

MUNICIPAL YEAR 2006/2007 REPORT NO. 10

MEETING TITLE AND DATE:

CABINET
14th June 2006

COUNCIL
28th June 2006

REPORT OF:

Director of Environment Street
Scene and Parks

Agenda – Part: 1

Item No. 10

Subject:

**Enfield's Final Local Implementation
Plan (LIP)**

Wards: All

Cabinet Members Consulted: Cllr Neville

Contact Officer: Glyn Jones 0208 379 3563 or e-mail glyn.jones@enfield.gov.uk

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Report provides details of Enfield's Local Implementation Plan (LIP). Under Section 145 of the Greater London Authority Act 1999 ('the GLA Act'), London local authorities must prepare Local Implementation Plans (LIPs) containing their proposals for the implementation of the Mayor's Transport Strategy (MTS) in their areas. Enfield's Draft LIP was submitted to Transport for London (TfL) in December 2005 and went out to Statutory and Public Consultation in January 2006. The period of consultation ended on 10th March 2006. Modifications to the Draft LIP have been carried out to reflect the outcome of the Consultation and TfL's response. Enfield's Final LIP will be submitted to the Mayor of London on 7th July 2006. Full Council approval of the LIP is required prior to submission to the Mayor of London, who will then have a period of 100 working days to consider the LIP for adoption, during which he may suggest further revisions. The expected date of adoption by the Mayor of London is September 2006.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

To approve:

- 2.1 Enfield's Final Local Implementation Plan.
- 2.2 Submission of the Final Local Implementation Plan to the Mayor of London, Ken Livingstone.

3. BACKGROUND

- 3.1 The Mayor of London is responsible for the Transport Strategy for London, as well as several other strategies such as spatial development (the London Plan), economic development, air quality and noise. The Mayor's Transport Strategy sets the policy framework for transport in London and provides the context for the various implementation agencies, which include Transport for London (TfL) and the London Boroughs.
- 3.2 The Mayor has published his Transport Strategy and, under Section 145 of the Greater London Authority Act 1999 ('the GLA Act'), London local authorities must prepare Local Implementation Plans (LIPs) containing their proposals for the implementation of the MTS in their areas.
- 3.3 A Local Implementation Plan (LIP) is a statutory document that must set out a plan of how a borough proposes to implement the MTS in its' area. It gives London local authorities the opportunity to present their full range of transport initiatives and projects and to show how and when they will address local transport issues through delivery of the MTS in an integrated manner. Each borough's LIP must therefore demonstrate clearly how the proposals it contains cover the necessary policy framework, projects, programmes, implementation mechanisms, planning and co-ordination activities.
- 3.4 Boroughs must ensure that LIPs include:
- Clear links between LIP proposals and MTS policies and proposals
 - A timetable for implementing the different proposals in the plan and the date by which these will be completed
 - Clear proposals for delivery of Mayoral targets
 - An assessment of the funding and resources needed to deliver the LIP and assumptions as to sources of funding.
 - LIPs should also have regard to the London Plan and other Mayoral strategies, where appropriate.
- 3.5 Enfield's Draft Consultation LIP was approved by Council on the 13th April 2005 and submitted to Transport for London (TfL) in December 2005 for comment and their response was received on 22nd March 2006. Enfield's Draft Consultation LIP also went out to Statutory and Public Consultation in January 2006. The consultation ended in March 2006.
- 3.6 Modifications to the Draft Consultation LIP have been carried out, which take into account some of TfL's formal comments as well as the outcome of further discussions with TfL, the results of the consultation, and in depth discussions with the Cabinet Member for Environment and Streetscene who also met with senior officials of TfL and clearly stated the Borough's position relates to the more controversial issues. Whilst the LIP must be influenced by, and seek to comply with, the Mayor's Transport Strategy, the Cllr Neville and Officers have sought to ensure that the needs of Enfield and the priorities of the Borough are also properly represented in the LIP. A copy of the Draft Consultation LIP along with the detailed responses from Transport for London, along with the Council's response to TfL, has been placed in the Members' Library and both Group Offices. In addition, attached at Appendix A is a document which details the key aspects of the policies and perspectives on which the development of the final version of the Local Implementation Plan is based relative to the draft version. This

document concentrates specifically on those issues which may clearly be considered more fundamental in that they detail essential policy considerations going clearly beyond the solely technical / descriptive considerations.

