



## London Borough of Enfield

<b>Report Title</b>	Approvals associated with the Enfield Town Liveable Neighbourhood project
<b>Report to</b>	Cllr Rick Jewell, Cabinet Member for Transport and Waste
<b>Cabinet Member</b>	Cllr Chinelo Anyanwu Cabinet Member for Environment, Culture and Public Spaces and Cllr Rick Jewell, Cabinet Member for Transport and Waste
<b>Executive Director /Director</b>	Doug Wilkinson – Director of Environment and Street Scene
<b>Report Author</b>	Richard Eason, Programme Director – Journeys and Places Email: richard.eason@enfield.gov.uk
<b>Ward(s) affected</b>	Grange Park; Southbury Ward; Town
<b>Key Decision Number</b>	KD 5482
<b>Classification</b>	Part 1 Public

### Purpose of Report

1. The Enfield Town Liveable Neighbourhoods project supports the creation of a vibrant, healthy town centre, and encourages people to visit and spend time in Enfield Town. The project proposes to deliver new and improved public realm, public spaces and greening, alongside improved walking and cycling provisions; and public transport passenger facilities to reduce car use and promote sustainable transport options.
2. This report aims to provide an overview of the statutory consultation that occurred between Wednesday 7 February 2024 and Sunday 3 March 2024, providing recommendations and to invite a decision on implementation of Phase 1 of the scheme using permanent traffic orders. This report follows the previous key decisions report 5308<sup>1</sup>.

1

## Recommendations

- I. Approve the draft traffic management orders (TMOs) set out in **Appendix A** reference TG52/1544 advertised to the public between 7 February 2024 and 3 March 2024, with the changes noted in this report made to reflect comments received during the statutory consultation.
- II. Grant approval to spend for £1.79m (of the £3.75m 24/25 capital budget envelope) to deliver Phase 1 of the Enfield Town Liveable Neighbourhoods project.
- III. Approve the implementation of Phase 1 of the Enfield Town Liveable Neighbourhoods project as shown in **Appendix G** that includes the changes noted in this report made to reflect comments received during the statutory consultation, using CIL and TfL funding as set out in this report.
- IV. Approve to investigate possibility of implementing the raised table on Cecil Road as detailed in this report, and progress with separate statutory consultation for that proposal.
- V. Delegate authority to the Programme Director of Journeys and Places to make a decision in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Transport and Waste on the proposed implementation of the raised table, based on the outcome of the proposed statutory consultation.
- VI. Note that based on the outcome of the future statutory consultation, the raised table on Cecil Road may not be implemented.

## Background and Options

3. A bid for funding for this ambitious and transformational Enfield Town Liveable Neighbourhood (LN) project was successful in 2019. Feasibility and concept design have been developed for the wider project that has since taken a phased approach to implementation. KD 5308 approved the decision to progress with statutory consultation for Phase 1 of the Enfield Town LN project that was advertised to the public between 7 February 2024 and 3 March 2024. This report summarises the outcomes of the consultation and invites a decision.
4. Funding is fully in place to enable the delivery of Phase 1 of the Enfield Town LN project, through a combination of Transport for London (TfL) funding and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funding allocated to the project. Future phases will be delivered as 'stand-alone' projects to deliver independent benefits and are subject to separate future decision reports.

## *Proposals*

5. Interventions proposed as part of Phase 1 include:
  - Closure of the eastern end of Little Park Gardens at its junction with Church Street to create a new public square.

- Changes to how traffic will operate on Little Park Gardens to facilitate the road closure.
  - Changes to how traffic operates at the Church Street / Cecil Road / Little Park Gardens junction (straight ahead from Cecil Road will now be permitted for general traffic).
  - New signalised crossing at the junction of Church Street / Sarnesfield Road.
  - Relocation of the crossing point on Cecil Road and upgrading it to being a signalised toucan crossing.
  - Implementation of diagonal path linking the two new crossing points on Church Street / Sarnesfield Road junction and on Cecil Road.
  - Changes to waiting and loading within the Phase 1 project area.
  - In addition, an introduction of a motorcycle parking on Burleigh Way was advertised during the statutory consultation. This is now proposed to be descoped from Phase 1.
6. More information, including plans of the proposed changes can be found in **Appendix F** and **Appendix G**, and the advertised draft Traffic Order can be found in **Appendix A**.

### ***Reason for Proposals***

7. The Council has declared a climate emergency with a commitment for the borough to become carbon neutral by 2040. Transport accounts for 39%<sup>2</sup> of the borough emissions, and therefore it is essential that this sector plays a key role in reducing emissions. Enabling an increase in active travel will form part of this response.
8. Enfield Council is focused on working with the community to create a healthy town center that encourages more people to visit and enjoy their time in Enfield Town. As such, we are bringing forward this proposal to deliver a new and improved public space, alongside better pedestrian, bus and cycling facilities that will mean people can arrive to and get around the town center by foot, cycle, bus or car.
9. It is recognised that trade-offs are inevitable due to finite amount of street space, but it is believed that on balance, the scheme will benefit the local community as well as those visiting and cycling through the area. The scheme is believed to also contribute to the wider borough and London aims and objectives as set out in this report.

