

## **Appendix D**

### **Enfield Town – summary of objections and LBE response to objections**

From 7 February to 3 March 2024, 33 people provided objections to the draft Traffic Order TG52/1544 for Phase 1 of the Enfield Town Liveable Neighbourhoods project. Objections raised have been taken from all communications throughout the consultation period for the traffic management orders (reference TG52/1544). This Appendix considers all objections made and provides the Council's response to each and should be read alongside the Key Decision report (KD 5482).

Objections received included comments on the following themes: broadly fell into the groupings below. Some may fall across more than one category but have only been listed once.

- Motor traffic, traffic related impacts, mobility, and access
- Physical safety
- Design and infrastructure
- Miscellaneous
- Out of scope

Objections are listed in each category in no specific order.

## Motor traffic, traffic related impacts, mobility and access

Ref	Nature of the objection	LBE response
1.1	The impact on traffic volumes and reduced parking may deter people from visiting this area resulting in a loss or negative impact on the businesses around Palace Garden Shopping Centre and the shops at the end of Church Street.	<p>All properties, including businesses within the project area, remain accessible by private motor vehicle. Off-street parking is also available in the town centre.</p> <p>The proposals are intended to increase the cycling levels. The provision of safe infrastructure will enable more people to make the choice to cycle some of their local journeys. Evidence from other schemes<sup>1</sup> indicates that the number of cycling journeys in the borough are increasing where good quality infrastructure has been introduced. Current environment is not cycle friendly; this project will help attract more users.</p> <p>These proposals are in line with Enfield Corporate Plan 2018-2022, Mayor's Transport Strategy (MTS), Climate Change Act and Government's Net Zero Strategy: Build Back Greener.</p>
1.2	The impact of loss of parking may result in the obstruction of private driveways.	Parking over and causing obstruction to private driveways is illegal and may be subject to enforcement.
1.3	<p>There may be an increase congestion in the area as a result of closing the east end of Little Park Gardens. Comments made reference to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Congestion for buses</li> <li>• Reduced capacity on the arterial main roads</li> <li>• Impede traffic arriving from Windmill Hill</li> <li>• Congestion in Church Street and Cecil Road</li> </ul>	The Council accept that some individual journeys that continue to be taken by private car may have become slightly longer than the same journeys prior to the implementation of the road closure. Overall journey times will continue to increase if motor vehicle use continues without enabling other alternative forms of travel. If more people can walk or cycle for some of their short journeys, this will free up road capacity for those on longer journeys or those that are not practical for walking or cycling.

<sup>1</sup> [Impacts of an active travel intervention with a cycling focus in a suburban context: One-year findings from an evaluation of London's in-progress mini-Hollands programme - ScienceDirect](#)

1.4	<p>The access and traffic flow may be impacted as a result of closing the east end of Little Park Gardens. Comments made reference to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Crossing from Cecil Road into Little Park Gardens does not provide a clear lane to be in to make this manoeuvre. It may not be possible for cars to indicate their intention to go straight across so will block the main route out of the town</li> <li>• Access to Enfield Grammar School</li> <li>• Access to the rear of the post office</li> </ul>	<p>The Council accept that some individual journeys that continue to be taken by private car may have become slightly longer than the same journeys prior to the implementation of the road closure. Overall journey times will continue to increase if motor vehicle use continues without enabling other alternative forms of travel. If more people are enabled to walk or cycle for some of their short journeys, then this will free up road capacity for those on longer journeys or those journeys that are not practical for walking / cycling.</p> <p>A section of Little Park Gardens was also reversed from an existing “westbound” to a proposed “eastbound” direction, enabling quicker access to the easter end of the area, with exit being in an anti-clockwise direction.</p>
1.5	<p>There are concerns regarding the signalised crossings at the junction of Church Street / Sarnesfield Road and the crossing point on Cecil Road. Comments made reference to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No evidence to suggest that signals are required</li> <li>• Signals may stop traffic for longer than the basic zebra crossings do now, and have the potential to back traffic up to the box junction at Chase Side, and Cecil Road</li> <li>• The increase of traffic lights may cause more confusion</li> <li>• Main users of that crossing are unaccompanied school children who will not wait for a signalled crossing. Instead they may try to cross between gaps in the traffic but where</li> </ul>	<p>The Church Street/Sarnesfield Road crossing is being proposed noting the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The A110 Church Street is a busy road with over 1000 vehicles per hour during the busiest peaks in the day. The road can be difficult to cross at this location. Distance between controlled crossings on Church Street is over 200m. Providing the controlled signal crossings will help reduce collision risks and help provide the link between the Library Green and main Town Centre high-street.</li> <li>• On-site observations of the junction showed vehicles turn into Sarnesfield Road occasionally without indicating, sometimes at speed, which can cause uncertainty and risks for pedestrians crossing the road. Some traffic collisions have occurred at or near this junction involving pedestrians.</li> <li>• Zebra crossings at this location may result in more delays to traffic, particularly at peak times for pedestrians.</li> <li>• Signals will only be called when pedestrians use the crossing. Traffic will only be stopped for a short period.</li> <li>• Providing signals should make things clearer to all road users.</li> </ul>

