Public Document Pack

OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Wednesday, 1 March 2017 at 7.30 pm
Conference Room, Civic Centre, Silver Street, Enfield, EN1 3XA

Contact: Stacey Gilmour
Scrutiny Officer
Direct: 020-8379-4187
Tel: 020-8379-1000
Ext: 4187
E-mail: stacey.gilmour@enfield.gov.uk
Council website: www.enfield.gov.uk

Councillors : Derek Levy (Chair), Abdul Abdullahi, Katherine Chibah, Joanne Laban, Edward Smith and Nneka Keazor

Education Statutory Co-optees: 1 vacancy (Church of England diocese representative), Simon Goulden (other faiths/denominations representative), Tony Murphy (Catholic diocese representative), Alicia Meniru & 1 vacancy (Parent Governor Representative).

Enfield Youth Parliament Co-optees (2)

Support Officer – Claire Johnson (Governance & Scrutiny Manager)
Stacey Gilmour (Scrutiny Officer)

AGENDA – PART 1

1. WELCOME & APOLOGIES

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members of the Council are invited to identify any disclosable pecuniary, other pecuniary or non-pecuniary interests relevant to items on the agenda.

3. CALL-IN OF REPORT: APPROVAL OF CYCLE ENFIELD PROPOSALS FOR THE A1010 SOUTH (Pages 1 - 68)

To receive a report from the Executive Director of Finance, Resources & Customer Services outlining a Call-In received for consideration by Overview & Scrutiny on the following reason: (Report No: 214).

Portfolio decision by Cabinet Member for Environment (7 February 2017): Approval of Cycle Enfield Proposals for the A1010 South.

Decision included on Publication of Decision List No: 54/16-17 Key Decision 4390 (List Ref: 1/54/16-17) issued on 7 February 2017.

It is proposed that consideration of the Call-In be structured as follows:

- Brief outline of reasons for the Call-In by representative (s) of the Members who have called in the decision.
- Response to the reasons provided for the Call-In by the Cabinet member responsible for taking the decision.
- Debate by Overview & Scrutiny Committee and agreement on action to be taken.

4. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

To note the dates of future meetings as follows:

Provisional Call-Ins:
Wednesday 8 March 2017
Wednesday 12 April 2017

Business meetings of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee will be held on:
Tuesday 21 March 2017 (Additional meeting)
Thursday 27 April 2017

Agenda Item 3

MUNICIPAL YEAR 2016/2017 REPORT NO. 214

MEETING TITLE AND DATE:
Overview & Scrutiny Committee,
1 March 2017

REPORT OF:
Executive Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services

Agenda – Part: 1	**Item: 3**
Subject: Approval of Cycle Enfield Proposals for the A1010 South **Wards:** Edmonton Green, Haselbury, Jubilee, Lower Edmonton, Ponders End and Upper Edmonton **Key Decision No:** 4390	
Cabinet Member consulted: N/A	

Contact officers and telephone numbers:
Asmat Hussain, Assistant Director Legal and Governance
Tel: 020 8379 6438
Email: asmat.hussain@enfield.gov.uk
Claire Johnson, Interim Governance Team Manager
Tel: 020 8379 4239
E mail: claire.johnson@enfield.gov.uk

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 This report details a call-in submitted in relation to the following decision:

Portfolio Decision by the Cabinet Member for Environment (7 February 2017) : Approval of Cycle Enfield Proposals for the A1010 South.

1.2 Details of this decision were included on Publication of Decision List No. 54/16-17 (Ref. 1/54/16-17 – issued on 7 February 2017).

1.3 In accordance with the Council's Constitution, Overview and Scrutiny Committee is asked to consider the decision that has been called-in for review.

1.4 The members who have called-in this decision do not believe it falls outside of the Council's Policy Framework.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1 That Overview and Scrutiny Committee considers the called-in decision and

either:

(a) Refers the decision back to the decision making person or body for reconsideration setting out in writing the nature of its concerns. The decision making person or body then has 14 working days in which to reconsider the decision; or

(b) Refer the matter to full Council; or

(c) Confirm the original decision.

Once the Committee has considered the called-in decision and makes one of the recommendations listed at (a), (b) or (c) above, the call-in process is completed. A decision cannot be called in more than once.

If a decision is referred back to the decision making person or body; the implementation of that decision shall be suspended until such time as the decision making person or body reconsiders and either amends or confirms the decision, but the outcome on the decision should be reached within 14 working days of the reference back. The Committee will subsequently be informed of the outcome of any such decision.

3. BACKGROUND/INTRODUCTION

3.1 Please refer to Section 3 in the Cabinet Decision Report.

4. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

None – Under the terms of the call-in procedure within the Council's Constitution, Overview & Scrutiny Committee is required to consider any eligible decision called-in for review. The alternative options available to Overview & Scrutiny Committee under the Council's Constitution, when considering any call-in, have been detailed in section 2 above.

5. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

To comply with the call-in procedure within the Council's Constitution.

6. COMMENTS OF THE DIRECTOR OF FINANCE, RESOURCES AND CUSTOMER SERVICES AND OTHER DEPARTMENTS

6.1 Financial Implications

The financial implications relating to the called-in decision have been detailed in Section 6.1 of the Cabinet Decision Report.

6.2 Legal Implications

S 21, S 21A-21C Local Government Act 2000, s.19 Police and Justice Act 2006 and regulations made under s.21E Local Government Act 2000 define the functions of the Overview and Scrutiny committee. The functions of the committee include the ability to consider, under the call-in process, decisions of Cabinet, Cabinet Sub-Committees, individual Cabinet Members or of officers under delegated authority.

Part 4, Section 18 of the Council's Constitution sets out the procedure for call-in. Overview and Scrutiny Committee, having considered the decision may: refer it back to the decision making person or body for reconsideration; refer to full Council or confirm the original decision.

The Constitution also sets out at section 18.2, decisions that are exceptions to the call-in process.

6.3 Property Implications

There are no corporate property implications arising from the Cabinet Decision Report.

7. KEY RISKS

The key risks identified relating to the called-in decision have been detailed in the Cabinet Decision Report.

8. IMPACT ON COUNCIL PRIORITIES

The way in which the called-in decision impacts on the Council priorities relating to fairness for all, growth and sustainability and strong communities have been detailed in the Cabinet Decision Report attached as Appendix 1.

9. EQUALITIES IMPACT IMPLICATIONS

The equalities impact implications relating to the called-in decision have been detailed in the Cabinet Decision Report.

10. PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

The performance management implications identified relating to the called-in decision have been detailed in the Cabinet Decision Report.

11. HEALTH AND SAFETY IMPLICATIONS

The health and safety implications identified relating to the called-in decision have been detailed in the Cabinet Decision Report.

12. PUBLIC HEALTH IMPLICATIONS

The public health implications identified relating to the called-in decision have been detailed in the Cabinet Decision Report.

Background Papers
None

APPENDIX 1

Call-In: Portfolio Decision: Approval of Cycle Enfield Proposals for the A1010 South

This page is intentionally left blank

MUNICIPAL YEAR 2016/2017 REPORT NO.

ACTION TO BE TAKEN UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY

PORTFOLIO DECISION OF:
Cabinet Member for Environment

REPORT OF:
Director – Regeneration & Environment

Agenda – Part: 1	**KD Num: 4390**
Subject: **Approval of Cycle Enfield Proposals for the A1010 South**	
Wards: Edmonton Green, Haselbury, Jubilee, Lower Edmonton, Ponders End and Upper Edmonton	

Contact officer and telephone number: David Taylor, 020 8379 3576

E mail: david.b.taylor@enfield.gov.uk

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report sets out the results of the A1010 South statutory consultation and seeks approval to implement the scheme, including making the necessary traffic management orders.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1 To approve the final design of the proposals for the A1010 South shown on the plans in Appendix A and to take all necessary steps to implement the scheme including:

a) Making the traffic management orders specified in Schedule 1 of Appendix C as advertised and without modification.
b) Implementing the raised entry treatments, flat top speed tables and raised junctions specified in Schedule 2 of Appendix C
c) Implementing the Zebra crossings and associated zig-zag markings specified in Schedule 3 of Appendix C
d) Implementing the 'Tiger crossings' and associated zig-zag markings specified in Schedule 4 of Appendix C
e) Introducing designated disabled persons parking places at least in the general locations specified Schedule 5 of Appendix C and all waiting and loading restrictions using the experimental powers provided by S9 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 Cycle Enfield represents a significant investment in the borough that can help improve our high streets and town centres; deliver long-term health benefits; and enable people to walk and cycle in safety. The overall Cycle Enfield programme includes not just cycle lanes on several of the borough's main roads, but also an extensive network of Greenway routes, 'Quieter Neighbourhoods', cycle hubs and a wide range of supporting measures to encourage more people to cycle.

3.2 On 7 July 2016 Cabinet granted approval to undertake detailed design and statutory consultation for lightly segregated cycling facilities and public realm improvements along the A1010 South between Lincoln Road and Fairfield Road. Cabinet also delegated authority to the Cabinet Member for Environment to approve and implement the final design of the scheme subject to consultation and completion of all necessary statutory procedures.

4. THE PROPOSAL

4.1 The proposal involves the introduction of segregated cycle lanes between Lincoln Road and Fairfield Road. For most of the route the cycle lanes will be located on both sides of the road and segregated by way of traffic separators. However, the section between Edmonton Green roundabout and Bounces Road/Croyland Road comprises a two-way cycle track on the western side of the A1010. In addition, the scheme provides the opportunity for public realm improvements at Edmonton Green roundabout and elsewhere along the corridor. Details of the proposed route are set out in the drawings attached as Appendix A.

4.2 The main works will be delivered by Ringway Jacobs via the London Highways Alliance Contract.

5.0 STATUTORY CONSULTATION

5.1 In addition to the statutory notification required prior to implementation of pedestrian crossings, speed tables and entry treatments etc. Traffic Management Orders (TMOs) are required to implement several elements of the scheme, including:

- Cycle lanes with exemptions to allow picking up and setting down by blue badge holders and maintenance vehicles
- Revocation and introduction of pay and display and free parking places
- Goods vehicle loading bays
- Introduction of prescribed routes, such as one-way working in some service roads

5.2 The procedure for making TMOs is set out in the Local Authorities' Traffic Order (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996. As a minimum,

the regulations require the council to publish notice of its intentions in the London Gazette and a local newspaper, as well as notify the following bodies:

- The Freight Transport Association
- The Road Haulage Association
- Metropolitan Police
- London Ambulance Service
- London Fire Brigade
- TfL (Buses) & relevant bus operators

5.3 A copy of the statutory notice is provided in Appendix D.

5.4 The Council also has discretion to consult other organisations it thinks appropriate and routinely consults additional groups such as:

- Enfield Disability Action
- London Travel Watch

5.5 In addition, the Council must take appropriate steps to inform those likely to be affected by the orders. This requirement was met by:

- Erecting site notices along the corridor.
- Promoting the consultation for three consecutive weeks in local newspapers.
- Publishing information on the Cycle Enfield website.
- Distributing 20,000 consultation leaflets to properties within 400m either side of the A1010 South corridor.

5.6 The A1010 South statutory consultation leaflet was a non-technical document that sets out what has happened so far; lists the key aspects of the scheme and changes made as a result of the initial consultation; includes a plan and visualisations of the route; includes answers to frequently asked questions; informs the reader how to access further information e.g. the air quality assessment, the economic impact assessment and the traffic modelling report and how to object to any aspect of the draft traffic management orders. A facility was provided on the Cycle Enfield website to make it easy for objections and representations to be made.