### ***Community and Stakeholder Engagement***

10. Enfield Town LN project has been subject to extensive engagement with the community. Five stages of engagement have been carried out to date on the Enfield Town LN scheme, including the recent statutory consultation on

---

<sup>2</sup> <https://new.enfield.gov.uk/services/environment/climate-action/>

Phase 1 where new and/or amended traffic orders are required to implement highway aspects of the project.

11. In the Autumn of 2019, Stage 1 of the engagement focused on the vision for the future of the town centre and established 5 community led design principles, these were that Enfield Town:
  - Is safe for all.
  - Has a vibrant economy.
  - Is a great place to be.
  - Offers transport choices.
  - Celebrates its heritage.
12. Stage 2 of community engagement in Autumn 2020 presented specific highways proposals and included design workshops on public realm. Feedback received shaped the design presented to the public in Summer 2021, forming Stage 3 of the community engagement.
13. Stage 4 of community engagement took place in the Summer/Autumn 2022 and included the presentation of the combined plans (highways and public realm elements of the scheme) which incorporated further feedback from the last engagement stage. This has now led to a freeze on the design to enable detailed design to take place prior to statutory consultation on various phases of the project.
14. Stage 5 was the statutory consultation on the draft TMOs for Phase 1 of the Enfield Town LN project.
15. Notice of the draft TMOs was published in the London Gazette and Enfield Independent newspapers on 7 February 2024.
16. Communications and engagement activities during the statutory consultation regarding Phase 1 of the project included:

**Table 1:** Engagement summary

<b>Event</b>	<b>Date and Time</b>	<b>Location</b>
Drop-in session to speak with the project team	10am – 1pm on Saturday 10 February 2024	Library Green
Drop-in session to speak with the project team	11am – 2pm on Tuesday 20 February 2024	Palace Gardens Shopping Centre, near Office Shoes
Online webinar	6pm on Tuesday 27 February 2024	Microsoft Teams via the link: <a href="https://tinyurl.com/EnfieldTown2024">https://tinyurl.com/EnfieldTown2024</a>
Exhibition of proposals	On display until Sunday 3 March 2024	Enfield Town Library

17. We invited residents and anyone interested to provide an objection or representation to the draft TMOs through the statutory consultation. The statutory consultation ran from Wednesday 7 February 2024 until midnight on Sunday 3 March 2024. Any objection or representation needed to be made in writing, quoting the reference TG52/1544 and stating the grounds on which it was made. Objections or representations were able to be made in any of the following ways:

- Online survey found on the project page <https://letstalk.enfield.gov.uk/enfieldtown>
- emailed to [journeysandplaces@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:journeysandplaces@enfield.gov.uk) or
- posted to: Journeys and Places, Enfield Council, Silver Street, Enfield, EN1 3XA.

18. There was a total of 69 responses to the statutory consultation received. Whilst many stated that they were an objection or representation, some responses did not state this. The objections summary and the Council's response to the grounds made, are detailed in **Appendix D**.

19. Statutory consultees were sent notice of the traffic order and invited to provide an objection or representation. No formal responses were received. Communication with stakeholders such as the Metropolitan Police, London Fire Brigade, and London Ambulance Service has continued throughout the project life.

### ***Overview of consultation feedback***

20. The following section summarises the feedback received in response to the statutory consultation. The summary of objections and Council's responses to the objections can be found in **Appendix D**.

**Table 2:** Overview of consultation

Number of responses	<p>A total of 43 survey responses, 13 paper responses and 13 email responses were received during the consultation period. They consisted of the below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Survey responses received online: 18 were submitted as representations and 25 submitted as objections.</li> <li>• Email: None were submitted as representations and one submitted as an objection, while 12 emails did not explicitly state and were just providing comments on the proposal.</li> <li>• Paper submission: Four were submitted as representations and seven submitted as objections, two did not state either.</li> </ul>
Demographics	<p>Respondents were required to register with the Let's Talk Enfield site to complete the consultation survey. This enables the Council to collect demographic information to better understand the people who are being engaged. The survey does not require respondents to provide their full</p>

	<p>name and full address due to data handling and processing regulations. Therefore, there is no verification process on individual responses.</p> <p>Around half the respondents provided demographic information on their age, race, and gender. This information showed that a wide range of ages participated. The main ethnicity identified was 'White – English, Welsh, Scottish, Northern Irish or British'. There were also nearly twice as many males as females. There were 11 people who advised they were Blue Badge holders and most people advised they did not have a physical or mental health condition or illness last or expected to last for 12 months or more. This information determines that the engagement was not entirely representative of the project area. Whilst town ward does have a large proportion of people who identify as 'White -English, Welsh, Scottish, Northern Irish or British' the demographic data collected suggests that the respondents to the survey were not representative of the ward profile as a whole. The EQIA report containing additional information of the demographics within the project area can be found in <b>Appendix E</b>.</p>
<p>Connection to the area</p>	<p>Of the respondents who provided information on their connection to the area, 60 live in Enfield, 9 respondents work in Enfield, and 3 respondents own a business in Enfield.</p>

21. A variety of comments were received with a mix of support, general comments, and concerns. The Council has carefully considered these and also provided a response to each objection in **Appendix D**. Below is a high-level summary of key themes based on all feedback received (whether objection, representation or 'not stated'):

*Motorcycle parking on Burleigh Way*

22. One of the concerns identified in the responses was regarding the proposed motorcycle parking on Burleigh Way. The motorcycle parking was proposed to respond to the high demand for motorcycle parking in the vicinity of the high street where motorbike delivery has increased significantly over the recent years, including in the pandemic period. Objections have been raised against these proposals by residents and business, with concern for pedestrian safety due to motorcycles causing obstruction when spilling into the pavement at times, pollution and noises made from the running engines as well as anti-social behavior by the motorbike drivers. Officers have considered this feedback and recommend to not proceed with the traffic order for the motorcycle parking on Burleigh Way. An alternative motorbike location will be investigated at a later stage.

