

LB Enfield, Design Surgery

Date Wednesday 12th October 2016, 15:30 – 17:00
Venue 7th Floor Boardroom, 55 Broadway (St James' Park)

Design Advisors

Fred Manson	Chair
Brian Deegan	Transport for London
Paul Dodd	Urban Design London

Guests

Jon Judah	LB Enfield
Paul Rogers	LB Enfield
Alexander Stebbings	Jacobs
Nivedita Vijayan	Jacobs
Alex Sexton	Transport for London

Apologies

Sunand Prasad	Penoyre & Prasad
---------------	------------------

Observers

Jamie Graham	Urban Design London
--------------	---------------------

The panel welcomed LB Enfield and their design team who provided an update on their Mini-Holland proposals for Enfield Town Centre. Following public consultation the borough have selected a preferred option which they are currently taking forward to detailed design. The preferred option retains the one-way gyratory through the town centre, reflecting concerns over vehicle access and potential impact on congestion. The panel were concerned that the preferred option does not realise the Mini-Holland ambition for cycling provision in the borough. The panel had reservations about the resultant quality of the town centre for people on foot and whether their needs and desire lines were being adequately catered for within the scheme.

Segregated cycle facilities are not provided along Church Street, however cycle facilities are proposed along Cecil Road, to the south of the town centre. These would be in the form of a westbound cycle lane and an eastbound contra flow cycle lane. The borough is investigating ways in which the east bound cycle lane can be segregated from general traffic using planters, which can also provide environmental benefits in terms of visual amenity, sustainable urban drainage and enhanced biodiversity.

The borough was urged to undertake a detailed site investigation to ensure that the proposal for planters is technically feasible, particularly in relation to underground services and soil characteristics, to ensure tree planting and suds are achievable. It was recommended that the borough use expert advice on SuDs to help shape the proposals. All tree and shrub planting requires maintenance and the borough should be clear about the cost and commitment to ongoing maintenance of such features to ensure they are cherished and maintained over the long term.

The borough was asked to question the design solution and test ways to try and improve it. For example, the panel asked if the east bound cycle route be raised to footway levels to provide a continuous level route along Cecil Road which may help assert cycle and pedestrian priority over the vehicles turning into the numerous access and services routes along Cecil Road .

The borough presented concept proposals to improve the pedestrian environment along Church Street. These were broadly welcomed by the panel who noted that the street may be designed to provide a sequence of events and the spaces along the street. The borough should carefully consider visual elements, signage, landscape features, signage etc. which engage the senses and make the street more inviting and comfortable to spend time in.

Although the panel recognised concern over congestion and desire to maintain existing traffic flows it was noted that the retention of the existing traffic Island at the junction of Southbury Road and Genotin Road does not reflect pedestrian desire lines and provides a poor sense of arrival from the train station. The panel urged the borough to reconsider proposals here to provide a simpler solution which accommodate desire lines. Given the projects status as a Mini-Holland project the panel queried whether the borough considered the suitability of less 'engineered' approach to highway design such as implied roundabouts.

The station forecourt will benefit from the removal of taxi parking and a new public realm, however the panel noted that access to the proposed cycle hub from the cycle lane is not ideal and encouraged the borough to review the layout to ensure the hub is visually prominent with easy access for both pedestrians and cyclists.

The panel look forward to seeing the proposal as it progresses.

UDL NOV 2016