5.7 The statutory consultation period commenced on 23 November 2016 and continued until 14 December 2016.

5.8 The Council received approximately 30 objections, most of which were made online. Details of the responses are provided in Appendix B but some of the key comments made by the statutory and other respondents are summarised in the paragraphs below.

Comments from Statutory Consultees

5.9 Responses to the statutory consultation were received from the Metropolitan Police, London Fire Brigade, London Ambulance Service and Arriva London.

Metropolitan Police

5.10 The Metropolitan Police Traffic Management Unit have been involved with the development of the scheme from the outset and provided comments that have helped shape the design. Their specific response to the statutory consultation was:

"I have had the opportunity to go through the drawings and the addition consultation documents now and based on my understanding of them, can see no reason to object".

London Fire Brigade

5.11 In response to the informal consultation reported to Cabinet in July 2016 the London Fire Brigade Borough Commander confirmed that he had "*no objections to the proposal of light segregation and the Cycle Enfield proposals for A1010 South".*

5.12 A number of queries were raised by the LFB in response to the statutory consultation. In particular, they sought confirmation that the traffic order included exemptions for emergency service vehicles (which it does); enquired about any barriers that may restrict LFB vehicles (of which there are none); and asked about any proposed measures to provide fast access to LFB vehicles. Whilst the scheme does not include any specific measures to benefit LFB vehicles, it is noted that the cycle lanes are formed using traffic separators, which enable fire appliances and other emergency service vehicles to drive over them in emergency situations.

5.13 Further information was subsequently provided to the LFB to clarify the arrangements for monitoring the scheme and to provide an indication of the type of objections received relating to fire access. No further comments or objections have been received from the LFB.

London Ambulance Service

5.14 The London Ambulance Service has not objected to the proposals but states:

"The LAS understands local authorities desire to improve the capitals roads and traffic flow, especially areas of high demand and peak time traffic. However, the LAS would always support direct and unhindered access 24/7 to all of London's roads to ensure we are able to provide the best care possibly to the population of London.

The London Ambulance Service is in principle unsurprisingly in favour of schemes which reduce the potential for accidents and also the severity of any injuries where they do occur. However, the London Ambulance Service is a fully mobile organisation which is permanently on the road. Travelling at lower speeds across significant areas of the borough is likely to increase travelling time and any additional journey time can reduce operational availability or increase journey time for patients being conveyed to hospital".

5.15 The use of traffic separators to segregate cyclists from other traffic will help to minimise the impact on emergency service response times, allowing broken down vehicles etc. to pull into the cycle lane if necessary. This distinguishes the scheme from many parts of the Cycle Superhighway, where the cycle lane is physically separated from the carriageway. In addition, the detailed traffic modelling demonstrates that the scheme will not cause gridlock, or indeed have a significant impact on journey times at most times. The impact of the scheme on journey times at peak times is summarised in paragraph 5.29 below.

Bus Operators

5.16 Fortnightly meetings to discuss all Cycle Enfield schemes take place between the Council and all relevant TfL stakeholders, including representatives from London Buses. In particular, the meeting is attended by the Area Manager responsible for bus operations in Enfield and Haringey, whose role includes liaison with the relevant bus operators.

5.17 Following TfL's Road Space Performance Group's (RSPG) approval of the scheme on the 17th November, TfL's Network Impact Management Team (NIMT) confirmed that the scheme will 'benefit users of the road network and therefore have no objections to the scheme being implemented subject to conditions. One condition relates specifically to the continuing need to work with TfL Buses to:

- identify further mitigation measures to minimise the impact on bus journey times and ensure that at least 50% of the bus mitigation measures are in place after scheme implementation.

5.18 Officers will continue to work with TfL to comply with the above condition to reduce the impact of the scheme on bus operations.

5.19 In line with the requirements of the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996, each of the bus operators that run services on behalf of TfL along the A1010 South (Arriva London, London General and Metroline) were notified about the proposals. No comments were received from any of the operators.

Air Quality

5.20 An independent study was commissioned to assess the impact of the scheme for the A1010 South on air quality. The assessment was carried out by Cambridge Environmental Research Consultants (CERC) and the result reported to Cabinet in July 2016.

5.21 The full report was published on the Cycle Enfield website and the leaflet sent to residents as part of the statutory consultation directed people to the report for further information regarding air quality.

5.22 Several people objected to the proposals on the basis that they felt that the 2.5% reduction in traffic levels on the corridor would not be achieved and, even if it was, there would be a worsening in air quality at junctions and other locations along the route due to additional delays at junctions and traffic being held behind buses or right turning vehicles. Whilst there is some basis for this concern, as set out below, it should be noted that many essential highway features, including pedestrian crossings, necessarily interrupt traffic flow and therefore impact on vehicle emissions.

5.23 The air quality report acknowledges that there is likely to be some increase in NO_2 concentrations at junctions where there are some increases in queue length and delay time. However, the report also states that the areas of these increases will be much smaller than the area of air quality improvements along the rest of the route, with reduced traffic flows at 2.5%. These improvements are small (between 0.1 $\mu g/m^3$ and 0.5 $\mu g/m^3$) but have the potential to increase if a greater mode shift from private car to cycling is achieved in the future.

5.24 Increasing cycling infrastructure and encouraging more people to cycle is a key element of the Council's Air Quality Action Plan, which is produced in recognition of the legal requirement on the Council to work towards air quality objectives within the Borough; this is as required under Part IV of the Environment Act 1995 and the relevant air quality regulations. The Action Plan contains a wide range of local measures but significant improvements in air quality also depend on both national and London-wide initiatives, such as the proposed Ultra-Low Emission Zone.

5.25 Enfield currently has a very low proportion of trips made by cycle compared to some other outer London boroughs. Although not guaranteed, a mode shift of 2.5% is not unrealistic given both the level of infrastructure improvement proposed and the evidence that many people (particularly younger people) would take up cycling if it were made safer.

Economic Impact

5.26 An independent town centre study was commissioned to assess the impact of the scheme on Edmonton Green Town Centre. The assessment was carried out by Regeneris and the findings reported to Cabinet in July 2016.

5.27 The full report was published on the Cycle Enfield website and the leaflet sent to residents as part of the statutory consultation directed people to the report for further information on the impact of the proposals on Edmonton Green town centre.

5.28 In response to the statutory consultation, several comments were made about the lack of parking and loading for business. South of Edmonton Green roundabout the existing level of parking is retained. North of Edmonton Green surveys demonstrate that sufficient parking will remain to meet existing demand. To support local shopping parades short stay bays are provided, allowing parking for up to two hours. The operation of these bays will be monitored post-implementation and adjustments made to either the number of bays and/or the method of control if necessary.

5.29 Specific loading bays have been provided at several locations along the corridor. In addition, the waiting and loading restrictions will be introduced on an experimental basis so that they can be quickly adjusted to allow loading and unloading to take place at appropriate locations in side roads, if required.

Congestion

5.30 Further work has been carried out since Cabinet in July 2016 and the latest traffic modelling report (November 2016) was published on the Cycle Enfield website to help inform statutory consultation. This assessment took account of the additional delays at junctions as well as delays at bus stops and due to any delays removal of right turning pockets.

5.31 The recorded journey times for the 2.4 mile A1010 South corridor are approximately 11-15 minutes for the northbound and southbound movements, except in the PM peak, where journey times exceeding 20 minutes were recorded.

The table below sets out the additional journey time per mile forecast once the scheme has been implemented, assuming no reduction in vehicle trips takes place as a result of a shift from car to cycle use (i.e. a worst case scenario).

Additional delay	Northbound	Southbound
AM Peak	+73s to +133s	+18s to +78s
PM Peak	+ 7s to +67s	+24s to +84s

5.32 Several comments and objections were received relating to increased congestion and delays. Assuming no transport modal shift, it is clear from the above table that there will be some increase in journey times, particularly during the busy peak periods. However, this needs to be off-set against the wider benefits of the scheme, such as better safety for cyclists, improved health of residents and enhanced public realm. In addition, providing the infrastructure to encourage more people to cycle short journeys could help in the medium to long-term to address future congestion.

Road Safety

5.33 A Stage 1 Road Safety Audit was completed since the report was considered by Cabinet. This is a key part of the on-going design process and further safety audits will be completed as part of the detailed design as well as post-implementation.

5.34 The Stage 1 Safety Audit has been published on the Council's website and identified a number of issues and concerns relating to the preliminary design, such as:

- Levels of compliance with the new shared pedestrian and cycle 'Tiger Crossings'
- Risk of conflict between pedestrians and cyclists in town centres and at bus boarders
- Risk of collisions where cycle lanes terminate just before side roads and where the cycle lane crosses side roads
- Reduced sightlines at certain junctions

5.35 Each of the points raised in the Stage 1 safety audit has been considered and taken into account in developing the detailed design. The detailed design itself will be subject to a Stage 2 safety audit prior to works commencing.

5.36 A particular concern raised by several consultees related to the risk of conflict between pedestrians and cyclists at bus boarders. Evidence from Camden and elsewhere suggests that bus boarders can be successfully introduced. In addition, the detailed design has been developed to include materials and signage to make it clear that pedestrians have priority at bus boarders. In addition, use of the bus boarders will be monitored and kept under review to help understand how they operate in practise, enabling further mitigation measures to be introduced if necessary.

Impact on Blue Badge Holders

5.37 The Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Exemptions for Disabled Persons) (England) Regulations 2000 require that certain traffic orders made by local authorities under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 that prohibit or restrict the waiting of vehicles in roads and street parking places must include a provision exempting any disabled person's vehicle displaying a disabled person's badge. This exempts the holder from waiting conditions in certain circumstances, and from charges and time limits at places where vehicles may park or wait. The proposed traffic orders comply with these requirements. However, several consultees have raised concerns about the impact of the scheme on blue badge holders, mainly because the introduction of a mandatory cycle lane reduces the opportunity for casual parking.

5.38 The proposals for disabled parking are summarised below:

- Although reduced in number, blue badge holders will be able to park free of charge in on-street Pay and Display bays for up to three hours;

- Designated bays for blue badge holders will be provided at least in the general locations specified in Schedule 6 of Appendix C, initially on an experimental basis so that they can be reviewed and amended in the light of demand, feedback and operational experience.
- Blue badge holders will be able to park for up to three hours on both double and single yellow lines, providing there are no loading restrictions in operation at the time. These restrictions are also to be introduced experimentally so that they can be quickly modified in the light of feedback and operational experience.
- The traffic order enabling the introduction of the mandatory cycle lane varies the national position so that vehicles with a blue badge can enter the lane to pick up and set down.
- Along the length of the residential section of the corridor, gaps in the mandatory lane will be provided for loading/unloading which can also be used by blue badge holders to park for up to three hours. These restrictions are also to be introduced experimentally so that they can be adapted quickly if necessary;

Loss of Uncontrolled Parking

5.39 North of Edmonton Green it is acknowledged that the loss of uncontrolled on-street parking may cause inconvenience to some residents in terms of parking and receipt of deliveries. Where possible, residential parking bays have been introduced and surveys indicate that most of the parking can be absorbed in the side roads.

5.40 It is accepted that these proposals will necessitate changes in the way deliveries are made to some residential properties along the route. Delivery vehicles may need to park in side roads with goods delivered via trolley for the last part of the journey. Where there is not a side road in the vicinity, the design now incorporates a range of 'loading zones' in the residential areas of the route. Vehicles will be able to stop in these for loading and unloading, outside of peak hours (10am – 3pm). In addition, the design ensures that those residents with a dropped kerb will continue to be able to access their properties.