*Changes on Cecil Road*

23. Another common concern raised was regarding the splitter island being removed from Cecil Road, outside the Town Park entrance. Concerns were

raised over risks with vehicles taking the corner at speed, losing control and creating damage to adjacent properties. Proposed designs narrow down Cecil Road to a single lane on the approach to the location. A signalised crossing and associated zig-zags are also being proposed to help reduce speeds of vehicles travelling westbound on Cecil Road. In response to the feedback received, designs have been slightly revised on the bend of Cecil Road outside of the Town Park. This includes small physical changes to the off-highways area. Officers are also exploring additional physical features on Cecil Road such as raised table on the approach to the Cecil Road corner to reduce vehicle speeds further. This report is seeking approval to investigate possibility of implementing the raised table in this location, and progress with separate statutory consultation for that proposal.

#### *Creation of new public square at the eastern end of Little Parks Gardens*

24. A number of objections raised concerns about the closure of the eastern end of Little Park Gardens to create a new public square. Objections were based on a concern that this would cause traffic congestion and delays, and concerns regarding access to Enfield Grammar School. Some respondents also believed that there is sufficient public space in the vicinity including outside Enfield Town Library, and as such another public realm area is not required. Safety concerns with possible loitering and anti-social behaviour in this area were also raised. However, representations and other comments were also received in support of the creation of the new public square, including that it would make it a more welcoming and useable space especially for families to stop and rest. Some respondents thought there are currently insufficient spaces to stop and that this area would be of benefit. Additional CCTV is also proposed to be installed in the proximity of the new square.

#### *Signalised crossing at the junction of Church Street / Sarnesfield Road and the crossing point on Cecil Road*

25. Some objections were against the proposed installation of traffic signals in the area due to the concerns for traffic delays and subsequent impacts of traffic backing up towards other junctions. Safety concerns were raised that the main users of that crossing are unaccompanied school children who may not wait for a signaled crossing. It was suggested that instead they may try to cross between gaps in the traffic and drivers may think they have priority due to the green traffic signals and therefore not be paying as much attention as would happen for a zebra crossing. Representations were made in support of the proposal for the new signalised crossings based on improved pedestrian safety. A respondent with young children thought this will be a significant benefit to them by streamlining travel between key sites and making it safer for children to cross Sarnesfield Road. Others thought these crossings would improve safety and reduce vehicle speeds in the area.

#### *Impacts on businesses and visitors to Enfield Town*

26. Some concerns were raised around the proposed parking changes and potential traffic delays and the impacts this may have on businesses. Objections were based on visitors being deterred from visiting the area.

Others were in support and commented these changes will help to revitalise the area.

*Funds should be spent elsewhere/waste of money.*

27. Decisions of Council spending and priorities was raised by a number of respondents. Some suggested this proposal would be a waste of money and others suggested the funds be spent elsewhere such as on supporting businesses, mental health, fixing potholes, street lighting, littering and other initiatives.

*Supportive of the scheme*

28. Representations were made in support of the scheme with comments on the improved safety and accessibility to the area, in particular to the town park. Others commented the changes would create a much more user-friendly experience for pedestrians and would open up the High Street to cyclists and make a safer and more enjoyable journey into town. The proposed changes were also said they would improve the neighbourhood and help to reduce pollution. The new town square and signalised crossings also received general support.

*Other comments:*

29. The following:

- Generally supportive comments.
- Generally opposing comments.
- Enfield Chase railway station users park in the vicinity during the day, impacting local residents being able to park.
- Littering within the area is an issue.
- Concern that proposals will cause additional pollution from traffic congestion.
- Concerns regarding the costs of the project.
- Concern that there is a lack of enforcement, notably for motorbikes parking outside dedicated areas or riding on the footway.
- Comments on the speed limit restriction of 20mph in the area, some requesting 20mph is introduced as part of phase 1 and others comment against it however this is not being proposed in this phase.
- Existing bike parking locations within the borough are not deemed safe or usable.
- Suggestion that there needs to be maintenance of roads and other assets within the town centre.

30. Comments that don't relate to the project and/or proposed traffic orders will be passed on to the relevant departments within the Council.

31. Other supportive responses were primarily centred around the project improving the area for pedestrians and people who cycle, and the proposals creating positive improvements to the public space.



32. Equalities Impact Assessment of the Proposal is covered further in this report and **Appendix E**.

**Risks that may arise if the proposed decision and related work is not taken:**

33. Several risks have been identified if the proposal(s) are not approved:
- Loss of benefits from the project: This project has the potential to deliver a range of benefits for Enfield Town which will be lost if the project does not continue.
  - Lost funding opportunity: If the project does not continue with the available funding, then TfL are likely to close the project from their perspective, resulting in a loss of any future funding potential.

