**From:** "5.1.2,e" <5.1.2,e@5.1.2,e>
**Sent:** Sun, 16 Apr 2023 17:53:22 +0200
**To:** "Verkeersmaatregelen Centrum West" <verkeersmaatregelenCW@amsterdam.nl>
**Subject:** Palenplan Centrum-West – Contribution to the public enquiry
**Attachments:** 23089_bereikbaarheidsanalyse_haarlemmerbuurt – p.1.pdf
**Categories:** Gele categorie

Sending my note **below** again, with a clearer subject line.

---------- Forwarded message ---------
Van: 5.1.2,e <5.1.2,e@5.1.2,e>
Date: zo 16 apr 2023 om 17:29
Subject: Palenplan – Contribution to the public enquiry
To: <verkeersmaatregelenCW@amsterdam.nl>
Cc: 5.1.2,e (Gmail) <5.1.2,e@gmail.com>

Hello,

Following my attendance of the public meeting at the Noorderkerk on 20 March, I would like to confirm in writing an opinion that I shared in person then, with the person leading this plan (sorry, I did not note your name) during the debrief time that took place at the end of the meeting.

Sorry for writing in English. My Dutch is improving but it is not quite at this level yet.

For context,
- My wife 5.1.2,e and I live currently at **Keizersgracht** 5.1.2,e which we rent.
- Within a couple of years, we will live at **Singel** 5.1.2,e which we own and are in the process of renovating.

## General feedback

In short:
- I was really surprised by how negative the overall atmosphere was at the Noorderkerk on 20 March.
- We hope that it will not lead the municipality to give up on its plan, for 2 main reasons:

**1.** Personally 5.1.2,e and I approve of your plan. There may be several ways in which it could be improved on, but we agree 100% with the general approach, which seems to us entirely coherent with the right way forward for Amsterdam's city centre.

**2.** More importantly, we believe that the negativity expressed by many attendees at the Noorderkerk is not representative of the majority opinion in the neighbourhood Centrum-West and in the city more broadly. There are different ways of putting it:

**a)** Most of the attendees were older people with an average age probably around 60 or so, far higher than the average of 38 across Amsterdam. As a result, the people present were on average much more conservative, pro status quo, than the average Amsterdammer.

**b)** An unfortunate aspect of direct democracy is that the most vocal part of a population is often on the more extreme and conservative side. A good example is the recent referendum about electrical scooters in Paris. 89% of the population voted in favour of a ban… but only 7,5% of the population voted. If a referendum was held in Centrum-West about the municipality's Palenplan, the result would probably be skewed in a similar way.

**c)** Anecdotally, this general point at b) is corroborated by the feedback that we have heard from friends and neighbours about the Palenplan in the last few weeks. We've asked a dozen people or so in the neighbourhood what they thought of the municipality's proposal. Only one was reserved about it, who is the only one who made time to attend the meeting at the Noorderkerk. All of the others were positive but did not bother to come to the Noorderkerk. Too bad, and – we suggest – to be taken into account in your political analysis.

**Points of detail**

With our future residence at Singel 5.1.2.e in mind, we would like to share 4 points specific to the impact of the Palenplan on our own part of the Centrum-West area. Using **the attached plan**, from page 1 of the 'REISTIJDANALYSE PALENPLAN CENTRUM WEST':

**i)** There is a mistake: the existing pole on Bridge no. 11 (at the crossing between the Singel and the Blauwburgwal) is missing.

**ii)** We would suggest making the 'No car access after 400 m' sign at the very top of the Singel (at the crossroads with the Drogbak) more visible than it currently is. At the moment, people who miss this sign can still get around the pole on Bridge no. 11 and keep going south, down the Herengracht for example. Once the Palenplan is enacted, this will no longer possible. A clearer signalisation at the Singel / Drogbak entrance into the Singel will avoid unnecessary traffic going down the Singel by mistake, and then having to back north through the Langestraat.

**iii)** It seems that the conditions of access through the 2 'sinkable poles' on the Singel should not change as a result of the Palenplan. If the catchment area giving right to a pass for these 2 poles was extended beyond its current limits, there is a risk that the Singel would become a major entry point into the northern area of the canal ring, which would result in a substantial increase in the traffic going through the northern end of the Singel.

**iv)** The pole that is currently suggested to be installed on Bridge no. 19 (at the crossing between the Herengracht and the Blauwburgwal) would seem be better placed on the northern side of the Blauwburgwal, just after the Langestraat. Otherwise, some drivers unfamiliar with the location and the traffic set up will drive all the way to Bridge no. 19 and will then have to go back to Langestraat, which may cause some traffic problems. It would be easier if the pole made it necessary to turn directly into Langestraat.

Thank you for reading this note, and best wishes for your efforts to finalise the plan.

Kindly,

5.1.2.e

5.1.2.e