5.41 On balance, the wider benefits that the scheme will bring for the whole Borough in both the short and longer term are considered to outweigh the inconvenience generated for some residents. Those residents that are affected will still be able to receive deliveries and park on-street, albeit further away from their properties than at present.

Value for Money

5.42 A number of respondents to the consultation cited their perception that the proposals would only benefit a very small percentage of the population. This suggests a misconception of what the scheme is trying to achieve. Currently, there are around 4,800 daily journeys by bicycle (less than 1% of total journeys). The initial target is to increase this fivefold to around 24,000 daily journeys. To achieve this, the scheme aims to open up the option of cycling

to the full spectrum of the community so that more people can choose to cycle particular journeys where appropriate. Cycle lanes of the quality proposed will enable cycling to become a realistic option as part of the transport mix, a further choice alongside private cars, using public transport or walking. Therefore, the intention is not for a small percentage of the population to cycle all their journeys, the aim is for a wide cross section of the community to cycle some of their journeys.

5.43 As highlighted in the initial bid document and subsequent reports, enabling an increase to the number of journeys cycled, with a view to decreasing short car journeys, can bring benefits for everyone, particularly when considered against a landscape of increasing population levels. As cycling levels increase, there is opportunity for some residents to improve their health and wellbeing, reducing the strain on the NHS for everyone. Improving the look and feel of the high streets has the potential to increase the reputation of Enfield as a 'place' encouraging wider forms of investment in the Borough. At the same time, everyone can benefit from an enhanced streetscape in our high streets and town centres, however they chose to travel. Cycling is also a low cost means of transport, increasing the level of disposal income that can support the local economy. The Council takes a longer term view when considering these benefits, adopting a position that this investment can create the right foundations to realise ever increasing benefits into the future.

Bus Stops

5.44 Several people made representations and raised objections about the potential for conflict between pedestrians and cyclists at bus stops, particularly the bus stop boarders.

5.45 Both the Stage 1 safety audit and the design appraisal undertaken by Centre for Accessible Environments (CAE) have also raised concerns about bus stop boarders and bypasses. CAE state that:

"We have serious concerns regarding [bus boarders], for those with mobility of sensory impairments and parents with young children as they have to cross the cycle lane to reach the bus. Again, better colour contract should be provided between the cycle lane and pedestrian areas.

We are not convinced that providing 'a sign' will slow cyclists down or get then to stop whist buses are loading/unloading ...(there is mention of them weaving through pedestrians). Will the Police Community Support Officers be monitoring behaviour?

We have serious concerns regarding [bus bypasses] for those with mobility of sensory impairments and parents with young children as they have to cross the cycle lane to reach the bus. Again, better colour contract should be provided between the cycle lane and pedestrian areas and there should be some form of delineation between the two routes.

5.46 The comments from CAE have been taken into account in developing the detailed designs and, for example, there will be clear delineation between the cycle lanes and the shared areas by bus stops.

5.47 Evidence from elsewhere (such as Royal College Street in Camden) suggests that bus stop boarders can operate safely. However, they are a relatively new feature and people's concerns are understandable. To mitigate the risks a 0.5m buffer strip has been provided where feasible so that someone alighting from a bus will not step directly into the cycle lane. In addition, signage will be erected, the cycle lane will ramp up to footway level, and materials used to highlight to cyclists that pedestrians have priority at bus stop boarders. Information on use of the new infrastructure will be provided to encourage bus passengers to look to the left when stepping off the bus. However, buses will be very obvious from a long distance away and it is anticipated that cyclists will slow down just as drivers do when approaching e.g. lights, crossings, etc.

5.48 As suggested by CAE, use of the boarders and bypasses will also be monitored post-implementation, both in Enfield and in the other Mini-Holland boroughs where they are being introduced, and remedial action taken if necessary.

Conclusions

5.49 All of the comments, representations and objections received following the statutory consultation have been considered and officers' responses are set out in Appendix B.

5.50 On balance, it is recommended that the detailed design be implemented as proposed and that all of the associated traffic orders be made without modification.

6. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

6.1 The Council could decline the Mini Holland funding. However, this would mean forgoing £8.1 million of investment in the borough on this scheme and the associated economic, health and transport benefits.

7. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- To make places cycle-friendly and provide better streets and places for everyone;
- To make cycling a safe & enjoyable choice for local travel;
- To create better, healthier communities;
- To provide better travel choices for the 34% of Enfield households who have no access to a car and an alternative travel choice for the 66% that do;
- To transform cycling in Enfield;
- To encourage more people to cycle;
- To enable people to make short journeys by bike instead of by car;
- To increase physical activity and therefore the health of cyclists;
- To reduce overcrowding on public transport;
- To help improve our town centres

8. COMMENTS OF THE DIRECTOR OF FINANCE, RESOURCES AND CUSTOMER SERVICES, AND OTHER DEPARTMENTS

8.1 Financial Implications

8.1.1 The table below summarises expenditure to date as well as forecast expenditure in 2017/18:

2014/15	£139,000
2015/16	£118,000
2016/17	£262,000
2017/18	£7,553,000
Total	£8,072,000

8.1.2 The above costs will be fully funded by TfL the Mini Holland.

8.1.3 Expenditure will be fully funded by means of direct grant from TfL. The funding arrangements are governed through the TfL Borough Portal and no costs will fall on the Council. The release of funds by TfL is based on a process that records the progress of the works against approved spending profiles. TfL makes payments against certified claims as soon as costs are incurred, ensuring the Council benefits from prompt reimbursement.

8.1.4 Use of the funding for purposes other than those for which it is provided may result in TfL requiring repayment of any funding already provided and/or withholding provision of further funding. TfL also retains the right to carry out random or specific audits in respect of the financial assistance provided.

8.2 Legal Implications

8.2.1 The traffic management orders proposed are to be made in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 ("the 1984 Act"), and the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996/2489 ("the 1996 Order"). In making the orders, the various procedural requirements contained within the 1984 Act and the 1996 Order will need to be complied with. Considerations need to be given to the various objections. Whether or not strictly speaking required, the Council has agreed to consider all objections to the proposed orders, including those directed to the overall scheme for the A105.

8.2.2 Paragraph 9 of the 1996 Order sets out circumstances when both a public inquiry needs to be held and may be held. Due to the nature of the traffic management orders proposed there is no absolute requirement for a public inquiry in this instance

8.2.3 The proposed traffic management orders include a number of experimental traffic controls. These are permitted by section 9 of the 1984 Act for a period of up to 18 months. The use of experimental traffic controls is permitted in a wide range of circumstances, including where the Council wishes to be able to make changes quickly in light of operational experience.

8.2.4 It would be open to the Council to hold a public inquiry even though not required to do so in these circumstances. In view of the extensive consultation and engagement that has already taken place, it is not considered that it is either necessary or proportionate to do so in this instance.

8.2.5 In exercising powers under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, section 122 of the Act imposes a duty on the Council to have regard (so far as practicable) to securing the 'expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians) and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway'. The Council must also have regard to such matters as the desirability of securing and maintaining reasonable access to premises and the effect on the amenities of any locality affected. Any final decision to implement any scheme needs to take account of the considerations set out above and the outcome of public consultation.

8.2.6 The recommendations within this report are within the Council's powers and duties

8.3 Property Implications

There are no property implications arising from this report.

9. KEY RISKS

Strategic	Failure to deliver the scheme for the A1010S would impact on the Council's strategic aim to deliver a successful Cycle Enfield programme that achieves the associated health, transport and town centre benefits.
Operational	The scheme is forecast to have some impact on both parking levels and journey times along the A1010S, as outlined in the report. This is balanced by the wider benefits of the scheme (such as better safety for cyclists, improved health of residents and enhanced public realm). In addition, the impact of the scheme on journey times has been modelled in detail and agreed with TfL. The Council is also committed to monitor the operational impact of the scheme.
Financial	The scheme is estimated to cost the Council £8.1m to implement. This risk is mitigated by the funding provided by TfL, which fully covers this cost.
Reputational	By implementing a scheme despite substantial local opposition, it may be perceived that the Council is not listening to the views of residents. This is mitigated by clear and on-going communication explaining the wider benefits of the scheme.

10. IMPACT ON COUNCIL PRIORITIES

10.1 Fairness for All

Extensive consultation and engagement has taken place in relation to the Cycle Enfield proposals for the A1010 South and a wide range of views have been expressed.

10.2 Growth and Sustainability

10.2.1 With forecast growth in the borough, the A1010 South scheme will help to provide a safe and efficient means of accessing the high street along this route, contributing to their long-term vitality.

10.2.2 Cycling is a sustainable mode of transport with virtually no environmental impact compared to motorised transport. GLA population projections of an additional 45,526 people in the borough by 2040 indicate that congestion will become ever more common without a modal shift towards more sustainable transport.

10.3 Strong Communities

The A1010 South scheme will have a positive impact on people living in deprived wards/areas by improving personal health and fitness, with the potential to improve air quality (save for the situation at junctions: see section on 'Air Quality' above). It is recognised that more people on the streets will provide 'passive surveillance' making streets more accessible for communities to use for play, meeting and social activities.

11. EQUALITY IMPACT IMPLICATIONS

11.1 The Council has a duty when introducing new policies and making changes to services to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic, and foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it. This includes persons of different ages, disability, race and sex (along with other protected characteristics). The content of the duty is set out in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 (attached as part of Appendix E). The particular duties in respect of the disabled should be noted (section 149(4)).

11.2 With respect to the proposals for the A1010 South, Council officers have produced an updated Equality Impact Assessment ("EQIA") (see Appendix E). This identifies whether or not (and to what extent) the proposals have an impact (positive or negative) on a particular equality target group, or whether any adverse impacts identified have been appropriately mitigated.

11.3 Due regard should be had to the public sector equality implications. The EQIA and its action plan continue to be reviewed to ensure delivery of the EQIA action plan and impact on the protected characteristic groups are minimised or mitigated.

11.4 The recommended traffic management orders and final scheme design include the following mitigation measures over and above those identified in the EQIA as follows:

- Make blue badge holders exempt from vehicular restrictions to enable them to pick up and set down in mandatory cycle lanes
- Introduce disabled persons' parking bays at the general locations specified in Appendix C, Schedule 6
- Provide gaps in mandatory cycle lanes for loading and unloading in residential parts of the corridor. Blue badge holders can park in these for up to three hours.
- Provide buffer strips, ramps, signage and distinctive paving at bus stop boarders
- Provide three rows of textured blocks to demarcate cycle lanes from pedestrian areas in town centres

11.5 In addition, the following steps will be taken following implementation of the scheme:

- Offering site visits to disability groups to familiarise their members with the new infrastructure
- Arranging for travel ambassadors to be available to explain how bus stop boarders work
- Publishing advice to both cyclists and motorists on the use of the new infrastructure.

12. PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

12.1 The proposal supports the commitment in the Council's Business Plan to:

- Maintain a clean, green sustainable environment
- Work in partnership to ensure that Enfield is a safe and healthy place to live

12.2 Specifically, the scheme forms a key element of the wider Cycle Enfield programme which aims to deliver both environmental and health benefits.

13. PUBLIC HEALTH IMPLICATIONS

13.1 Cycle Enfield provides a unique opportunity to improve the health of the borough's residents and address health inequality. Physical inactivity is recognised as the fourth leading cause of mortality worldwide.