**Risks that may arise if the proposed decision is taken and actions that will be taken to manage these risks:**

34. The following are risks and mitigations considered if the proposal(s) is approved.
- Cost Control: It is already acknowledged that the project will be delivered incrementally as funds allow. Inflationary pressures remain uncertain however each aspect of the project will have a contingency budget allocated and the future scope reviewed should the delivery cost escalate.
  - Disruption during construction: Traffic management arrangements will be designed to minimise disruption and ongoing engagement will take place with the emergency services and transport operators. The needs of local residents, people working in the town centre and visitors to the town centre will all be considered. Church Street and Cecil Road form part of the Strategic Route Network (SRN). Continuous discussions will be held with key stakeholders throughout the development of the traffic management plans.
  - Reputational damage with regards to suggestions that the Council does not listen to residents: The statutory consultation on Phase 1 of the project is the fifth stage of engagement with residents, businesses and other stakeholders on this project. Various activities have been delivered to engage the community in a conversation at each stage, and engagement summary reports can be found on the project page that capture the approach and findings from the stage. The Council has ensured that consultation feedback has been carefully analysed and collated, which can be found within this report, including a summary of objections included in **Appendix D** of this report. 33 objections were received during the 25-day consultation period, and each have been considered. The Council has a responsibility to balance these views with long term benefits to the local and regional areas and how these contribute towards national and global challenge. As a result of the consultation, the motorcycle bay in Burleigh Way will not be implemented as part of the Phase 1 of the project, and an

alternative location will be considered at a later stage. In response to the feedback received, designs have also been slightly revised on the bend of Cecil Road outside of the Town Park. This includes small physical changes to the off-highways area. Officers are also exploring additional physical features on Cecil Road such as a raised table on the approach to the Cecil Road corner to reduce vehicle speeds further.

35. Negative impact to some people with disabilities:

- In order to provide for the pedestrian desire line between the park and the library, the location of the new Toucan crossing has meant that an existing bush at the south-western corner of the library green is proposed to be removed/ cut back and an existing BT telecommunications pole will be in conflict with those using the crossing. This may affect everyone but particularly those with visual impairments who would not expect this obstruction to be present. It is extremely close to the tactile paving. It is however proposed to relocate the pole from its current location with the new location being currently agreed on with BT.
- A participant of one of the workshops representing the Enfield National Autistic Society made a point regarding lighting. The point was that those with autism can find that their senses are overloaded, and that bright lighting can lead to physical stress. It was noted that any proposed lighting should be designed taking into account requirements for adequate lighting and ensuring the area is not excessively lit when not required.

### **Preferred Option and Reasons for Preferred Option**

36. The project continues to align with the initial objectives, and now more than ever, it is important that this transformational project is progressed to deliver a range of benefits. The project fully aligns with local, London and national policy on investing in town centres and enabling increases in active travel and as such the preferred option is to enable this project to continue through to the implementation of Phase 1 works. This includes the approval of the TMOs outlined in **Appendix A** with the variation for the removal of the motorcycle parking on Burleigh Way as shown in **Appendix F** and **Appendix G**.

37. These recommendations should be considered in the knowledge that:

- This report is also seeking approval to investigate possibility of implementing the raised table on Cecil Road, and progress with separate statutory consultation for that proposal.
- This report is seeking approval of delegated authority to the Programme Director of Journeys and Places in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Transport and Waste to make a decision on the next steps for the TMO for the proposed raised table, based on the feedback received during the respective future statutory consultation.
- The project is progressing using a phased approach, of which, this is Phase 1. Future phases will be delivered as 'stand-alone' projects to deliver independent benefits and are subject to separate future decision reports.

38. This report seeks approval to implement Phase 1 of the Enfield Town Liveable Neighbourhoods project as shown **Appendix F** and **Appendix G** using CIL and TfL funding as set out in this report.

39. The construction of Phase 1 is anticipated to consist of the following elements:

- Main civil works, as well as exploration of options for the design for the raised table – incumbent contractor TKJV (*circa* £1m)
- Greening – incumbent contractor Nicholls (*circa* £75k)
- Lighting – current PFI contractor (*circa* £100k)
- Variable Message Signs (VMS) signs – below threshold quotation SWARCO (*circa* £24k)
- CCTV – incumbent contractor Openview (*circa* £100k)
- Traffic signals – via exception as no other provider available; TfL (*circa* £100k)
- Art design and implementation – open market procurement via LTP *circa* £15k
- Utilities such as BT/Openreach (*circa* £50k) – via exception as no other provider
- Project Management – awarded via Matrix (*circa* £65k)

There will also be number of small contracts such as drafting and reviewing statutory consultation related documents or carrying out a Road Safety Audit.

There is sufficient budget to carry out Phase 1 works.

40. The following other options have been considered:

- Do nothing/No longer progress the scheme: This is not recommended as this project delivers a range of benefits for the borough.
- Proceed with the TMOs as advertised. This is not recommended as on balance, the Council view is that the initially advertised TMO should be amended responding to the concerns raised from the engagement and consultation around Burleigh Way and changes on Cecil Road bend as detailed in this report.