	<p>drivers may believe they have priority due to the green traffic signals and may not be paying as much attention as would happen for a zebra crossing</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The presence of traffic signals should cause drivers to proceed more cautiously, and drivers should be aware of the pedestrians waiting to cross the road. Presence of signals is safer than having no controlled crossings at this location.</li> </ul> <p>The Cecil Road crossing is being proposed noting the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The A110 Cecil Road is also a very busy road with over 800 vehicles per hour during the busiest peaks in the day. Signal crossings proposed outside the park, providing a new pedestrian and cycle link between the green spaces.</li> <li>• Proposed signals at this location are considered safer.</li> <li>• Signals will only be called when pedestrians use the crossing. Traffic will only be stopped for a short period.</li> <li>• Providing signals should make things clearer to all road users.</li> </ul> <p>The presence of traffic signals cause drivers to proceed more cautiously, and drivers should be aware of the pedestrians waiting to cross the road. Presence of signals is safer than having no controlled crossings at these locations and makes things clearer to all road users.</p> <p>Signals will only be called when pedestrians use the crossing and traffic will only be stopped for a short period.</p>
1.6	<p>There may be an increase in air pollution because of the stationary queuing traffic.</p>	<p>Nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>) and particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>) are generally considered to be the main pollutants of concern and road transport contributes to a significant proportion of these pollutants. The volume and movement of traffic can directly impact air quality. No broad negative impacts on air quality are anticipated. Small improvements in air quality could occur with an overall increase in walking, cycling and public transport mode share and have the potential to increase if a greater mode shift from private motor vehicles to walking, cycling and public transport is achieved in the future.</p>

1.7	<p>There will be negative impacts as a result of the introduction of motorcycle parking in Burleigh Way. Comments made reference to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts on the restaurant Marcus</li> <li>• Volume of delivery motorcycles</li> <li>• Concern for pedestrian safety due to motorcycles causing obstruction to the pavement at times</li> </ul>	<p>The Council is proposing that the motorcycle bay in Burleigh Way is not implemented as part of the Phase 1 of the project. An alternative location will be considered at a later stage.</p>
1.8	<p>There will be an increase in cars parking on residential roads nearby the station (e.g. Chase Court Gardens) during day hours and thus there are little or not at all available spaces for residents.</p>	<p>Proposals will remove 16 on-street parking spaces (including four on Little Park Gardens and 12 on Church Street). This is not likely to significantly impact parking on Chase Court Gardens and residential roads associated with the railway stations. Removal of 16 on-street parking bays can be accommodated by off-street parking areas (such as the Palace Exchange or Palace Gardens car parks).</p>
1.9	<p>There were concerns regarding the proposed 20mph speed limit. With concerns for additional traffic delays as a result.</p>	<p>A 20mph speed limit is not proposed to be introduced as part Phase 1 of the project.</p>
1.10	<p>There may be a negative impact on people with disabilities, including access to buses, carparks and pavements.</p>	<p>While the scheme has removed some on-street parking, dedicated blue badge spaces are being provided.</p> <p>Provision of signalised crossings will help elderly and vulnerable users cross busy roads (particularly at the Church Street/Sarnesfield Road junction).</p> <p>Bus journey delays as a result of introducing signals are likely to be minimal as signals will only be on red when called by pedestrians.</p>