13.2 Compared to those who are least active, sufficient physical activity reduces all-cause mortality and the risk of heart disease, diabetes, breast and colon cancer, energy balance, mental health issues and musculo-skeletal disease by approximately 20 to 40%. These conditions account for 70% of the NHS budget, e.g. some £70 billion. The implied healthcare savings would equate to between £14 - 28 billion.

13.3 The greatest gain in the health of the public will be from increased physical activity as those who cycle for utility purposes are 4x more likely to meet physical activity guidelines that those who do not. However, other benefits are likely to accrue to the wider Enfield community including the avoided costs of motorised transport. These include avoided air pollution, congestion, noise, community segregation and increased financial resilience that result from a long-term modal transport shift towards cycling.

13.4 'Health' conditions do not only apply to the NHS; it has been estimated that obesity costs the borough some £84 million a year. The annual cost of social care provision for stroke alone is estimated at £2.2 million a year. It is estimated that physical activity reduces the risk of this by 20 - 35%.

Background Papers

None

List of Appendices:
Appendix A: Scheme drawings
Appendix B: Response to objections
Appendix C: Orders to be made & other features
Appendix D: Traffic Order Notice
Appendix E: Equality Impact Assessment

A1010 South Statutory Consultation – Response to Objections

1.0 Statutory Consultation Period

1.1 Statutory consultation for the A1010 South project was held from Wednesday 23rd November to Wednesday 14th December 2016. The purpose of this consultation was for interested parties to consider the published draft Traffic Management Order (TMO). There was also an opportunity for the revised drawings and associated impact assessments to be considered. Following consideration of this information, if they felt appropriate, interested parties were invited to provide feedback on the proposals.

1.2 Notice of the statutory consultation period and publication of the TMO was carried out in the prescribed way, through publication in the Enfield Independent, Advertiser and London Gazette Press. The draft TMO was also fixed to lampposts along the route. However, in addition to this, over 20,000 thousand leaflets were also distributed to homes and business on and around the proposed route.

1.3 During the consultation period revised drawings, the detailed draft TMO and a range of other impact assessments for this scheme were all available for public viewing, both online and at the Civic Centre. The leaflet distributed to homes and businesses summarised the key elements of the scheme and invited readers to consider the full detail available.

1.4 Both the draft TMO and the additional leaflet clearly stated that any objections that wish to be raised should be done so in writing. In order to streamline this process for respondents, a simple objection form was added to the Cycle Enfield website where individuals could state the specific location and nature of their objection. Alternatively, if they preferred, individuals were invited to write to the Council and provided with a full address, both on the draft TMO and the leaflets notifying residents and businesses about the consultation.

2.0 Participation & Responses

2.1 30 responses to the consultation were received and all responses have been considered. In some cases responses covered more than one issues and some issues were reflected by more than one respondent. The table below captures the range of issues that were raised and provides a response to each.

Table 1

Ref	Consultation Feedback	LBE Response
1	Concerns regarding the lack of parking and loading for businesses.	South of Edmonton Green roundabout the existing level of parking is retained. North of Edmonton Green, parking surveys show that the effective loss of parking can be accommodated on side roads.
2	Suggestion that there is scope to introduce additional parking in the area around 570 Hertford Road.	Parking cannot be accommodated immediately outside 570 Hertford Road, due to the proximity to the signalised junction with Nightingale Road. The scheme introduces a designated loading bay outside 560 Hertford Road and parking to the south of that location, as well as additional footway parking outside St Alphege Church on the western footway.

3	Request for cycling provision to be extended along Lincoln Road to connect with the A1010 South scheme.	There are plans for a Greenway along Lincoln Road and surrounding roads to connect to the A1010 South scheme. This is part of the wider work to build a coherent network that complements the major schemes.
4	Concern that there are insufficient people cycling to justify the plans and that there are already some cycle lanes that appear not to be used.	The purpose of this investment is to significantly increase cycling levels, not to simply provide facilities for those that currently cycle. Whilst the Borough does have a number of cycle lanes, these do not form part of a considered network. To encourage mode shift, a coherent network needs to be created that enables people to find a route that connects the different destinations that they wish to travel between. The mini Holland funding enables the Borough to create this network over a relatively short period of time. Like any other transport system, this network is comprises of key main road routes, allowing direct and convenient travel and a further series of (greenway) routes on quieter streets. It is the accumulation of this comprehensive network which should accelerate the increase in cycling journeys.
5	Objection to making Croyland Road a one-way street westerly between Millbrook Road where it meets Hertford Road.	Croyland Road has been converted to one-way working to accommodate safe cycle facilities at the junction of Hertford Road/Croyland Road, whilst maintaining acceptable levels of traffic capacity at the junction. The retention of Two-way working on Croyland Road would result in significant delays to general traffic and buses. The resulting diversion and increase in journey times are assessed to be minimal.
6	Objection to the bus stop boarder design on the grounds that it creates a danger for pedestrians and is not in accordance with the London Cycling Design Standards.	Monitoring of the bus boarder on Royal College Street has been undertaken by Camden who reported no incidents since its implementation. Monitoring of the bus boarders will be carried out following implementation and also at locations across the other mini-Holland boroughs, where they have been or will be implemented. The bus boarder on Royal College Street is referenced in the London Cycle Design Standards as an example of cycle facilities at bus stops. The proposed design for bus boarders on the A1010 introduces different material on the bus boarder, so that pedestrian and cyclists are more aware of the shared environment and will have the effect of slowing cyclists down.
7	Objection to the 'formalising' of the loading bay in front of the leisure centre as business have loading facilities at the rear. The suggestion is to introduce a bus stop at this location to assist with the interchange from bus to train.	The area in front of the leisure centre provides a pick-up and drop-off location for school buses dropping off and picking up children. Converting the area to a bus stop would remove this facility, with no suitable alternative location and whilst it is accepted that an additional bus stop would benefit bus passengers, the loss of

		the pick-up and drop-off facility for school buses is considered a negative impact.
8	Objection to the proposals on the grounds that they will increase pollution, considering the changes to junctions and narrowing of lanes.	The air quality report for this scheme acknowledges that there is likely to be some increases in some increase in NO_2 concentrations at junctions where there are some increases in queue length and delay time. However, the report states that the areas of these increases will be smaller than the area of air quality improvements along the rest of the route, with reduced traffic flows at 2.5%. These improvements are small (between 0.1 µg/m3 and 0.5 µg/m3) but have the potential to increase if a greater mode shift from private car to cycling is achieved in the future. This shift is unlikely to occur if the Council does not adjust the road network to create safe infrastructure to encourage more people to cycle.
9	Concerns raised that the locations of bus stops at Nightingale Road junctions will cause congestion problems.	It is accepted that the location of the northbound bus stop, north of the junction with Nightingale Road will results in traffic being held behind a stationary bus but this is considered the optimum position. The bus stop has been assessed for the potential delays being caused by buses waiting while passengers board/alight. We envisage no substantial issues that would result in significant delays to the northbound traffic movements during normal operation. A distance of 80m (approx.) is available to the north of the junction and the bus stop to accommodate the queue without blocking the junction.
10	Concern that a dangerous informal pedestrian crossing would replace the current signalised crossing at the Nightingale, Gilliard and Hertford Road junction.	It is accepted that the removal of the crossing reduces the provision for pedestrians at the junction. The removal is to maintain a reasonable level of junction capacity under the proposed scheme, whilst providing cycle facilities at the junction. A signalised crossing for pedestrians is maintained on the northern arm and the pedestrian island is retained so pedestrians crossing informally can do so in two stages. The Stage 1 Road Safety Audit, independently conducted by TfL, has not raised this proposed change as an issue.
11	Objection to the proposals on the grounds that there is insufficient evidence to support the proposition that these proposals will increase cycling levels.	The development of safe cycling infrastructure in towns and cities across the UK has seen an increase in cycling levels. Enfield have conducted surveys across the Borough and were told that the best thing that the Council could do to encourage people to cycle is to create safe cycle routes.
12	Objection on the basis that the proposals are a waste of public money and funds should be spent on other council services.	The Mini Holland funding can only be spent on delivering the Mayor's Cycle Vision for London. If Enfield doesn't use it, it is likely the funding would be allocated to another London borough to spend on similar proposals. This investment cannot be spent on other council services.

13	Concern that the modelling has been conducted by Jacobs who are an 'interested party' and have taken an optimistic view.	The modelling has been independently audited by TfL using the TfL Model Audit Process.
14	Concern over a lack of consideration of pedestrians crossing side roads.	Entry treatments have been introduced at locations in retail areas to improve pedestrian crossing movements on side roads. Junction radii have also been tightened at certain locations to reduce turning traffic speeds, which will improve the situation for pedestrians, as well as cyclists.
15	Concerns over cycling facilities that are footway level as the perception is that they are effectively shared space.	Where footway level cycle lanes have been used, it has been to remove the conflict with cars pulling into parking spaces, at bus stops and to retain southbound bus lane. Different surfacing is to be used to clearly differentiate between footway and cycle lane.
16	Concerns that motor traffic will utilise side roads to avoid the main corridors.	The Quieter Neighbourhood initiative, part of the overall programme, will follow implementation of the main road route routes. Local communities will be able to contribute their views into the design processwhere interventions to prevent 'rat running' can be explored.
17	Concerns that side roads will be saturated with displaced parking from the A1010.	It is accepted that levels of parking on side roads will increase as a result of the scheme. Surveys were carried out for the first 100m on every side road on the A1010, within the extent of the scheme and these surveys showed that there was sufficient capacity to accommodate the relocated parking, from the main road.
18	Objection that the consultation process has been weak, unfair and unstructured.	The engagement and consultation for this scheme has been extensive and way beyond the statutory minimum required. It has consisted of a series of public exhibitions for businesses and residents. The details of the proposals have been available for review and over the last 18 months there has been extensive publicity regarding the ongoing engagement and consultation. The plans have been hosted online using professional consultation software and printed copies of the materials have been available to those that have requested it, an opportunity that has been widely promoted. As a direct result of the consultation, a range of changes have been made to the design of this scheme.
19	Objection that the road is too narrow to accommodate cycle lanes.	The proposed design accommodates a minimum of 1.5m cycle lanes, with 3.25m carriageway in each direction for traffic which is sufficient to accommodate a large vehicle in each direction.
20	Concerns that residents will not be able to receive delivery, collection, use of skips etc directly outside of their homes.	In the residential sections of the corridor, where there is no side road in close proximity to a property, it is proposed to introduce sections of single yellow line that will permit off-peak loading, which will allow for deliveries and loading. Applications for skips to be placed in

		the cycling lane for extended durations are likely to be refused.
21	Objection about increased journey times for cars and buses.	The increase in journey times are considered acceptable given the level of wider benefits generated by the project. Mitigation is being implemented outside the scope of the A1010 South corridor to minimise the impact on bus journey times, as a result of the scheme.
22	Question about whether the Council will pay for drives for residents whose parking will be displaced.	An assessment will be made of properties that have the potential to have a dropped kerb introduced. If planning is approved, then the kerb will be dropped at no expense to the property owner, however the property owner would need to commit to the rest of the works on their personal property at their own expense.