### **Relevance to Council Plans and Strategies**

41. This project contributes towards the objectives of the Council corporate plan as described below.

- **Clean and green spaces** – this project will include the delivery of improved public realm, including additional greenery and longer-term contribute towards greater levels of sustainable transport.

- **Safe, healthy and confident communities** – this project will help contribute towards a safer Enfield Town and through increasing transport choices help enable healthier lifestyles.
- **Thriving children and young people** – this project will help improve the town centre for all generations and the full masterplan includes items such as a sensory garden and other opportunities for informal play.
- **More and better homes** – this project will help create improved connections with current and future active travel routes, enabling more transport choices for local neighbourhoods to travel into the town centre in a sustainable way.
- **An economy that works for everyone** – this project will contribute towards developing a town centre that is vibrant, healthy and inclusive.

## Financial Implications

### Capital Implications

42. In February 2024 Council approved a 2024/25 capital budget envelope of £3.75 for the Enfield Town Liveable Neighbourhoods project.:

**Table 3** – budget breakdown

	<b>2024/25</b>
<b>Budget envelope</b>	<b>£m</b>
<b>TfL (24/25 approved allocation)</b>	1.075
<b>CIL (earmarked of the Total CIL approved £3.99m)</b>	2.675*
<b>Total</b>	<b>3.75</b>

\*This value may change if some activities are not completed within the current FY and span into the next 2025/26 FY

43. Of this budget envelope this report seeks approval for the implementation of Phase 1 of the scheme. Phase 1 is estimated to cost around £1.79m and is broken down as follows:

**Table 4** – Estimated budget breakdown of the Phase 1 stage

<b>Phase 1 Estimated budget summary</b>	<b>£1,790</b>
Staff costs (recharged internal staff)	4%
Construction inc. PM fees	65%
PMO fees (internal and external)	3%
Contingency inc. towards the raised table design and works	28%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Funding split</b>	
TfL grant	43%
CIL (or potential further TFL)	57%

44. TfL grant allocation for 2024/25 of a £1.075m was approved by TfL in January 2024 and will be mostly used to fund the bulk of Phase 1 planned works.
45. Reports seeking approval to start these works; and later phases of work will be brought forward in due course. These will require all funding options to have been explored – including potential further TfL grant funding to reduce the requirement to drawdown historically earmarked CIL.

### **Financial risks**

46. There is risk that Phase 1 costs will exceed current estimate, which will impact the availability of funding for later phases of the scheme. This risk is mitigated by the inclusion of circa £500k contingency within Phase 1 cost estimates as detailed in Table 4.
47. There is risk that staff recharges to this scheme do not comply with the Council's published policy for staff capitalisation. To address this risk, good governance processes are being put in place and all proposed staff recharges will be reviewed prior to being journaled to ensure staff have been working directly on this scheme, no additional overheads are included, and that the salary recharges are in line with estimates above.
48. TfL funding will be claimed in arrears, based on actual spend incurred. The risk of ineligible spend being incurred will be managed by robust monthly budget monitoring (by the budget holder) and review of spend incurred.
49. TfL grant funding for 2024/25 is expected to be claimed for by June 2025. This sets a clear timeframe within which grant funded works should be completed by. There is a risk that any works not completed within this period may have to be funded from non-TfL grant.
50. There is risk that the Strategic CIL provisionally earmarked to the scheme in previous years no longer demonstrates effective use of finite strategic CIL resource. This risk is mitigated by the requirement for Capital Review Panel and Strategic Planning Board to approve all potential CIL drawdowns in advance of spend being incurred for the Liveable Neighbourhood Programme.
51. The risk of 'non-asset-enhancing' spend being incorrectly added to the asset at year end will be managed as part of year end closedown processes.

### **Value for Money assessment**

52. The project will achieve several goals as detailed in this report using external grant funding and community infrastructure levy (CIL).
53. This investment will contribute to the Council's commitment to become carbon neutral by 2040 and create a healthy town centre that increases

footfall and visitor experience through an improved public space and better pedestrian, bus and cycling facilities.

### **Borrowing implications**

54. The project is fully funded by TFL grant and CIL. There is no impact on the Council's overall borrowing requirement.

### **Revenue Implications**

55. The project is TFL capital grant funded project, and there are no revenue financial implications, except in relation to:
- Staff costs capitalisation – relevant staff costs will be fully capitalised on a quarterly basis; and
  - Loss of Parking charges income estimated to be circa £74k per annum, which will need to be added to the 2025/26 MTFP.
  - The £2K of revenue costs allocated for the annual maintenance of SUDS (Sustainable drainage systems).
  - Rain gardens maintenance costs are not significant compared to the overall value of the scheme and the value they provide in terms of climate resilience and the aim of creating a liveable neighbourhood.

### **VAT Implications**

56. The report sets out that the Council proposes to deliver new and improved public realm, public spaces and greening, alongside improved walking and cycling provisions; and public transport passenger facilities to reduce car use and promote sustainable transport options as part of Phase 1 of this project.
57. The Council will be acting in a non-business capacity in its role as a Highways Authority and can therefore claim back any VAT incurred on associated costs. As a result, there will be no partial exemption implications to the Council arising from this proposal.
58. Should the project not be undertaken in the way described in the report, the VAT implications will need to be reassessed.