3.7 The following summarises the key changes made to the Draft Consultation LIP in the process of developing the Final LIP, those in **bold** are those which are considered to be more fundamental in that they entail policy considerations.

3.7.1 Accessible Transport

- Setting out the current door to door services in the Borough and plans for increasing uptake
- Explanation of consultation process with disability organisations and consideration of targets
- Explanation of position on a Mobility Forum

3.7.2 Freight

- Setting out the contacts for freight issues in the Borough, current fleet composition, emission standards
- Further development possibilities of Freight Quality Partnerships
- Identification of possible freight transfer locations and waste transport

3.7.3 Cycling

- Consultation details with user groups, provision of information on cycling
- Review of key cycling accident locations
- Programme for development of cycle parking. On-street, at schools and at work
- **Completion of the London Cycle Network Plus**

3.7.4 Bus

- Expansion of enforcement on Bus Lanes where appropriate
- Responding to TfL's targets on bus journey times – announced by TfL since the draft LIP was submitted
- **Future development of bus priority**
- **Detailing Enfield's position on Bus Stop Accessibility and Clearways**

3.7.5 Streets (Parking)

- Powered two Wheeler parking provision and consultation of users
- Address the issue of persistent evaders and moving traffic contraventions
- **Explanation of Enfield's policies on CPZs and reviewing policy in regard to commuter parking near stations.**
- Parking and loading controls on A roads and busy bus routes

3.7.6 Streets (Non Parking)

- **Enfield's response to traffic reduction targets and detailing traffic reduction contributions from Programmes such as walking and cycling**
- Spelling out details of roadworks (hours) restrictions and noise standards

- 3.7.7 Walking
 - Details of improvements to lighting, safety and security
 - Plans for possible pedestrianisation
 - Enfield's policy on further development of Bus Stop Accessibility to acknowledge Enfield's position on competing demands.
 - Contribution to implementing the London Walking Plan

- 3.7.8 Taxis, Private hire and Community Transport
 - Further details on the Vulnerable People Transport Strategy including security and safety
 - Enfield's position on results of pilot studies done by the Commission for Accessible Transport
 - Linkages with TfL's Door to Door Strategy

- 3.7.9 National Rail and Underground
 - Enfield's position on Identification of potential Rail Freight facilities
 - Station Access and linkages to the Community Safety Strategy and development of safer travel and CCTV.

- 3.7.10 Strategies
 - Development of access to town centres and linkages to cultural life
 - Linkages to the Health Improvement Action Plan

- 3.7.11 Consultation
 - The chapter on consultation will detail the responses received to the Draft Consultation LIP and how the responses were considered in the process of developing the Final LIP.

- 3.7.12 Strategic Environmental Assessment
 - The revised Environmental Report will comment on the modifications to the Final LIP and likely impacts.

- 3.6 The redrafted LIP requires approval by the Council before submission to the Mayor of London in July 2006. The Mayor's responses will then be addressed with a view to completing the process fully so that a LIP for Enfield, approved by the Mayor, will be adopted in September 2006.

- 3.7 In accordance with the GLA Act, The Mayor of London, Ken Livingstone can only approve a LIP where:
 - The LIP is consistent with the Mayor's Transport Strategy
 - The proposals contained in the LIP are adequate for the implementation of the MTS
 - The timetable for implementing those proposals, and the date by which proposals are to be implemented, are adequate for those purposes.

- 3.10 Approval of a LIP may be delayed for one or more of the following reasons:
 - Failure to set out appropriate plans for delivery of the MTS
 - Unjustified inconsistency with the London Plan and other statutory Mayoral strategies

- Failure to address the priorities for borough actions set out within the LIP guidance
- Form or structure incompatible with the LIP guidance
- Insufficient information on programmes or schemes and their background to permit proper evaluation
- An unrealistic/unachievable programme
- Unrealistic/unsuitable milestones/performance indicators/end date
- Inadequate information on funding and resource requirements.

3.11 Non-approval of the LIP could have an impact upon the level of funding received by The Mayor of London, Ken Livingstone, to a Borough; Enfield currently receives about £4-5m per year.

3.12 Boroughs are strongly encouraged to follow the suggestions on format and content defined in the TfL Guidance. Enfield's LIP's focus is on:

- Establishing linkages between the Borough's transport objectives and those embodied in "Putting Enfield First."
- Demonstrating clear links between LIP proposals and MTS policies and proposals
- A timetable for implementing the different proposals in the plan and the date by which these will be completed
- Clear proposals for delivery of Mayoral targets
- An assessment of the funding and resources needed to deliver the LIP
- How due account is taken of the London Plan and other Mayoral strategies, where appropriate.
- A Strategic Environmental Assessment of the impact of the proposals
- Assessment of the impact of the proposals with regard to equal opportunities

4. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

None. The LIP is a Statutory requirement arising from GLA Act 1999.

5. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations are seeking the necessary approvals that will enable Enfield's Local Implementation Plan to be submitted to the Mayor of London.

6. COMMENTS OF THE DIRECTOR OF FINANCE AND CORPORATE RESOURCES AND OTHER DEPARTMENTS

6.1 Finance Comments

- i. Expenditure, once approved by Transport for London, is fully funded by means of direct grant; hence no costs fall on the Council. TfL direct funding replaced the previous system of Supplementary Credit Approvals (SCA) during 2001/2002.
- ii. TfL allocated each London Borough, including Enfield, £50,000 in 2004/5 to assist in the preparation of their LIP.

6.2 Legal Comments

- i. The Mayor's Transport Strategy provides the framework for the development of Local Implementation Plans (LIPs) by London Boroughs; it also provides the basis for the assessment of grant applications, submitted through BSPs.
- ii. Section 145 of the Greater London Authority Act 1999 ('the GLA Act'), states that London local authorities must prepare Local Implementation Plans (LIPs) containing their proposals for the implementation of the Mayor's Transport Strategy in their areas.
- iii. Under the Greater London Authority Act 1999, The Mayor of London, Ken Livingstone is empowered, through TfL, to provide grants to London Boroughs to assist with the implementation of the Transport Strategy. TfL are charged with responsibility of ensuring that the key rationale for allocating grants is the delivery of the Mayor's Transport Strategy.

7. PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

The Council's Improvement Plan includes:

- Objective 1e.i - "Consult on Draft Local Implementation Plan" and;
 Objective 1e.ii - "Submit LIP to obtain Approval by Mayor of London".

8. PUTTING ENFIELD FIRST

Seeking to address the transport issues of Enfield is consistent with 'Putting Enfield First'.

AIM 1: A cleaner greener Enfield

- 1b) Upgrade and improve Enfield's roads and pavements.
- 1e) Deliver improvements to Enfield's transport links by working with our North London partners.

AIM 3: A safer Enfield to live, work, study and do business

- 3a) Work to achieve a safer, stronger Enfield through development of the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership.
- 3b) Work with partners to reduce crime and anti-social behaviour and respond to the fear of crime.
- 3c) Promote public safety in Enfield by the use of CCTV, and improve safety on roads and in the home.

Background Papers

- The Mayor's Transport Strategy for London, Greater London Authority - July 2001
- Local Implementation Plan Guidance, Transport for London - July 2004
- Enfield's Draft Consultation Local Implementation Plan – December 2005
- TfL's response to Enfield's Draft Local Implementation Plan – March 2006.
- Enfield's Final Local Implementation Plan – June 2006

1. INTRODUCTION

The subject of this document is the submission of Enfield's Local Implementation Plan to Transport for London. In particular, the document seeks to highlight the key aspects of the policies and perspectives on which the development of the final version of the Local Implementation Plan is to be based relative to the draft version that was published for public and statutory consultation in December 2005. The development of the final version is essentially a redrafting of that consultation draft LIP that was submitted to the Mayor of London. By way of its' response to Enfield's draft LIP, TfL had made extensive comments and observations running into well over one hundred pages; this document concentrates specifically on those issues which may clearly be considered more fundamental in that they entail essential political / policy considerations going clearly beyond the solely technical / descriptive considerations of redrafting the LIP against the background of TfL's comments.

2. BACKGROUND

Since the receipt of TfL's responses to the Draft LIP in March 2006, officers held two detailed discussions with Cllr Neville. The purpose of these two discussions was as follows:

The first discussion, held on the 30th of March 2006, was aimed essentially at establishing an adequate background appreciation of the stance that TfL were taking on Enfield's draft LIP and at initiating Enfield's consideration of how to deal with TfL's comments and the demands that TfL were making to Enfield to include when developing Enfield's final LIP. The first meeting also identified the relatively more controversial items that needed greater attention from Cllr Neville for further perusal.