Appendix C – Traffic Orders and Feature to be Implemented

Schedule 1 - Orders to be made without modification

a) The Enfield (Cycle Lanes) (No. *) Order 20**
b) The Enfield (Free Parking Places) (Various Road, Edmonton) (No. *) Order 20**
c) The Enfield (Free Parking Places) (Various Road, Ponders End Area) (No. *) Order 20**
d) The Enfield (Parking Places) (Pay and Display) (No. *) Order 20**
e) The Enfield (Goods Vehicles Loading Bay) (Various Roads) (No. *) Order 20**
f) The Enfield (Prescribed Routes) (Various Roads) (No. **) Order 20**
g) The Enfield (Free Parking Places) (Various Roads) (Disabled Persons) (No. *) Order 20**

Schedule 2 – Traffic Calming Features to be introduced

All features specified in schedules 1, 2 and 3 of the notice included as Appendix D

Schedule 3 – Zebra Crossings to be Retained

a) outside No. 223 Hertford Road N9
b) outside No. 373 Hertford Road N9
c) outside John Wilkes House, High Street EN3

The associated zig-zag markings would be placed adjacent to the crossing and between the points specified in Schedule 4 of the notice included as Appendix D.

Schedule 4 – Tiger Crossings to be Introduced

a) outside No. 295 Hertford Road N9
b) outside No. 267 Fore Street N18

The associated zig-zag markings would be placed adjacent to the crossing and between the points specified in Schedule 5 of the notice included as Appendix D.

Schedule 5 – Pelican/Toucan Crossings

a) outside Community House, Fore Street N9 (existing Pelican crossing to be amended)
b) outside No. 405 Fore Street N9 (existing Toucan crossing to be amended)
c) Outside No. 118 Hertford Road N9 (new cycle crossing)

The associated zig-zag markings would be placed adjacent to the crossing and between the points specified in Schedule 6 of the notice included as Appendix D.

Schedule 6 – Disabled Persons' Parking Bays to be Introduced Experimentally

New Disabled Persons' Parking Bays at least in the following general areas:

a) service road south of Park Avenue
b) between Cleveland Road and Bridlington Road
c) by the loading bay to the north of Nightingale Road

Enfield Council Predictive Equality Impact Assessment/Analysis

Department:	**Regeneration & Environment**	Service:	**Traffic & Transportation**
Title of decision:	Approval of Cycle Enfield Proposals for the A1010 South	Date completed:	28 January 2017
Author:	David Taylor	Contact details:	david.b.taylor@enfield.gov.uk 020 8379 3576

Equality Act 2010 – Section 149

Public sector equality duty

(1) A public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to -
- (a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;
- (b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;
- (c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

(2) A person who is not a public authority but who exercises public functions must, in the exercise of those functions, have due regard to the matters mentioned in subsection (1).

(3) Having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to—
- (a) remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic;
- (b) take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it;
- (c) encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low.

(4) The steps involved in meeting the needs of disabled persons that are different from the needs of persons who are not disabled include, in particular, steps to take account of disabled persons' disabilities.

(5) Having due regard to the need to foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to—
- (a) tackle prejudice, and

(b) promote understanding.
(6) Compliance with the duties in this section may involve treating some persons more favourably than others; but that is not to be taken as permitting conduct that would otherwise be prohibited by or under this Act.
(7) The relevant protected characteristics are—
age; disability; gender reassignment; pregnancy and maternity; race; religion or belief; sex; sexual orientation.
(8) A reference to conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act includes a reference to—
(a)a breach of an equality clause or rule;
(b)a breach of a non-discrimination rule.
(9) Schedule 18 (exceptions) has effect.

Type of change being proposed: (please tick)

New project	✓	Policy change or new policy		Grants and commissioning		Budget change	

1 *Describe the change, why it is needed, what is the objective of the change and what is the possible impact of the change:*

Background

With traffic levels increasing year on year, air quality will get worse and Enfield's roads will eventually grind to a halt. This will be exacerbated by the expected increase in the population by an additional 80,000 by 2040. Doing nothing is not an option. The Cycle Enfield programme is an opportunity to start addressing these problems by enabling residents to consider making journeys by bike instead of the car. Cyclists are able to make more efficient use of road space relative to all other modes of surface transport except buses and do not emit pollution. Cycle Enfield will also enable us to make significant public realm improvements at town centres along the route, thereby making them more attractive and encourage people to spend more time and money in local shops and restaurants.

Cycle Enfield is about delivering a network of safe, direct and legible cycle routes and a programme of supportive measures to encourage more people to cycle. This will deliver many economic, health and transport benefits for local residents, businesses and visitors to Enfield.

Between 20 November 2015 and 20 March 2016, Enfield Council undertook a public consultation on the A1010 South scheme. We wrote to all properties within 400 metres of the proposed route, inviting local residents and business owners/managers to attend an exhibition and participate in the consultation. We also consulted residents' associations, disability groups, cycling groups, the Metropolitan Police, London Ambulance Service and London Fire Brigade, transport user groups and bus operators. Detailed information on the proposals was published at http://cycleenfield.co.uk/have-your-say/a1010-south-scheme-consultation/. We provided copies of the consultation documents to those people that requested them in hard copy.

The focus of the A1010 South consultation was about shaping the scheme to provide high quality, lightly ??? segregated facilities to encourage more people to cycle whilst meeting the needs of residents, businesses and visitors to Enfield. Enfield Council received a total of 377 responses to the online consultation. The majority of respondents supported the overall proposals with 45.1% (170) fully supporting and 5.6% (21) partially supporting the scheme. 47.2% of respondents (178) did not support the scheme and 2.1% (8) either had no opinion or were unsure.

Proposal

The A1010 South is the second of our main road cycling schemes and involves the installation of lightly segregated cycle lanes on both sides of the A1010 South between Lincoln Road and Fairfield Road. Additional traffic lights will be installed to remove conflicts and enable cyclists to pass safely through junctions. The scheme also involves significant public realm improvements at Edmonton Green and to the area immediately north of St Joseph's Road. To accommodate the new cycle lanes, it will be necessary to remove all central refuges and right turn pockets. Relevant guidance, best practice and further engagement with stakeholder groups will help to develop the detailed designs and address comments and concerns raised by or on behalf of older people and those with disabilities.

Officers have carefully considered the concerns and issues raised in the consultation with respect to equalities, and have already made a number of design changes e.g. the introduction of buffer strips at bus stop boarders. Any remaining concerns will be addressed during the detailed design phase and statutory consultation.

Issues raised by key stakeholders in response to informal consultation

Below were common concerns raised by respondents:

- Concerns about cyclists' behaviour
- Concerns that that a loss of parking will prevent carers and nurses from doing their jobs
- Concerns about the arrangements for pedestrians at bus stop boarders and bus stop by-passes
- Concerns about the impact on emergency services, especially ambulances
- Concerns about the needs of the visually impaired
- Concerns about special needs pupils, who need to be collected by school bus
- Concerns about Dial-a-Ride services
- Concerns about the lack of regard for easy access parking needs of disabled people/ blue badge holders/ elderly and infirm
- Concerns about loss of parking outside cafes and shops
- Concerns that disabled patients will find it more difficult to park close to the surgery
- Allocation of funding

Relevant bodies consulted included:

- Royal National Institute for the Blind (RNIB) - no comments or suggestions received
- Guide Dogs - no comments or suggestions received
- Age UK - No comments or suggestions received
- Over 50s Forum - no comments or suggestions were received from the Over 50s Forum, although account was taken of statement that the Over 50s Forum submitted in connection with the A105 consultation.
- Enfield Disability Action - no comments or suggestions were received
- Enfield Vision - no comments or suggestions received
- Centre for Accessible Environments (CAE) – detailed design appraisal undertaken and report submitted to help inform detailed design

Statutory Consultation

Statutory consultation relating to the various traffic management orders was carried out in line with the Local Authorities' Traffic Order (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996. The statutory consultation period commenced on 23 November 2016 and continued until 14 December 2016 and resulted in 30 objections. In addition to the prescribed statutory consultees, Enfield Disability Action were notified and the public informed by:

- Erecting site notices along the corridor
- Promoting the consultation for three consecutive weeks in local newspapers
- Publishing information on the Cycle Enfield website.
- Distributing 17,000 consultation leaflets to properties within 400m either side of the A1010 South corridor.

2 Do you carry out equalities monitoring of your service? If No please state why?

The 'service' in this instance relates to users of the A1010 South corridor, including residents, businesses and community uses located along the route. However, there is limited specific information about the characteristics of the range of service users, which includes private vehicle users; taxis/minicab users; bus users; dial-a-ride users; pedestrians and cyclists. This is partly due to the range of organisations involved in providing services and partly due to the difficulty in collecting relevant equalities monitoring data.

Some context about the areas served by the A1010 South corridor is provided in the 2011 Census and the analysis included in the ward profiles for Edmonton Green, Haselbury, Jubilee, Lower Edmonton and Ponders End wards. The table below summarises some of the relevant characteristics of the key indicators and compares these to the borough average:

	Aged 65+	Health/Disability[1]
Borough	**12.7%**	**7.3%**
Edmonton Green	8.6%	7.9%
Haselbury	9.8%	7.1%
Jubilee	11.9%	8.0%
Lower Edmonton	10.0%	7.8%
Ponders End	9.4%	7.2%

1. Persons with long term health problems/disability - limiting a lot

This suggests that a lower than average proportion of people living in the five wards are 65 or over (particularly in Edmonton Green and Ponders End wards). It is also clear that a significant number of residents have a long-term health problem or disability that is significantly limiting, albeit the proportions are either around or above the borough average.

Equalities monitoring was carried out in relation to the earlier A1010 South consultation. This highlights the support/partial support for the scheme peaks at age 60-64; that men are more positive about the proposals than women; and that the majority of disabled people did not support the proposal. To address these concerns there will need to be continuing engagement with all affected parties, both to help inform the detailed designs and to address identified issues and concerns post-implementation.

3. Equalities Impact **Indicate Yes, No or Not Known for each group**	Disability	Gender	Age	Race	Religion & Belief	Sexual Orientation	Gender reassignment	Pregnancy & Maternity	Marriage & Civil Partnerships
Does equalities monitoring of your service show people from the following groups benefit from your service? (recipients of the service, policy or budget, and the proposed change)[1]	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Does the service or policy contribute to eliminating discrimination, promote equality of opportunity, and foster good relations between different groups in the community?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
*Could the proposal discriminate, directly or indirectly these groups?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Could this proposal affect access to your service by different groups in the community?	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No
Could this proposal affect access to information about your service by different groups in the community?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Could the proposal have an adverse impact on relations between different groups?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No

[1] Although not directly supported by primary data, it is likely that all of the protected groups are users of the A1010 South corridor

If Yes answered above – please describe the impact of the change (including any positive impact on equalities) and what the service will be doing to reduce the negative impact it will have.

*If you have ticked yes to discrimination, please state how this is justifiable under legislation.

The two protected groups impacted by the A1010 South proposals are Age and Disability. The preliminary designs have been amended to take account of comments, concerns and suggestions received and thereby prevent, reduce or mitigate any negative impacts as follows. The detailed designs have been developed taking into account previous consultation responses and input from specialist consultants.

Protected characteristic: Age

Positive Impacts

- Providing segregated facilities will have a positive impact by enabling people of all ages to cycle.
- Supporting measures and cycle training for older adults may encourage more to take up cycling and remain physically active.

