

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 30 November 2016 03:14
To: Sockett David
Cc: [REDACTED]; Fairholme Nick; Holland Martin; Hall Daniel; Carter Graham (Streets); Seabright Elizabeth; Adler James (ST); Durowoju Mufu (ST); Brown Janet (ST)
Subject: Re: FW: Traffic problems on Tufnell Park Rd

Thank you David for your note.

We look forward to the pollution data and we hope for a good breeze this weekend. We have noted increased signage to the South including on/near Euston Rd. As of last weekend, we would mention that some messages were out of date and inconsistent and we hope they can be updated well before the weekend.

We also thank you for the update on the 271 which, if TfL prefers to redistribute a share of traffic to Hornsey Rd as opposed to suspending surplus capacity certainly would address our issues.

So in short, while there are still some issues to finalise, we accept the efforts TfL has made to mitigate a situation that started off badly.

Dear [REDACTED]

This leaves us with one significant outstanding issue lacking clarity - the enforcement of HGVs ignoring the ban.

If I park in Islington or drive down a bus lane or commit some other offense, one of your courteous and very effective enforcement officers or cameras quickly issues with me with a ticket or I get a letter in the post. If I pay within a certain amount of time, I get a reduction although it is still rather expensive. That is your business and the little green and white cars with CCTV cameras make LBI all the more effective.

But now we understand that you are completely unable to issue any fines or other penalties against parties such as Murphy's and other habitual offenders - Is this correct or are we misinformed? Exactly how many traffic infractions/fines have been issued in the last few weeks? Is the number close to zero?

Please note, we are not expecting criminal prosecution of drivers in the High Courts followed by us asking for a few of them to be drawn and quartered - we promise we are not quite that vindictive. But we would hope they might be held accountable with the same sort of financial penalties errant Islington residents may suffer for our own driving and parking misdeeds.

As council is aware, this is an issue that predates the present situation. We note the report from 2014 which took a view that the matter was tolerable. While we would question some of the report's findings, one that we would note it did not properly address the significant amount in the early morning hours (and now we are suffering accordingly). If the ban was legally enforced in the 23:00-07:00 in general that would have made a notable difference in quality of life terms for the residents.

Its very kind that TfL will contact Murphy's but based on our experience over the years, this is futile as previous efforts by Islington would seem to have gone unheeded and Murphy's was identified as being the largest contributor to this issue in the 2014 study. We are sadly confident they will acknowledge the phone call, tell you what you want to hear and keep on doing what they have been doing for years.

We appreciate that, with success, LBI has done much to help make TfL more accountable but we also must ask that LBI also commit to the mitigating deliverables agreed that are in their remit.

This is a residential area that includes many young families, the road and piping infrastructure has been repeatedly demonstrated to be fragile, there are a number of listed properties. We would of course hope for a more thought out long term strategy since Murphy's and others have no motivation to change. But for the moment, the starting point is from now until mid January.

I happen to be awake with jet lag and so I am sending this note at an odd hour but I can assure you that more than a couple of HGVs have rumbled by in the time it has taken me to draft this note and I can identify them even though I am in a room that does not face the street.

We await your further update and clarification on the above before [REDACTED] and I report back to the wider membership of the TPRA.

Thanks again to all as we reaffirm that we have come a long way from the starting point and that is a tribute to all involved. We just hope that we can wrap up these last issues which will allow a reasonable Christmas and New Year Season without having to try to take last minute remedial steps during the the holiday break.

All the best - [REDACTED]

On 25 November 2016 at 16:20, Sockett David [REDACTED] wrote:

[REDACTED]

Thank you for the call earlier this week, as promised the update on your issues is as follows:

1. HGVs on Tufnell Park Rd

- a. We will add more camera signage ahead of the next full closure on 3/4 December
- b. As you note, the responsibility for prosecutions rests with LBI though we continue to work closely with the borough to raise awareness of the ban. For example, we are using the CCTV to identify HGV operators who are not observing the ban. We have contacted these companies directly, they have apologised and confirmed they have held specific driver briefings about the need to follow the HGV

diversion route. We also continue to reiterate that the ban is being rigorously enforced in our weekly email to 10,000 freight operators, and we have called 200 major operators who are responsible for a large proportion of goods vehicles across London.

c. Similarly, following our call, we will contact Murphy's directly about their vehicles.

d. We will look at extending our preventative staff's (EoS) site coverage hours during the next closure and update you next week.