The second discussion with Cllr Neville was held, on the 3rd of May 2006, in order to confirm and further clarify the council's perspective to be reflected in the process of redrafting the LIP. It was also aimed at arriving at a definitive internally fully consolidated position on the matters of particular concern with regard to divergence between Enfield's perspective and that of TfL because Enfield would then be in a sound position to explain its' stance on such matters to TfL.

With the positions confirmed by Cllr Neville at the second meeting, officers from Enfield met with officers of TfL responsible for the assessment of several work programme areas of the LIP. This meeting took place, at TfL, on the 16th of May 2006 and was effectively a prelude to Cllr Neville and Enfield's officers meeting with senior management, concerned with the LIP approvals, within TfL.

The meeting between senior management at TfL and Cllr Neville accompanied by officers from Enfield took place on the 23rd of May 2006. Cllr Neville stressed, to TfL, that whilst the LIP must be influenced by, and seek to comply with, the Mayor's Transport Strategy, there was also a need to ensure that the needs and priorities of the Borough of Enfield, as clearly stated manifesto commitments, are also properly represented in the LIP. At this particular meeting, in addition to a general discussion on Enfield's policies, priorities and perspectives, TfL's attention was specifically drawn to Enfield's stand on the following matters:

A. Traffic reduction targets – the difficulties of not having adequate baseline data, lack of proper definition in the target as set by TfL, rising real levels of public transport fares, acute lack of orbital transport and limitation of alternatives to car dependency, safety and security considerations as obstacles to traffic reduction and how these aspects make it extremely difficult to induce traffic reduction in outer London situations, the need for the council to honour the explicit manifesto commitment relevant to traffic, made at the recent council elections, held earlier this month, to facilitate traffic movement and to address the issue of congestion rather than traffic reduction against the background of particularly high levels of car ownership of the order of 1200 cars per 1000 households. The council will not accept

an anti-car attitude nor implement anti-car measures. However, Enfield will maximise its' contribution to congestion reduction by encouraging and inducing appropriate modal shifts, particularly in the peak hours, rather than make unrealistic and costly attempts to pursue ill defined traffic reduction targets. Enfield will also seek to contribute to growth in car sharing and car clubs. It is to be appreciated that by 'traffic', TfL implies the totality of movement and TfL appreciates that the situation in outer London is clearly different from that which obtains in central London.

B. Reallocation of road space – The very limited possibilities in Enfield without jeopardising safety, the complexity of functions served by practically all the significant routes, the lack of adequate public transport access to large parts of the population. practical experience with limitations of use where cycling provision has been implemented, limitations of land acquisition possibilities were explained. However, rather than unrealistic attempts at road space reallocation, Enfield will support and implement the fullest obtainable encouraging conditions on the streets for pedestrians and cyclists. Enfield appreciates the need to complete the LCN routes but, in view of local circumstances, will ask for flexibility with regard to completion time limits and implementation of local priority routes. These encouraging conditions will be induced mainly by increasing safety and security for pedestrians and cyclists through properly planned maintenance, significant improvements in street lighting through a PFI contract and publicity of health and fitness benefits etc. Enfield are spending very substantial amounts of its' own resources on footway improvements. In all considerations of allocating road space, audited usage figures will be the essential basis of assessment.

C. Bus priority and bus stop clearways – Enfield has clearly demonstrated the fullest commitment to bus priority and facilitating the movement of bus traffic particularly on LBI and major bus routes. However, there are many roads in Enfield of substantially residential character where it is not justified to implement bus priority and undo clearway restrictions to excessively hinder residents' parking where they have no alternative. These pressures are manifested in electoral pressures to which the local authority has to be sensitive. There are situations where bus priority measures are not justified by actual usage levels. These should be decided on the basis of audited bus usage figures; subject to such audit, Enfield will support and facilitate bus movement in the fullest measure and ensure that all other programmes are considered and implemented carefully to serve the recognised needs of efficient movement of buses.

D. Development of Park and Ride facilities and CPZs – TfL needs to appreciate that the reality is that park and ride facilities are clearly dependent on responses to local sensitivities; Enfield has particular experience of this issue though cases such as Hadley Wood. The limitation on land availability too is very restrictive. There is also the potential conflict between requirements for Enfield to put forward CPZ proposals and Park & Ride proposals. On CPZs, there is a need to consider the fact that undue introduction may induce people to make whole trips by car rather than only a relatively short part of the trip by car. The council also needs to accept that Enfield's own residents have parking needs around stations. However, Enfield will make the maximum possible contribution to encourage people to shorten car trips and use trains more through innovative schemes and consider, for instance, discount parking schemes which will facilitate shift away from car use.