Negative Impacts

Impact	Mitigation
Possible conflict with cyclists at bus stop boarders	Installation of buffer strips, ramps, signage and distinctive paving to inform cyclists that they are entering an area used by pedestrians and must give priority to pedestrians. Publicity campaign to be launched prior to and following opening of route to inform pedestrians and cyclists how to use the new facilities.
Possible conflict with cyclists if pedestrians drift into parallel cycle track and vice versa	Existing footway widths have been maintained (including those in town centres) and new cycle tracks will be designed with a contrasting surface and clear markings to minimise risk.
Longer distance to walk to some bus stops	Most bus stops are kept in or close to their current locations. However, bus stop LA is amalgamated with bus stop LB near Nightingale Road, but is still within TfL's 400m standard.
Loss of pedestrian refuges and right turn pockets	The general narrowing of traffic lanes is expected to reduce vehicle speeds along the corridor, potentially making it safer to cross away from formal crossing points.
Change in road layout could result in short term uncertainty whilst all road users adapt to the new road layout	Publicity campaign to be launched prior to and following the opening of route to inform pedestrians and cyclists how to use the new facilities.

Protected characteristic: Disability

Positive Impacts

- Side road entry treatments at Fairfield Road, Brettenham Road and Osman Road will make it easier for wheelchair users and people with restricted mobility to cross the side roads
- Supporting measures and cycle training for older adults may encourage more to take up cycling and remain physically active.

Negative Impacts

Impact	Mitigation
Possible conflict with cyclists at bus stop boarders	Installation of buffer strips, ramps, signage and distinctive paving to inform cyclists that they are entering an area used by pedestrians and must give priority to pedestrians. Publicity campaign to be launched prior to and following opening of route to inform pedestrians and cyclists how to use the new facilities.
Possible conflict with other roads users in 'shared space' areas.	Shared surface treatments are only proposed at localised areas e.g. at the mouth of Bridge Road and Cleveland Road. The detailed designs have been developed in conjunction with specialist advisers, and involve the use of contrasting materials, tactile surfaces, low kerbs and other measures to help blind and partially sighted pedestrians navigate safely.
Loss of parking for blue badge holders	Blue badge holders will continue to be able to park in marked bays on-street. Dedicated blue badge bays will be introduced on an experimental basis in a number of locations along the corridor as part of the scheme.
Reduced opportunity for dial-a-ride, taxis/minicabs to pick up and set down	The traffic order has been drafted to enable Dial-a-Ride vehicles and taxis and minicabs transporting Taxi-card holders to set down and pick in lightly segregated cycle lanes.
Change in road layout could result in short term uncertainty and confusion whilst all road users adapt to the new road layout	Prior to completion, targeted engagement with a wide range of local disability groups to raise awareness of the scheme and its possible impacts. Post completion, provision of advice and/or training in use of new facilities.

4. Tackling Socio-economic inequality **Indicate Yes, No or Not Known for each group**	Communities living in deprived wards/areas	People not in employment, education or training	People with low academic qualifications	People living in social housing	Lone parents	People on low incomes	People in poor health	Any other socio-economic factor Please state;
Will the proposal specifically impact on communities disadvantaged through the following socio-economic factors?	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	
Does the service or policy contribute to eliminating discrimination, promote equality of opportunity, and foster good relations between different groups in the community?	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	
Could this proposal affect access to your service by different groups in the community?	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	

If Yes answered above – please describe the impact (including any positive impact on social economic inequality) and any mitigation if applicable.

- The A1010 South scheme will have a positive impact on people living in deprived wards/areas by improving personal health and fitness. Any shift from public transport or car use to cycling has the potential to increase financial resilience by reducing spend on travel costs.
- The A1010 South scheme will have a positive impact on people who are currently unemployed by making it easier for them to attend training courses and job interviews.
- The A1010 South scheme will have a positive impact on people with low incomes as travelling by bike is a cheaper alternative than travelling by car or public transport.
- The A1010 South scheme will have a positive impact on people in poor health by increasing opportunities for physical activity and helping to tackle obesity. Physical activity has been shown to reduce long-term conditions (heart disease, diabetes, musculo-skeletal problems, mental illness by 20 – 40% depending on the condition.

5. Review

How and when will you monitor and review the effects of this proposal?

Monitoring and evaluation will take place throughout the life of the scheme.

Due to the difficulty in obtaining primary data about the characteristics of users of the A1010 South corridor, monitoring will take the form of continued engagement with key stakeholders representing the interests of older people and disabled people. Engagement will continue with local groups and representative bodies, including the Physical Disability Partnership Board etc.

Enfield Council Predictive Equality Impact Assessment/Analysis

Action plan template for proposed changes to service, policy or budget

Title of decision: Approval of Cycle Enfield Proposals for the A1010 South

Team: Traffic & Transportation

Department: Regeneration & Environment

Service manager: David B Taylor

Identified Issue	Action Required	Lead Officer	Timescale/ By When	Costs	Review Date/ Comments
Stakeholder engagement	Improve/maintain dialogue with disability groups before, throughout construction period & post implementation	Traffic & Transportation	Ongoing	Fully funded by Transport for London	
Continue to minimise equalities barriers throughout implementation phase	Ensure contractor considers needs of vulnerable users throughout construction phase	Traffic & Transportation	Throughout construction	Fully funded by Transport for London	
Scheme publicity	Develop campaign aimed at relevant protected groups to highlight the changes to the road layout	Traffic & Transportation	During construction and after opening of relevant sections of A1010 South route	Fully funded by Transport for London	
Monitoring	Establish local stakeholder group(s) to provide feedback on the impact of scheme on relevant protected groups	Traffic & Transportation	Ongoing	Fully funded by Transport for London	Local contacts to be identified to feedback on new infrastructure.

Retrospective EQIA	Arrange for a retrospective EQIA to be carried out post-implementation in conjunction with relevant stakeholders/special advisors.	Traffic & Transportation	30/06/2018	Fully funded by Transport for London	

Date to be Reviewed: September 2017

APPROVAL BY THE RELEVANT ASSISTANT DIRECTOR - NAME: Bob Griffiths SIGNATURE:.....

This form should be emailed to joanne.stacey@enfield.gov.uk and be appended to any decision report that follows.

FORE STREET N18 / N9, THE BROADWAY N9, THE GREEN N9, HERTFORD ROAD, EDMONTON N9 AND HIGH STREET, PONDERS END EN3. - TRAFFIC ORDERS ASSOCIATED WITH THE INTRODUCTION OF CYCLE LANES BETWEEN NORTH CIRCULAR ROAD N18 AND LINCOLN ROAD EN3.

FORE STREET N18 / N9, HERTFORD ROAD, EDMONTON N9, KING EDWARD'S ROAD, EDMONTON N9 AND NORTHFIELD ROAD EN3 - REVOCATION AND INTRODUCTION OF FREE PARKING PLACES.

FORE STREET N18 / N9 - REVOCATION AND INTRODUCTION OF PAY AND DISPLAY PARKING PLACES.

FORE STREET N18 / N9, HERTFORD ROAD, EDMONTON N9 AND ROSEMARY AVENUE N9 - REVOCATION AND INTRODUCTION OF GOODS VEHICLES LOADING BAYS.

THE SERVICE ROAD FRONTING Nos. 209 - 231 FORE STREET N18; THE SERVICE ROAD FRONTING Nos. 78 - 84 HIGH STREET PONDERS END EN3; THE SERVICE ROAD FRONTING ANGEL CORNER PARADE AND NO. 210 FORE STREET N18; THE SERVICE ROAD FRONTING Nos. 582 - 600 HIGH STREET PONDERS END EN3; CROYLAND ROAD N9 BETWEEN ITS JUNCTIONS WITH HERTFORD ROAD, EDMONTON N9 AND MILLBROOK ROAD N9; HERTFORD ROAD, EDMONTON N9 AT ITS JUNCTION WITH CROYLAND ROAD N9 AND AT NO. 134 HERTFORD ROAD EDMONTON N9 (THE FILLING STATION) AT THE JUNCTION OF HERTFORD ROAD, EDMONTON N9 AND BOUNCES ROAD N9 - INTRODUCTION OF PRESCRIBED ROUTES.

LOWDON ROAD N9, NORTHFIELD ROAD EN2, FORE STREET N9 AND HERTFORD ROAD, EDMONTON N9 - REVOCATION AND INTRODUCTION OF DISABLED PARKING BAYS.

FORE STREET N18 / N9, HERTFORD ROAD, EDMONTON N9 AND HIGH STREET, PONDERS END EN3 - REMOVAL AND INTRODUCTION OF CONTROLLED PEDESTRIAN CROSSINGS AT VARIOUS LOCATIONS BETWEEN NORTH CIRCULAR ROAD N18 AND LINCOLN ROAD EN3.

FORE STREET N18 / N9, HERTFORD ROAD, EDMONTON N9, HIGH STREET, PONDERS END EN3, ANGEL PLACE N18, BRETTENHAM ROAD N18, SEBASTAPOL ROAD N9, SHRUBBERY ROAD N9, OSMAN ROAD N9, PLEVNA ROAD N9, GROSVENOR ROAD N9, NORTH ROAD N9, BRIDLINGTON ROAD N9, BEDFORD ROAD N9, PARK AVENUE N18, PARK ROAD N18, CLEVELAND ROAD N9 AND ST JOSEPH'S ROAD N9 - INTRODUCTION OF SPEED TABLES, RAISED JUNCTIONS AND ENTRY TREATMENTS.

Further information may be obtained from Traffic and Transportation, telephone number 020 8379 4859

1. NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Council of the London Borough of Enfield (the Council) propose to make The Enfield (Cycle Lanes)(No. *) Traffic Order 20**, The Enfield (Free Parking Places)(Various Road, Edmonton)(No. *) Order 20**, The Enfield (Free Parking Places)(Various Road, Ponders End Area)(No. *) Order 20**, The Enfield (Parking Places)(Pay and

Display)(No. *) Order 20**, The Enfield (Goods Vehicles Loading Bay) (Various Roads) (No. *) Order 20**, The Enfield (Prescribed Routes)(Various Roads)(No. **) Traffic Order 20**, The Enfield (Free Parking Places)(Various Roads)(Disabled Persons)(No. *) Order 20** under sections 6, 45, 46, 49 and 124 of and Part IV of Schedule 9 to the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, Section 8 of the and Part I of Schedule 5 to the Local Government Act and Schedule 9 to the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2016.

2. The general effect of the Orders would be to:

(a) introduce a mandatory cycle lane Order to amend Item (5) of paragraph 12 in Part 7 of the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2016 to include in the list of purposes
  (i) Council maintenance vehicles (or approved contractors), performing maintenance along the route; and
  (ii) Blue Badge holders, for the purpose of picking up and setting down passengers.

(b) revoke and introduce Free Parking Places in parts of the streets specified in the second paragraph of the heading to this Notice;

(c) revoke and introduce Pay and Display Parking Places in parts of the streets specified in the third paragraph of the heading to this Notice;

(d) revoke and introduce Goods Vehicles Loading Places in parts of the streets specified in the fourth paragraph of the heading to this Notice;

(e) introduce prescribed routes in the streets specified in the fifth paragraph of the heading to this Notice, as follows:

  (i) one way traffic in a Northerly direction on the service road fronting Nos. 209 - 231 Fore Street N18.
  (ii) one way traffic in a Northerly direction on the service road fronting Nos. 78 - 84 High Street Ponders End EN3.
  (iii) one way traffic in a Southerly then Easterly direction on the service road fronting Angel Corner Parade and No. 210 Fore Street N18.
  (iv) one way traffic in a Southerly direction on the service road fronting Nos. 582 - 600 Hertford Road, Edmonton N9.
  (v) one way traffic in a Westerly direction on Croyland Road N9 between its junctions with Hertford Road, Edmonton N9 and Millbrook Road N9.