2. Bus routes along Tufnell Park Rd - we need to maintain a link from Archway to Highgate and back which the no 4 does not do and nor would cutting the 271 at Nags Head. However, ahead of the next weekend closure, we are considering diverting the 271 along Hornsey Road as a way of maintaining the link, but reducing the impact on Tufnell Park Rd. We can update you next week on this.

3. Pollution monitoring – we are starting to get information from monitors and can provide some feedback next week.

Regards

DS

From: Sockett David
Sent: 22 November 2016 14:06
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: Fairholme Nick
Subject: RE: Traffic problems on Tufnell Park Rd

[REDACTED]

Thanks for your email and recognition of the improvements made. I will look into your detailed points with the wider team and respond before the end of the week.

Regards

DS

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 22 November 2016 13:10
To: [REDACTED]; Sockett David
Cc: [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Subject: Traffic problems on Tufnell Park Rd

Dear Councillor [REDACTED] and Mr Sockett,

Thank you for the recent correspondence.

We need to firstly give credit to all involved and acknowledge that this last weekend was certainly better than previous ones. There were backups and occasional issues but not nearly as many as before. So we would like to thank you for the steps taken thus far.

There are still some outstanding issues which we expect to be addressed this week and we request you come back to us on these points. If it was only about another weekend, it would be bearable, but we know that we are facing this issue well into January with at least two weeks of non-holiday, weekday traffic (and that is based on the assumption that TfL has no further surprises and associated delays)

1. The most significant issue which appears to be unaddressed is the enforcement of the lorry ban, which is a question for LBI as much as TfL. The camera is up on Tufnell Park Rd but there is only very minimal signage highlighting the ban. We think that there needs to be clear warning signage of the cameras and the fact that drivers who break the ban are being prosecuted. We would like to know how many infractions have been issued by LBI in the past week against lorries who ignored it? If there have been none, this a toothless tiger. The trucking community is rather tight knit and we suspect as soon as a few of them start getting fines, the rest will fall into line. So we need to know that this will start happening this week.

We recognise that the TfL staff are doing a good job diverting a good portion of the HGV's, but they only work daytime hours and the worst part of the problem appears to be in the 11pm-6am period when deliveries, primarily southbound, are being made into Central London. Because it is southbound, this is not just a weekend problem when there is full bridge closure.

2. We acknowledge the traffic flow was better at most points. That said, the 271 as viewed throughout much of the day still looks rather empty. We still do not

understand the point of a bus that serves only three extra stops on Highgate Hill covered by two other lines? If the solution that you reluctantly accepted has made such a difference, why would you not carry it through to a logical conclusion?

3. We have seen what appear to be the pollution monitors. Can you tell us when we get to see the results from those devices? We assume this weekend was not too bad with the breezy weather, but if we are going to monitor pollution we would like to see the results in a timely manner (as noted in our previous email, hourly readings with identified daytime peaks). Can you provide us with a weblink to see the data feed?

We look forward to receiving a prompt reply to these concerns.

Yours sincerely

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted contact information]

Click [here](#) to report this email as SPAM.

The contents of this e-mail and any attached files are confidential. If you have received this email in error, please notify us immediately at postmaster@tfl.gov.uk and remove it from your system. If received in error, please do not use, disseminate, forward, print or copy this email or its content. Transport for London excludes any warranty and any liability as to the quality or accuracy of the contents of this email and any attached files.

Transport for London is a statutory corporation whose principal office is at Windsor House, 42-50 Victoria Street, London, SW1H 0TL. Further information about Transport for London's subsidiary companies can be found on the following link: <http://www.tfl.gov.uk/corporate/about-tfl/>

Although TfL have scanned this email (including attachments) for viruses, recipients are advised to carry out their own virus check before opening any attachments, as TfL accepts no liability for any loss, or damage which may be caused by viruses.

--

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]