there are concerns?

█: -Forest Walk – no significant objection, only a few concerns by residents about the lighting scheme increasing the risk of antisocial behaviour along the path. Exact lighting scheme to be determined at Detailed Design stage.

█: -Ways to address this concern e.g. lighting scheme (?) elsewhere in London (Barking & Dagenham) is at 25% power unless activated by motion sensor.

Cllr BR: -What's the status of the Haringey section?

█: -LB Haringey intending to go to public consultation on their schemes later in the year (December 2019?) depending on outcome of Barnet consultation, and TfL go-ahead.

Cllr BR: -Does Barnet section need to go to Committee before going to trial? Area Committee or Environment Committee?

█: -Intention is to go to parallel area committee for decisions that would give go-ahead for entire route. Aiming for January 2020. Want to take entire route to the Committee (including other measures that need Committee approval).

Cllr AH questioned going to Committee after the trial?

█: -Best to go before, due to the level of objection to the scheme during the public consultation. There's a perception that the traffic will divert and there is probably some reality of that. Need to clarify mitigation measures before we put in the trial.

█: -Does the trial need to go to Committee at all?

█: -Would want to allow discussion of the objections. It's a local issue and would want the local Councillors to be comfortable with it.

Off-road path through Friern Barnet Lane

█: -Overall objection to off-road path (56% respondents disagree/strongly disagree) sounds likely to be associated with objection to proposed diagonal filter.

	<p>█: -Looking at concerns raised in responses to scheme, there is a disagreement over the route, rather than to the path itself, specifically a disagreement to using Buxted Road.</p> <p><u>Friern Park</u></p> <p>█: -Concerns about whether the road is appropriate for a Cycleway.</p> <p>█: -The route is appropriate for Level 2 Cycling.</p> <p>Cllr AH: -Glenhurst Road is likely to become one-way.</p> <p><u>Next steps</u></p> <p>█: -Are Cllrs comfortable proceeding to trial with additional mitigation? Have to explain that to residents carefully (residents letter expected to be sent Autumn 2019) – but can explain reasons.</p> <p>Cllr GC: -Wants clarification about what decisions are being made based on this meeting – specific proposals needed before agreement in principle given by Cllrs.</p> <p>█: -More steps needed – understanding where concerns are coming geographically from will feed into the proposal for trial.</p> <p>Cllr GC: -Conscious of Cllrs not present that are not in agreement with parts of the scheme, specifically Cllr PCW and the Horsham Ave.</p> <p>█: -Revised report (late September) will be shared with all Councillors for review. Decision to progress can be made in subsequent meeting, or by email depending on Councillor preference.</p> <p><u>Horsham Avenue Mitigation</u></p> <p>█: -Horsham Ave point no entry from Woodhouse is a mitigation measure. The question is about going ahead with the measure from the beginning of the trial. Minor changes to the traffic order can be made during the trial, but preference to</p>	<p>Sustrans to draft residents letter, following completion of consultation report</p>
--	---	--

	<p>include mitigation measures in the trial from the start. Want to make sure the items are in the order as possible options.</p> <p>█: -Recommend that we go ahead with the closure with the mitigation from the beginning to prevent the rat running, because there's no point forcing ahead with a scheme that people have concerns about and may be right about unless addressing that. The proposal has to be made with the mitigations.</p> <p><u>Discussion about behaviours in the area and effect of the Horsham Ave mitigation.</u></p> <p>█: -More detailed post code analysis (i.e. responses from Horsham Ave residents) might help with this.</p> <p>█: -Could trial without the no-entry on Horsham and see what happens.</p> <p>Cllr BR: -Difficult to approve or endorse the scheme due to the opposition but position could be 'there should be a trial to closely monitor the impacts'. There will be congestion at different times of the day. People have to accept that. Lots of schools etc. Making it easier for people to cycle is a better way to address congestion than trying to move traffic around to other roads.</p> <p><u>Other Concerns</u></p> <p>Cllr AH: -Residents concerned the trial would start without mitigation and the permanent scheme would go ahead.</p> <p>█: -Duty bound to investigate comments received during the change/experiment.</p> <p><u>Residents letter</u></p> <p>█: -Residents are expecting an update in Autumn 2019.</p> <p>Cllr BR: -Worthwhile putting examples of similar schemes into any communications that take place. Will work with Cllr PCW to come up with wording.</p> <p>█: -Summary of next steps –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update analysis • Develop concept drawings of additional mitigation measures • Share designs with councillors for review 	
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree next steps, with aim to go to Committee in January. <p>Clarification needed on what next steps are once Sustrans has provided updated report with analysis.</p>	
--	---	--