

Auckland Road LTN – meeting two

17 November 2020, 13:30-15:00

Attendees:

[REDACTED] LB Bromley (AC) (LBB)
[REDACTED] LB Bromley (SW)
[REDACTED] LB Croydon (IP) (LBC)
[REDACTED] LB Croydon (MA)
Sam Monck, TfL (SM)
Andrew Wiseall, TfL (AW)
Zoe Vidion, TfL (ZV)
David McKenna, TfL (DM)
Zoe Murphy, TfL (ZM)
Michelle Wildish, TfL (MW)

Meeting objective:

Update from all parties on progress related to the Crystal Palace and South Norwood LTN (Auckland Road)

Actions:

- LBC (IP) to share how it intends to carry out analysis and how it will be used – if possible, noting potential legal restraint
- TfL (AW) agreed to produce a monitoring report, based on its own data. It would continue to monitor data for as long as it can until the report deadline, however there will be some caveats applied
- Both boroughs to let TfL (SM) know what monitoring and analysis might be required, with cost so this can be considered
- LBC (IP) to check if he can provide a note of consultation results breakdown. As above, this might not be possible due to restrictions

Notes of the discussion follow

LB Croydon update:

- Local engagement has started to help determine the future of the scheme
- Aimed for this start sooner, but needed to wait until the removal of the scaffold on Church Road
- Public consultation now underway. Three options: retain, revise, remove the scheme. Under a potential revised scheme ANPR cameras would be introduced with residents of the neighbourhood exempt
- Consultation runs for four weeks (until 7 December). Officers then make a recommendation as to how to proceed with the scheme
- Feedback is analysed at the end. Early indication of 2,300 responses so far but not all have answered the key end questions, meaning around 2,000 responses won't be counted
- LBC received a pre-action protocol letter regarding a potential judicial review from residents of Croydon and Bromley. LBC responded with an offer to meet however the application has gone to the High Court and LBC has 21 days to respond

- Reported the local road network is performing better, following removal of the scaffold at Church Road

Consultation:

Angus Culverwell (AC) added some Bromley residents reported confusion with the consultation questionnaire and options. Noting some information not easily available, and a need to stop a response, to go and cross reference information.

Mark Averill (MA) confirmed initially some links within were not working and this was quickly rectified by the web team.

AC asked if there is a way to help respondents come back and complete their consultation responses.

MA confirmed they are planning social media reminders of the consultation and that some respondents may be planning to come back and complete their responses. The system does not prevent them from doing that.

LB Bromley update:

- Pleased with news the scaffolding was removed but noted the date of this coincided with a second national lock-down, so the effect was not clear
- Immediate issues for Bromley residents of Patterson/Milestone/Belvedere Road and Cintra Park continue. They see just as much traffic, only now it moves faster and there are less jams
- Queuing on Anerley Hill continues. While queue lengths have reduced, they remain longer than those experienced before the LTN and traffic continues to find other ways to get through quicker
- LBB official position remains a call for complete removal of the LTN due to the continued negative impact on the highway and increased pollution and congestion along Anerley Hill
- Noting even a camera-controlled solution with exemption permits would not remove the issue with non-permit traffic filtering through

Anerley Hill congestion:

Ian Plowright (IP) notes as a Saturday cyclist on the hill there is an issue at the Hamlet Road junction as vehicles enter and exit, then a gap in congestion until Cintra Park. This road operates one-way out to Anerley Hill to prevent traffic entering from the hill. In addition, Belvedere Road operates one-way northbound. LBB could address its congestion by considering conversion of Milestone Road one-way, in only from Church Road. LBB residents exempt from cameras would have other options.

AC confirmed LBB has applied for enforcement powers and these are expected by summer 2021, however this is not a preferred solution as it does not remove issues with queuing traffic that is not exempt.

TfL scheme assessment update:

- Data was presented for the Crystal Palace and South Norwood LTN area
- Based on monitoring bus performance by journey time, noting there is not freight traffic journey data or automatic traffic counters in the area
- Based on one week of data, w/c 2 November – only a very early indication as follows:
 - Church Road northbound and southbound saw a large improvement to bus journey times following removal of the scaffold and temporary lights
 - This suggested the removal of the scaffold and temporary lights had caused the biggest variance in performance, as opposed to lockdown or the LTN – however one week of data is insufficient to draw firm conclusions
 - Anerley Hill northbound, 7am-7pm showed a continued increase to journey times though not significant. To note, the discovery of a detector fault at the top of Anerley Hill led to reduced green time for half of the week and would have resulted in additional delay. This has now been resolved
 - Anerley Hill southbound – unexplained recent spike in journey time delay
 - Crystal Palace Parade – data did not show a huge variance in bus journey times, noting data shows Crystal Palace Parade southbound is queuing
 - South Norwood Hill – little effect as a result of temporary lights and seems to be back up to the average journey times seen pre-lockdown

In summary data is based on one week, post scaffold, and at a time of lockdown. As a result, it does not present an ability to determine whether the LTN is having an unreasonable impact on the road network.

Noted changes will impact the network due to restriction of movement, affecting overall resilience in the area. As above, one week of data is not sufficient to make a balanced judgement of scheme benefits against any trade-offs/ disbenefits.

AC noted an ongoing impact to traffic on Anerley Road northbound. It would be interesting to see how things change, post lock-down.

IP noted according to DfT data, traffic is generally increasing on unclassified streets should we protect these routes or allow them to fill with motorised traffic.

Noted this is a long-standing subject for debate.

Next steps

Consultation results

SM asked AC from a Bromley perspective, while recognising LBB's position remains for removal of the scheme, would the LBC consultation with shareable views from the community, meet concerns.

LBB would like assurance that interpretation of the consultation result is transparent. This was important in addressing potential issues later down the line, where residents negatively impacted may raise questions around validity of data and integrity of the remove option.

LBC is not intending to apply weighting to responses, but there will be levels of desegregation based on where respondents live. This would be broken down by those within the LTN and impacted in different ways (Milestone/Patterson/Belvedere, Auckland/Lancaster, then Sylvan/Stambourne/Fox Hill). Also, responses from surrounding A roads. While the scheme was introduced in a hurry, it was introduced with strong policy and guidance.

AC would look to seek assurance that 'A road' responses were considered as important, particularly to note the continued and significant concern from Anerley Hill and residents.

Noting the current judicial review, with LBB named an interested party. LBC could not go into detail about analysis of each geographical grouping, but the decision would be made at pace and in public to ensure transparency.

AC adds this would not remove his members view that the scheme should be removed, to remove current negative impacts on residents until a suitable solution can be consulted on. LBB will respond to the consultation on this basis.

Data monitoring

Following an action from meeting one, IP had circulated a monitoring brief but had to move fast to ask consultants to widen its scope and had not been able to get iBus data

TfL agreed to produce the monitoring report, based on its own data. This was considered a more objective way to report that may save money, be unbiased and not an interpretation from consultants. However, this would be required at short notice due to LBC's tight decision-making timetable. The report would also be shared with LBB.

SM referred to the new DfT letter stipulating there needs to be more consultation and monitoring of schemes. TfL is keen to make sure we do this. It is looking to carry out more overlay of monitoring across London.

A portion of new money is set aside for future monitoring and TfL can help both boroughs with analysis and monitoring, that would be shared with all three authorities.

IP is considering a further experimental order, and this may mean he will come back and take up the TfL offer of other monitoring.

ENDS