### **Legal Implications**

59. Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 provides that planning permissions may be granted subject to planning obligations, agreed between a developer and the local planning authority, which are set out in a separate legal agreement, often referred to as a 'Section 106 Agreement'. Obligations often take the form of financial or in-kind contributions towards the provision or improvement of infrastructure if a need is generated by the new developments. Financial contributions must be spent as set out in the planning agreements.

60. The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is a charge which can be levied by local authorities on new development in their area to facilitate the delivery of infrastructure needed to support development in their area. The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended) governs the way in which CIL funds are spent which would be on infrastructure priorities identified by the Council.
61. Section 23 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act provides the Council (as local traffic authority) with powers to establish crossings for pedestrians on roads for which they are the traffic authority.
62. Section 62 of the Highways Act 1980 provides the Council (as Highways authority) with powers to carry out, in relation to a highway maintainable at the public expense by them, any work (including the provision of equipment) for the improvement of the highway.
63. The Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (RTRA 1984) provides powers to regulate use of the highway. In exercising powers under the RTRA 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 cyclists) 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.
64. A decision as to whether to implement the scheme must also be consistent with the Council's network management duty under section 16 of the Traffic Management Act 2004 ("the 2004 Act"). That is, the duty "to manage their road network with a view to achieving, so far as may be reasonably practicable having regard to their other obligations, policies and objectives, the following objectives (a) securing the expeditious movement of traffic on the authority's road network; and (b) facilitating the expeditious movement of traffic on road networks for which another authority is the traffic authority".
65. Section 6 of the RTRA enables the Council to make permanent traffic management orders. The Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 (as amended) prescribe the procedure to be followed in making these types of orders.
66. Any works outlined in this report that constitute 'development' as defined in the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 will require planning permission and consequently an application seeking such will be required to be submitted to the Local Planning Authority.
67. Any contracts awarded in connection with the recommendations included in this Report must be procured in accordance with the Council's Contract Procedure Rules and, where applicable, the Public Contracts Regulations 2015.
68. The recommendations set out in this report and within the Council's powers and duties.

## Equalities Implications

69. Local authorities have a responsibility to meet the Public Sector Duty of the Equality Act 2010. The Act gives people the right not to be treated less favourably because of any of the protected characteristics. The needs of diverse groups when designing and changing services or budgets need to be considered, so that the decisions do not unduly or disproportionately affect access by some groups more than others. The Public Sector Duty Act 2010 requires Local Authorities, in the performance of their functions, to:
- Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act.
  - Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.
  - Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.
70. The EqIA process is a continuous throughout the development of the project, from its conception to its utilisation. The latest EQIA report can be found in **Appendix E**, and the overview of the equalities impact of the proposals is set out in Table 5 below.

**Table 5: Overview of the Equalities Impact of the Proposal**

Age	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The new public square is likely to have a positive impact, on those who are older as well as those who are very young. This will be of particular benefit to those with children who may need to stop and rest and those who are older and may be more likely to need to stop and rest and perhaps have more time available to do so.</li> <li>• The introduction of signalised crossing facilities will be of particular benefit to those more vulnerable road users such as older people who may take more time to cross as well as children and those crossing with children.</li> <li>• It is recommended to ensure the plants within the new rain garden planting areas are non-toxic to ensure they are not a danger to children.</li> </ul>
Disability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional seating within the public realm will be particularly beneficial for those with mobility impairments and enable them to make longer or more frequent walking journeys.</li> <li>• Existing BT telecommunications pole is currently in conflict with those that will be using the crossing between the park and the library. This could affect everyone but particularly those with visual impairments who would not expect this obstruction to be present (it is extremely close to the tactile paving). A relocation of the BT pole away from the crossing is already agreed with BT.</li> </ul>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is proposed additional dedicated disabled parking spaces that will have a positive impact on blue badge holders who struggle to find available and accessible parking around the town centre.</li> </ul>
Gender reassignment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is believed that it is unlikely that the introduction of Phase 1 of this scheme will unduly impact people who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing, or have undergone a process (or part of a process) to reassign their sex.</li> </ul>
Marriage and civil partnership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is believed that it is unlikely that the introduction of Phase 1 of this scheme will have a disproportionate impact on grounds of Marriage and Civil partnership.</li> </ul>
Pregnancy and maternity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The interventions which include the implementation of new pedestrian crossings and raised tables at junctions which will enable those who are pregnant or moving around with children and/ or with prams/ pushchairs, to walk through the area more safely and confidently.</li> <li>• In the short to medium term the scheme may adversely increase congestion on the surrounding road network as construction takes places, and some traffic may reassign from roads within the study area. As such the scheme could negatively impact journey times.</li> <li>• More seating within the public realm as well as outside of entrance to Town Park will be beneficial to those who are pregnant or with children, enabling them to make longer walking journeys confidently by providing places to rest.</li> </ul>
Race	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Road or lane closures during construction may cause temporary disruption to bus services within the scheme extent. This may have a disproportionately negative impact on 'Other Ethnic Group' and 'Black and Black British' people who are more likely to use buses as their primary method of travel than any other ethnic group. This may make some of their journey slightly longer.</li> <li>• Where English is not understood well, residents may be unable to understand the proposals being put forward, particularly during construction, where bus stops may be temporarily moved, or routes temporarily diverted.</li> </ul>
Religion or belief	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is believed that it is unlikely that the introduction of Phase 1 of this scheme will unduly impact people on the grounds of their religion or belief.</li> </ul>
Sex	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a risk that the new public realm area could attract anti-social behaviour that may create an intimidating environment that may disproportionately affect women. Additional CCTV is proposed to be installed in the proximity of the new square.</li> </ul>