(vi) Southbound vehicles on Hertford Road, Edmonton N9 shall be prevented from turning righting into Croyland Road N9.

(vii) Vehicles using the southern access of No. 134 Hertford Road N9 (the filling station) at the junction of Hertford Road, Edmonton N9 and Bounces Road N9 shall be prevented from turning right into Hertford Road, Edmonton N9.

(f) revoke and introduce disabled bays in the streets specified in the sixth paragraph of the heading to this Notice.

3. **FURTHER NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN** that in order to control the speed of traffic, the Council propose to construct under sections 90A to 90I of the Highways Act 1980 –

(a) raised entry treatments (flat top design road hump) which would be constructed at a maximum height of 75mm above carriageway level and cover the full width of the road at each junction location specified in Schedule 1 to this Notice;

(b) raised junctions which would be constructed at a maximum height of 75mm above the carriageway level and cover the full width of the roads at the locations specified in Schedule 2 to this Notice.

(c) raised speed tables which would be constructed at a maximum height of 75mm above carriageway level and cover a maximum width of 2.0m within the cycle lane at the locations specified in Schedule 3 to this Notice.

4. **FURTHER NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN** that the Council has approved, under section 23 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, the provision of new zebra crossings in the following locations: Hertford Road, Edmonton N9, outside No. 223 Hertford Road, Edmonton N9; outside No. 436 Hertford Road, Edmonton N9 and High Street, Ponders End EN3, outside No. 80 High Street, Ponders End EN3. The associated zig-zag markings would be placed adjacent to the crossing and between the points specified in Schedule 4 to this Notice and would prohibit all vehicles from stopping on them at all times.

5. **FURTHER NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN** that the Council has approved, under section 23 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, the provision of new tiger crossings (a crossing where traffic should give way to pedestrians and cyclists) in the following locations: Fore Street N18, outside No. 267 Fore Street N18 and Hertford Road, Edmonton N9, outside No. 295 Hertford Road, Edmonton N9, The associated zig-zag markings would be placed adjacent to the crossing and between the

points specified in Schedule 5 to this Notice and would prohibit all vehicles from stopping on them at all times.

6. FURTHER NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Council has approved, under section 23 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, the provision of new signal controlled crossing in the following locations: Fore Street N9, outside Faith House, Fore Street N9; outside Nos. 403-405 Fore Street N9 and Hertford Road, Edmonton N9, outside No. 120 Hertford Road, Edmonton N9. The associated zig-zag markings would be placed adjacent to the crossing and between the points specified in Schedule 6 to this Notice and would prohibit all vehicles from stopping on them at all times.

7. **FURTHER NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN** that the Council of the London Borough of Enfield (the Council) propose to convert the footway into shared-use cycle tracks using powers under sections 65(1) and 166(4) of the Highways Act 1980 in parts of the following streets: Fore Street N18 / N9, The Broadway N9, The Green N9, Hertford Road, Edmonton N9 and High Street, Ponders End EN3.

8. To allow for the introduction of the proposed cycle scheme it is necessary to change the position of the existing bus stop clearway in several locations as follows: on the East side of Fore Street N9 opposite Nos. 385 to 397 to a new position opposite Nos. 373a to 389 Fore Street N9; on the East side of High Street, Ponders End EN3 opposite the common boundary of Nos. 4 and 6 High Street, Ponders End EN3 for a distance 27 metres to a new position outside Nos. 590 to 600 Hertford Road, Edmonton N9 and on the West side of Hertford Road, Edmonton N9 outside Nos. 45 to Edmonton United Services Club for a reduced length between Nos. 37 to 45 Herford Road, Edmonton N9. Note: the new bus stop clearways which would operate at any time depicts the approved sign and road markings and does not need to be implemented by way of a traffic order).

9. A copy of each of the proposed Orders, a map indicating the locations and effects of the proposed Orders, the zebra, tiger and signalled controlled crossings and associated zig-zag markings, of the Council's statement of reasons for proposing to make the Orders and any other relevant documents can be inspected at the Reception Desk, the Civic Centre, Silver Street, Enfield, Middlesex, EN1 3XD during normal office hours on Mondays to Fridays inclusive.

10. Any person desiring to object to the proposed Orders, or make any other representations in respect of them or the zebra, tiger and signalled controlled crossings (including the zig-zag markings) should send a statement in writing to that effect, and in the case of an objection stating the grounds thereof, to the Head of Traffic and Transportation, the Civic

Centre, Silver Street, Enfield, Middlesex, EN1 3XD, quoting the reference TG52/1327, by 14th December 2016.

11. Under the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985, any letter you write to the Council in response to this Notice may, upon written request, be made available to the press and to the public, who would be entitled to take copies of it if they so wished.

Dated 23rd November 2016

David B. Taylor
Head of Traffic and Transportation

Note - Waiting & loading restrictions will be introduced on an experimental basis as part of separate proposals at various locations in Fore Street N18 / N9, The Broadway N9, The Green N9, Hertford Road Edmonton N9 and High Street Ponders End EN3 (between North Circular Road, Edmonton N18 and Lincoln Road, Ponders End EN3).

SCHEDULE 1
(Raised entry treatment location)

Angel Place N18, from the North Western Kerb-line of Fore Street N18 for a distance of 13.0 metres in a Westerly direction along Angel Place N18.

Brettenham Road N18, from the North Eastern Kerb-line of Fore Street N18 for a distance of 17.0 metres in a South Easterly direction along Brettenham Road N18.

Sebastopol Road N9, from the North-Eastern kerb-line of Fore Street N9 for a distance of 11.0 metres in a South-Easterly direction along Sebastopol Road N9.

Shrubbery Road N9, the northern arm, from the North-Western Kerb-line of Fore Street N9 for a distance of 11.5 metres in a Westerly direction along Shrubbery Road N9.

Osman Road N9, from North-Eastern kerb-line of Fore Street N9 for a distance 12.0 metres in a South-Easterly direction along Osman Road N9.

Plevna Road N9, from the North Eastern Kerb-line of Fore Street N9 for a distance of 13.5 metres in a South Easterly direction along Plevna Road N9.

Grosvenor Road N9, from the North-Eastern kerb-line of Hertford Road, Edmonton N9 for a distance of 13.5 metres in a South-Easterly direction along Grosvenor Road N9.

North Road N9, from the North-Western kerb-line of Hertford Road, Edmonton N9 for a distance of 13.0 metres in a North-Westerly direction along North Road N9.

Bridlington Road N9, from the North-Western kerb-line of Hertford Road, Edmonton N9 for a distance of 14.0 metres in a North-Westerly direction along Bridlington Road N9.

Bedford Road N9, from the North-Western kerb-line of Hertford Road, Edmonton N9 for a distance of 14.0 metres in a North-Westerly direction along Bedford Road N9.

SCHEDULE 2
(Raised Junction locations)

Fore Street N18, from a point 1.0 metres South of the common boundary of Nos. 252 and 254 Fore Street N18 for a distance of 22.0 metres in a North-Easterly direction along Fore Street N18 and from the North-Western Kerb-line of Fore Street N18 for a distance of 14.0 metres in a North-Westerly direction along Park Avenue N18.

Fore Street N18, from a point 1.0 metres North of the common boundary of Nos. 257 and 259 Fore Street N18 for a distance of 72.5 metres in a North Easterly direction along Fore Street N18 and from the North-Western kerb-line of Fore Street N18 for a distance of 19.0 metres in a North-Westerly direction along Park Road N18.

Fore Street N9, from a point 7.0 metres North of the common boundary of Nos. 401 and 403 Fore Street N9 for a distance of 28.0 metres in a North Easterly direction along Fore Street N9.

Hertford Road, Edmonton N9, from a point 4.0 metres North West of the common boundary of Nos. 291 and 293 Hertford Road, Edmonton N9 for a distance of 45.5 metres in a North-Easterly direction along Hertford Road, Edmonton N9 and from the North-Western Kerb-line of Hertford Road, Edmonton N9 for a distance of 9.0 metres in a North-Westerly direction along Cleveland Road N9 and from the North-Eastern kerb-line of Hertford Road, Edmonton N9 for a distance of 11.5 metres in a South Easterly direction along St Joseph's Road N9.

SCHEDULE 3
(Speed Table in Cycle Lane locations)

Fore Street N9, from a point 2.5 metres North-East of the North-Western kerb-line of Shrubbery Road N9, the northern arm, for a distance of 36.0 metres in a North-Easterly direction along Fore Street N9.

Fore Street N9, from the Southern boundary of Nos. 375 Fore Street N9 for a distance of 35.0 metres in a North Easterly direction along Fore Street N9.

Hertford Road, Edmonton N9, from the Southern boundary of No. 187 Hertford Road, Edmonton N9 for a distance of 27.0 metres in a North Easterly direction along Hertford Road, Edmonton N9.

Hertford Road, Edmonton N9, from a point 4.5 metres North-East of the North-Western kerb-line of Houndsfield Road N9 for a

distance of 35.0 metres in a North-Easterly direction along Hertford Road, Edmonton N9.

Hertford Road, Edmonton N9, from a point 5.0 metres South-West of the South-Eastern kerb-line of Tramway Avenue N9 for a distance of 45.0 metres in a South-Westerly direction Hertford Road, Edmonton N9.

Hertford Road, Edmonton N9, from the Northern boundary of No. 353 Hertford Road, Edmonton N9 for a distance of 38.0 metres in a North-Easterly direction along Hertford Road, Edmonton N9.

Hertford Road, Edmonton N9, from a point 6.5 metres South-West of the South-Eastern kerb-line of Cuckoo Hall Lane N9 for a distance of 38.0 metres in a South-Westerly direction along Hertford Road, Edmonton N9.

Hertford Road, Edmonton N9, from a point 3.5 metres North-East of the common boundary of Nos. 4 and 5 Byron Terrace N9 for a distance of 42.0 metres in a North-Easterly direction along Hertford Road, Edmonton N9.

Hertford Road, Edmonton N9, from a point 5.0 metres South-West of the South-Eastern kerb-line of Nightingale Road N9 for a distance of 50.0 metres in a South-Westerly direction along Hertford Road, Edmonton N9.

Hertford Road, Edmonton N9, from a point 5.5 metres North-East of the common boundary of Nos. 477 and 479 Hertford Road, Edmonton N9 for a distance of 38.0 metres in a North-Easterly direction along Hertford Road, Edmonton N9.

High Street, Ponders End EN3, from a point 40.0 metres South-West of the South-Eastern kerb-line of Orchard Road EN3 for a distance of 42.5 metres in a South-Westerly direction along High Street, Ponders End EN3.

High Street, Ponders End EN3, from the Southern boundary of No. 96 High Street, Ponders End EN3 for a distance of 30.0 metres in a North-Easterly direction along High Street, Ponders End EN3.

SCHEDULE 4
(Length of zig-zag markings relating to the new zebra crossings)

HERTFORD ROAD, EDMONTON N9, Both Sides, from the common boundary of Nos. 213 and 215 Hertford Road, Edmonton N9 for a distance of 39.0 metres in a North-Easterly direction along Hertford Road, Edmonton N9.
HERTFORD ROAD, EDMONTON N9, Both Sides, from a point 2.0 metres North-East of the common boundary of Nos. 426 and 428 Hertford Road, Edmonton N9 for a distance of 39.0 metres in a North-Easterly direction along Hertford Road, Edmonton N9.

HIGH STREET, PONDERS END EN3, Both Sides, from the Northern boundary of No. 76 High Street, Ponders End EN3 for a distance of 39.0 metres in a North-Easterly direction along High Street, Ponders End EN3.