## Physical safety

Ref	Nature of the objection	LBE response
2.1	Motorcycle parking in Burleigh Way may cause safety issues to pedestrians especially to unaccompanied school children.	The motorcycle bay in Burleigh Way will not be implemented as part of the Phase 1 of the project. An alternative location will be considered at a later stage.
2.2	The proposed new public square on Little Park Garden will enable anti-social behaviour particularly after school, rough sleepers, and encourage loitering along with more delivery moped drivers. There was a request that the square is covered by a dedicated CCTV camera.	It is anticipated that the new and improved public realm area will increase footfall and natural surveillance of the area. Additional CCTV is proposed to be installed in the proximity of the new square. The square will also bring a range of benefits including use by a range of different people including families, shoppers, elderly people and young people. Mixed use helps to discourages antisocial behavior.

## Design and infrastructure

Ref	Nature of the objection	LBE response
3.1	There is no need for the new public square on Little Park Gardens due to other surrounding rest areas.	The placemaking strategy for Enfield Town identified there are not enough places to stop and rest across the town centre, therefore opportunities to introduce more places to stop and rest are being proposed.
3.2	The removal of the traffic island near the park entrance on Cecil Road may cause safety issues with vehicles veering off the bend.	Cecil Road is being reduced to a single lane on the approach to the bend which is predicted to help reduce speeds of those travelling westbound.  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 exploration of additional physical features on Cecil Road such as raised table on the approach to the Cecil Road corner to reduce vehicle speeds further.
3.3	The positioning of the diagonal path across the Library Green is not appropriate.	The path has been designed to enhance the connection between the high street and the entrance to Town Park and the Council does not find that the path position is not appropriate.

### Miscellaneous

Ref	Nature of the objection	LBE response
4.1	<p>Money is being wasted and/or should be used in a different way such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supporting businesses</li> <li>• Fixing potholes or street lighting</li> <li>• Other areas that are in bigger need</li> <li>• Addressing anti-social behaviour including littering.</li> </ul>	<p>Whilst it is acknowledged that some people may feel this way, the project aims to provide range of different benefits and tackle other issues as identified in the Project Rationale. The proposals are in line with the Enfield Corporate Plan 2018-2022, Enfield Council's Climate Action Plan 2020, Mayor's Transport Strategy (MTS), Climate Change Act and the Government's Net Zero Strategy: Build Back Greener. This project is being primarily funded by Transport for London to deliver these interventions to work towards achieving the objectives that are detailed in the Project Rationale document. Transport funding from external sources is not able to be allocated to other Council projects.</p>
4.2	<p>The statutory consultation ran over the half-term break from 10 February to 2024 to 18 February 2024 not allowing families who normally go away on holiday the opportunity to make a representation or objection.</p>	<p>The consultation ran for 3.5 weeks and was planned to accommodate for those with various needs, including those that may be able to visit the in-person pop-up during the half-term break. Other events were arranged outside of the half-term break, including a webinar that was held online and can be rewatched online; as well as the permanent exhibition displayed inside and outside of the library for the duration of the consultation. Consultation materials were also available online on the project page.</p>
4.3	<p>There may be additional noise from increased traffic volume and the increased proximity of passing vehicles to resident</p>	<p>Only a small section of hedges is being removed and this is on the splitter island located on Cecil Road. This is not thought to have a</p>

	housing and lack of shielding from the hedges that will be removed.	significant difference to a noise level, also given that the island with a small hedge is positioned in between two westbound traffic lanes.
4.4	The scheme should be trialled and monitored before being implemented.	Traffic modelling had been carried out before a decision was made to propose the implementation of the scheme.
4.5	The measures proposed may not allow for businesses to thrive and grow.	It is thought that the proposal will improve look and feel of the area as well as safety and accessibility, and this in turn, will help business to thrive and grow.

### Out of Scope

Ref	Nature of the objection	LBE response
5.1	There are areas of uneven pavements in the Town Centre with water pooling when it rains.	This comment will be passed onto the relevant team within the Council.

**END**