Sexual orientation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Possible increases in pedestrian and cycling numbers can help to reduce the levels of crime, through an increase in natural surveillance. Lighting is also being improved as part of the proposals, particularly in Library Green to further improve safety. Consequently, these proposals could have a significant positive impact on this protected group, who are more likely to experience unwanted sexual behaviour.</li> </ul>
Care Experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is not thought that there would be a specific disproportionate impact on children or young people in care although as discussed in the 'Age' section above, the fully pedestrianised space created in Little Park Gardens is likely to particularly benefit children as a whole</li> </ul>
Socio-economic deprivation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is recommended that the benefits of this scheme are advertised, with a specific focus on reaching those with lower household incomes.</li> </ul>

## Environmental and Climate Change Implications

71. Table 6 provides an overview of environmental and climate change considerations.

**Table 6 – Overview of Environmental and Climate Change Considerations**

Consideration	Impact of Proposals
Energy consumption	<p>There are no changes proposed to the current service delivery arrangements. Refuse vehicles will continue to be able to collect refuse from all properties.</p> <p>There may be a minimal increase in Energy consumption as an indirect result of added commercial activity, subject to how 'creation of a vibrant, healthy town centre, and encourages people to visit and spend time in Enfield Town' will be achieved i.e., new businesses/uses added if any.</p>
Measures to reduce carbon emissions	<p>Positive.</p> <p>Transport generates a significant amount of greenhouse gas emissions, making up 39% of borough-wide emissions as per the Climate Action Plan 2020. The primary contributor of these emissions is on-road transport from cars. The proposals will enable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased levels of active travel by making journeys safer and more appealing.</li> <li>Over time a reduced private vehicle trips by making alternatives equally attractive.</li> </ul> <p>In the shorter term, there may be some increase in carbon emissions on the surrounding primary road network.</p>
Environmental management	<p>Neutral.</p> <p>The main impact will be in the implementation of the</p>

	project and the resultant embedded carbon. Some recycled materials may be used, along with environmentally friendly planting. However, the main offset will be a forecast reduction in the use of private vehicles as noted above.
Climate change mitigation	<p>Positive</p> <p>In the longer term, as part of a wider programme to encourage active and sustainable modes of travel, the project is expected to contribute towards reducing the negative environmental impacts of private motor vehicle use through reduced carbon emissions, lower rates of road traffic collisions and improved public realm. Additional greening such as SUDS, is also being proposed.</p> <p>There will be no long-term contracts entered into as part of this project that would introduce environmental risks and require mitigation measures to counteract any negative impacts on future climate change.</p>

72. Delivery of improved cycle facilities will enable a mode shift, ultimately reducing emissions from private vehicle use and increasing active modes of travel. This will improve the health of both those cycling and others (through reduced air pollution).
73. Improved crossing facilities, improved footways and improved environment overall aims at encouraging more walking and targeting single-occupancy car use. This in turn, enables a more active and a healthy lifestyle.
74. Existing overreliance on using private vehicles instead of sustainable modes such as walking, cycling and public transport, makes for a case to shift the focus of the provision towards these modes to enable and encourage their use. This project helps to deliver this change and mode shift. Reduction of parking bays, increased number of disabled bays and increased number of cycle parking to further support provision of cycle facilities, will all help with this change geared towards improving environment and tackling current climate emergency.

### **Public Health Implications**

75. This scheme aligns with the Enfield Transport Plan 2019-2041 and the Enfield Healthy Streets Framework. The Enfield Town project is looking to maximise the health and environmental benefits by creating a more pleasant and green environment, increasing physical activity through encouraging walking and/or cycling as an everyday transport mode for those who are able to. The positive effects of increased physical activity on health and wellbeing are well documented; it can help prevent and/or ameliorate a range of lifestyle related conditions, including obesity, Type 2 diabetes, heart disease, stroke, some cancers, musculoskeletal issues, and poor cognitive and mental health. Prevention of lifestyle related conditions can also lead to significant cost savings within health and social care services.

76. Achieving a modal shift towards active travel can also help reduce the health damaging effects of motorised transport including road traffic injuries, air pollution, community segregation, and noise. Creating an environment where people actively choose to walk and cycle as part of everyday life, has the potential to reduce health inequalities. This is due to the fact that income or wealth would become a less significant factor in a person's ability to travel within the borough and gain access to healthcare, employment, social networks, etc. Therefore, improving active travel in the Borough is likely to benefit those who are less prosperous and therefore likely to own motorised transport. Active travel can also be more cost-effective than other initiatives that promote exercise, sport and active leisure pursuits. Climate change has been named as one of the greatest threats to human health in the 21st century. Reducing motorised traffic and promoting forms of active travel can help lower local greenhouse gas emissions that contribute to climate change and will lead to improvements in the health of residents and the environment in the long run.