SCHEDULE 5
(Length of zig-zag markings relating to the new tiger crossings)

HERTFORD ROAD, EDMONTON N9, Both Sides, from a point 1.5 metres South of the common boundary of Nos. 301 and 303 Hertford Road, Edmonton N9 for a distance 39.0 metres in a South-Westerly direction along Hertford Road, Edmonton N9.

FORE STREET N18, Both Sides, from a point 2.5 metres North East of the common boundary of Nos. 257 and No. 259 Fore Street N18 for a distance of 44.0 metres in a North-Easterly direction along Fore Street N18.

SCHEDULE 6
(Length of zig-zag markings relating to the new signal controlled crossings)

FORE STREET N9, Both Sides, from the Northern boundary of No. 321 Fore Street N9 for a distance of 44.0 metres in a South Westerly direction along Fore Street N9.

FORE STREET N9, Both Sides, from a point 1.0 metre North of the common boundary of Nos. 397 and 399 Fore Street N9 for a distance of 42.5 metres in a North-Easterly direction along Fore Street N9.

HERTFORD ROAD, EDMONTON N9, Both Sides, from a point 2.0 metre North-East of the common boundary of Nos. 108 and 110 Hertford Road, Edmonton N9 for a distance of 43.5 metres in a North-Easterly direction along Hertford Road, Edmonton N9.

APPENDIX 2

Call-in request form submitted by 8 Members of the Council

This page is intentionally left blank

DST – Ref No:

CALL-IN OF DECISION

(please ensure you complete all sections fully)

Please return the completed original signed copy to:
Claire Johnson, Scrutiny Team, 1st Floor, Civic Centre

TITLE OF DECISION: APPROVAL OF CYCLE ENFIELD PROPOSALS for the A1010 South

DECISION OF: CABINET MEMBER for ENVIRONMENT

DATE OF DECISION LIST PUBLICATION: TUESDAY 7 FEBRUARY 2017

LIST NO: 54/16-17 DECISION NUMBER 1/54/16-17

(* N.B. Remember you must call–in a decision and notify Scrutiny Team within **5 working days** of its publication).

A decision can be called in if it is a corporate or portfolio decision made by either Cabinet or one of its sub-committees, or a key decision made by an officer with delegated authority from the Executive.

(a) COUNCILLORS CALLING-IN (The Council's constitution requires seven signatures or more from Councillors to call a decision in).

(1) Signature:	**Print Name:** ERIN CELEBI
(2) Signature:	**Print Name:** ERIC JUKES
(3) Signature:	**Print Name:** Alessandro Georgiou
(4) Signature:	**Print Name:** ROBERT HAYWARD
(5) Signature:	**Print Name:** T.M. STEVENS
(6) Signature:	**Print Name:** Cllr. D. DELMAN
(7) Signature:	**Print Name:** D PEARCE
(8) Signature:	**Print Name:** N DINES

(b) SCRUTINY PANEL RESOLUTION (copy of minute detailing formal resolution to request call-in to be attached).

NAME OF PANEL:

DATE OF PANEL:

Cllr LEE CHAMBERLAIN

This page is intentionally left blank

APPENDIX 3

Reasons for Call-in by Councillor calling in the decision

&

Briefing Note in response to called in decision

This page is intentionally left blank

(1) Reason why decision is being called in:

London Ambulance
The London Ambulance Service needs 24/7 access, the proposed scheme's infrastructure could impede that access. The London Ambulance Service is currently not meeting its response times so any restriction will not help them achieve them which is of detriment to residents. This particular scheme is on the doorstep of North Middlesex Hospital and any delays caused by this scheme could be critical.

Air Quality Monitors
The report in 5.23 mentions that air quality will worsen at certain junctions as NO2 will increase yet the report fails to recommend additional air quality monitors be used in order to monitor this so that improvements can be made.

Journey times
There is not much information in the report to justify the journey delay times stated also is it accurate the additional delay maximum will be 2min peak.

Parking
Parking is important to residents and local businesses. The report fails to mentions how the final plans allow for the flexibility mentioned in 5.2.8 where the operation of parking bays will be monitored post implementation and adjustments made to the number of bays/or method of control.

Regeneration of the area
The decision does not comment upon the regeneration of the area including the White Hart Lane Stadium and Edmonton Heartlands Housing Zone and how the upscale in the development will affect the number of people using the a1010 and its impact on scheme.

Bus Boarders
The report fails to say how the communication will be delivered in terms of explaining how bus borders work to residents especially the elderly, the blind and others with additional needs.

Driveway crossovers
The report fails to state maximum the number of driveway crossovers that might be requested and costs associated with providing them.

Consultation and Value for Money
20.000 leaflets were sent out but the consultation only achieved 30 responses and they were mainly online. If we further examine the amount of money involved and the scale of the scheme given the extremely low response rate have enough people responded to justify the spend?

(2) Outline of proposed alternative action:

Refer the decisions back to the Cabinet Member

(3) Do you believe the decision is outside the policy framework?

No

(4) If **Yes**, give reasons: n/a

FOR DST USE ONLY:

Checked by Proper Officer for validation –

Name of Proper Officer: J6 Middleton-Albooye Date: 14/02/2017

OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
1 March 2017

RESPONSE TO
REASONS FOR CALL IN
[PART 1/PART 2]

Relating to the Following Decision:

Decision: **Approval of Cycle Enfield Proposals for the A1010 South**

Decision Date: **6 February 2017**

Decision of: **Cabinet Member for Environment**

Key Decision No: **KD4390**

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Cycle Enfield represents a significant investment in the borough that can help improve our high streets and town centres; deliver long-term health benefits; and enable people to walk and cycle in safety. The overall Cycle Enfield programme includes not just cycle lanes on several of the borough's main roads, but also an extensive network of Greenway routes, 'Quieter Neighbourhoods', cycle hubs and a wide range of supportive measures to encourage more people to cycle and to improve the look and feel of our high streets and town centres.

1.2 On 7 July 2016 Cabinet granted approval to undertake detailed design and statutory consultation for lightly segregated cycling facilities and public realm improvements along the A1010 South between Lincoln Road and Fairfield Road. Cabinet also delegated authority to the Cabinet Member for Environment to approve and implement the final design of the scheme subject to consultation and completion of all necessary statutory procedures.

1.3 On 6 February the Cabinet Member for Environment considered report RE 16.123 (KD 4390) and approved the final design of the proposals for the A1010 South and, subject to detailed costs being agreed by Transport for London, to implement the scheme and make the associated traffic management orders.

2. REASONS FOR CALL-IN

2.1 The reasons why the decision was called in are as follows: -

See attached

3. RESPONSE TO REASONS FOR CALL-IN

a) London Ambulance Service

As noted in report RE 16.123, the London Ambulance Service did not object to the proposals for the A1010 South, offering support for schemes that reduce the potential for and severity of collisions. However, the LAS stressed the importance of direct and unhindered access across London's roads and highlighted that travelling at lower speeds across significant areas of the borough is likely to increase travelling times.

The impact of the scheme on journey times for general traffic at peak times was clearly summarised in the report. However, the impact on journey times for emergency service vehicles will be less than stated in the report. The use of traffic separators to segregate cyclists from other traffic will help to minimise the impact on emergency service response times, allowing vehicles to pull into the cycle lane to get out of the way of an ambulance or fire appliance. In some situations, this may be better than the current arrangements were the parked vehicles restrict the width of the traffic lane.

b) Air Quality Monitoring

No representations or objections were made specifically about air quality monitoring so this was not addressed in report RE 16.123. The wider impact on air quality was raised and the report therefore refers to the fact that there is likely to be some increase in NO_2 concentrations at those junctions where there are some increases in queue length and delays. However, the report also states that the areas of these increases will be much smaller than the area of air quality improvements along the rest of the route, with reduced traffic flows at 2.5%. These improvements are small (between 0.1 $\mu g/m^3$ and 0.5 $\mu g/m^3$) but have the potential to increase if a greater mode shift from private car to cycling is achieved in the future.

Increasing cycling infrastructure and encouraging more people to cycle is a key element of the Council's Air Quality Action Plan, which is produced in recognition of the legal requirement on the Council to work towards air quality objectives within the Borough; this is as required under Part IV of the Environment Act 1995 and the relevant air quality regulations. The Action Plan contains a wide range of local measures and notes that significant improvements in air quality depend on both national and London-wide initiatives, such as the proposed Ultra-Low Emission Zone.

Air quality monitoring and modelling are currently undertaken and this will continue in the future to help inform the Council's Action Plan.

c) Journey Times

Paragraphs 5.30-5.32 of RE 16.123 summarise the results of the extensive traffic modelling that was undertaken to assess the impact of the scheme. The models have been independently audited by Transport for London and confirmed as fit for purpose. The table following paragraph 5.31 sets out the delay per mile for the busiest AM and PM peak hours for both the northbound and southbound directions.

d) Parking

Paragraph 5.28 of RE 16.123 refers to a number of locations where short-stay bays will be provided to support local businesses. These will initially be introduced to allow free paring for up to two hours, with a restriction that motorists must wait for at least four hours if they want to return to the same bay. The use of these bays will be monitored to ensure that they are being used as intended and that there is a sufficient turnover of vehicles. If not, other options to be considered in consultation with affected residents and business, include reducing the maximum length of stay (to ensure a greater turnover of spaces); changing the method of control (e.g. to pay and display); or introducing additional bays in side roads, where feasible.

e) Regeneration of the area

No representations or objections were made on the basis of additional traffic that may be generated from future development in the area and this was therefore not addressed in the report. In any event, it is clear that the highway network cannot continue to absorb demand for car use given the scale of growth forecast for the borough and across London. The scheme for the A1010 South and the wider Cycle Enfield programme supports the approach set out in the London Plan, the Mayor's Transport Strategy and his recently published 'Healthy Streets for London' document, which is about encouraging more people to walk, cycle and use public transport.

f) Bus Boarders

No representations or objections were made on the basis that the was insufficient information regarding the Council's plans to communicate with residents about use the new bus boarders. This issue was therefore not addressed in the report.

However, explanations of how new types of infrastructure will be used will be disseminated via a range of channels including the Cycle Enfield website and newsletter. Visits can also be arranged for local groups (such as sheltered housing along the route) where officers can provide further explanations of how bus-stop boarders are designed to operate. As part of the communication with Enfield Disability Action, we have also offered the opportunity for a site visit with a selection of their members who we can then work with to help cascade the relevant information.

g) Driveway Crossovers

No representations or objections were made regarding the provision of footway crossovers and this was not therefore addressed in the report.

The opportunity for footway crossovers will be considered in advance of work commencing, taking into account relevant planning criteria. Where crossovers are feasible and can be provided as part of the works they will be provided free of charge, with residents only having to fund any necessary the works with the curtilage of their properties.

h) Consultation and Value for Money

The original consultation on the A1010 South was carried out between 20 November 2015 and 20 March 2016 and generated 377 responses. A further 872 views were obtained from face to face interviews. All responses were reported to Cabinet in July 2016 and, taking the various views into account, the decision was made to proceed to detailed design and statutory consultation.

The statutory consultation, referred to here, was principally about inviting objections to the traffic management orders required to enable traffic and parking to be regulated once the scheme has been implemented. The number of responses therefore gives no indication of the level of support for the scheme itself, which as you are aware is in alignment with the cross-party Mini Holland bid as submitted to and awarded by the Mayor of London.