### **Property Implications**

77. The majority of these proposals affect streets, roads and pavements, which are all adopted public highway and therefore there are no corporate property implications.
78. The proposal for Little Park Gardens will close some highway and convert to General Fund corporate land. This may require maintenance by Highways/Parks/General Fund Corporate Landlord management so there could be minor long-term revenue implications.

### **Crime and Disorder Implications**

79. Project aims to improve perceived and actual safety through improved public realms and enabling mode shift which aim at increased footfall. This in turn helps increase natural surveillance. The project also proposes to increase CCTV coverage within Phase 1.

### **Other Implications**

#### *Network Management*

80. S122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 requires the Council to exercise the powers provided by the Act, so far as reasonably practical, to secure the 'expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians). Section 16 of the Traffic Management Act 2004 also places a specific network management duty on local traffic and highway authorities.
81. Guidance on this duty was originally published in 2004 and has been more recently updated.

82. The guidance acknowledges that management of demand can play a role in helping meet the network management duty. In particular, paragraph 38 states:

*"Government and local authorities have been looking at ways of reducing the demand so as to moderate or stem traffic growth even when the economy is growing. This has resulted in changes to land use plans, the establishment of school and workplace travel plans, and the promotion of tele-working amongst other things. More directly this has led to the desire to make cycling and walking safer and more attractive and the encouragement of public transport through ticketing schemes or better information, bus priority and quality initiatives, and congestion charging. These can all help to secure the more efficient use of the road network and successful measures can have an impact on its operation. They should not be seen as being in conflict with the principles of the network management duty and it is for the Local Traffic Authority (LTA) to decide on the most appropriate approach for managing demand on their own network.<sup>3</sup>"*

83. From a network management perspective, some of the key points to note are:

- Cecil Road and Church Street are Principal Roads (A110), forming part of London's Strategic Road Network (SRN). Both roads have an important movement function for traffic and are key bus routes.
- Although Enfield is the highway and traffic authority for the A110, TfL, as the strategic transport body for London, have an oversight role to ensure that changes to the SRN do not prejudice its effective operation. TfL have been engaged throughout the process and the scheme has been approved by TfL via their Traffic Management Act Notification (TMAN) system.
- By encouraging a mode shift towards active travel modes, the scheme is anticipated to help the Council meet its network management duty in longer term. However, it is acknowledged that the scheme could lead to additional delays in the short-term, including during construction. These negative impacts need to be considered and balanced against the potential longer-term benefits of the scheme.
- Once implemented, the impact of the scheme will be monitored to assess its impact on journey times and the other measures set out in the project Monitoring Plan.

84. During construction, network disruption will be minimised by co-ordinating street works in the surrounding area and putting in place temporary traffic management arrangements, including advance warning signs. Regular engagement with TfL Buses, the emergency services and other road user groups will be maintained and adjustments to the traffic management arrangements made in response to concerns raised, where practicable.

Access to properties, local residents, businesses and visitors will be maintained as much as possible throughout the construction period.

### *Procurement Implications*

85. It is required that any procurement to implement above recommendations will be undertaken in accordance with the Council's Contract Procedure Rules (CPR's) and the Public Contracts Regulations (2015). Proposed procurement projects to be taken through the Council's Procurement Assurance Process. Therefore, a Gate 2 (Procurement Strategy) Report shall be presented for endorsement prior to procurement launch.
86. All frameworks must be legally accessible to the Council and be access in line with the framework rules. Due Diligence to be completed for all the frameworks to be used for the procurement process.
87. Any proposals to modify/vary any existing contracts, must be discussed and agreed with Procurement Services and Legal services in advance.
88. At the end of the sourcing process, authority to award the contract will be sought in line with the CPR's and Council's Governance. Gateway 3 Contract Award report to be endorsed at the Council's Procurement Assurance Group. The Service Area shall ensure this procurement activity takes place via the Council's e-Tendering portal and will be promoted to the Council's Contract Register, and the upload the executed contracts/agreements.
89. All awarded projects must be promoted to Contracts Finder to comply with the Government's transparency requirements. Contact [Procurement.Support@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Procurement.Support@enfield.gov.uk) for any support.
90. If the contracts are over £100,000 the CPR's state that the contract must have a nominated contract owner in the Council's e-Tendering portal.
91. If the contracts are over £500,000 the CPR's state that the contract must have a nominated Contract Manager in the Council's e-Tendering portal and there must be evidence of contract management, including, operations, commercial, financial checks (supplier resilience) and regular risk assessment uploaded into the Council's e-Tendering portal.
92. Existing contracts used must have sufficient budget, within them, and not overspending. That the contract must be able to deliver the services needed within the project, and now outside the scope of the contract.
93. Exceptions for suppliers where there is no other provider must be on the Exception waiver form and presented at Procurement Assurance Group (PAG). These contracts must also follow council governance and have a contract and contract classification carried out.

richard.eason@enfield.gov.uk  
02081320698

## **Appendices**

Appendix A – Advertised Traffic Orders documents  
Appendix B – Advertised Traffic Orders plan  
Appendix C – Initial scheme design plan (with the surrounding existing context)  
Appendix D – Summary of objections and LBE responses to objections  
Appendix E – Equalities Impact Assessment (EQIA)  
Appendix F – Proposed Traffic Order plan  
Appendix G – Proposed scheme designs (with the surrounding existing context)

## **Background Papers:**

None

## **Departmental reference number, if relevant:**

None