E. Development of School Travel Plans – Enfield are convinced that carefully designed school bus projects can make a very effective contribution to addressing the issues of peak hour congestion at sensitive locations. A few years ago, Enfield offered to pilot a school bus project. Enfield would like a clarification on the prospects for a financial contribution from TfL towards such a project. Behavioural issues surrounding the use of bus services used by secondary school pupils by other members of the public is a well-known issue. Enfield will explore innovative means of initiating school transport schemes by pooling the resources used in Door-to-Door transport. TfL asked it to be noted that such measures may be considered ‘High Risk’ in terms of being able to deliver targets.

3. TfL’s ISSUES AND ENFIELD’S RESPONSES – THE BASIS OF THE FINAL LIP

A rational approach to representing and recording the positions, from Enfield’s perspective, arrived at through the above four meetings is to provide extracts from Part C of TfL’s response document sent to Enfield; the extraction represents those issues which may clearly be considered more fundamental in that they entail essential political / policy considerations going clearly beyond the solely technical / descriptive considerations of redrafting the LIP against the background of TfL’s comments .

The following table gives, in column 8, the essential ‘pointers’ to Enfield’s response/rebuttal of TfL’s comments on the more fundamental issues as given in column 7; further, the positions stated in column 8 will also form the basis of Enfield’s perspective in the Final LIP to be submitted to TfL in July 2006.

EXTRACT FROM PART C of TfL's RESPONSE DOCUMENT - POINTS for CONFIRMATION / AMENDMENT
by COUNCILLOR NEVILLE

REF	PRIORITY	POLICY OR PROPOSAL	BOROUGH RESPONSE	MUST OR ENCOURAGED INCLUDED	LIP PAGE REF	OBSERVATION IN TFL'S Response to ENFIELD's Draft LIP	ENFIELD's POSITION / PERSPECTIVE
4E.Pr8		Proposal 4E.Pr8: TfL will work with the SRA to ensure: additional network capacity for freight is provided to tackle existing pinch-points and to ensure that the growth in rail freight does not impose limitations on existing or planned passenger services; the development of freight bypass routes around London, wherever possible removing non-London traffic from dense residential areas and releasing capacity for expanded passenger services and London-based freight.	Boroughs are encouraged to identify sites for freight handling in their planning documents.	No		The LIP does not identify any existing or potential sites for rail freight facilities or refer to a process to do so. The LIP does not reject (or justify) the availability of rail freight facilities in the borough and this should be addressed in the Final LIP.	1. This is an issue which is dependent on commercial viability and therefore specific feasibility studies alone can inform decisions; it is impossible to generally cover the issue of identification of Rail Freight sites without proper site(s) specific analyses of economic viability.
4E.Po3		Policy 4E.Po3: Railtrack (Network Rail), Train Operating Companies and the London boroughs should consider proposals to increase parking to ensure they achieve a net gain for sustainable modes from the car, and have regard to the local traffic, access and environmental impacts. The Mayor will have regard to these criteria in considering cases in which he has a planning remit.	Boroughs are encouraged to include a programme for review of existing parking provision	Yes	PEP 4.22, 5.6 & PEP Rec 22PEP 4.22, 5.6 & PEP Rec 22	The number of existing car parking spaces at stations is noted but no approaches or initiatives follow. There is a comprehensive approach to reviewing CPZ, many of which are around NR stations, and amongst the objectives given in PEP Rec 22 (on CPZs) is the need to assist public transport operators, a criterion which could lead to either a strengthening or relaxing of CPZ	2. CPZ considerations are very site specific and are clearly subject to specific consultation outcomes and local sensitivities; availability and acquisition of land is a very acute consideration in parking provision at stations. A key issue is that in very many localities in Enfield, public transport accessibility is low and unless parking provision is adequate at stations, many people will be constrained or motivated to do the whole journey by car because bus penetration is quite low into many residential areas. These conflicting aspects need to be addressed in a way that takes account of site particularities.

REF	PRIORITY	POLICY OR PROPOSAL	BOROUGH RESPONSE	MUST OR ENCOURAGED INCLUDED	LIP PAGE REF	OBSERVATION IN TFL'S Response to ENFIELD's Draft LIP	ENFIELD'S POSITION / PERSPECTIVE
						controls.	
4F.Pr7	II	Proposal 4F.Pr7: All bus routes will be effectively enforced, to protect against illegal stopping and other traffic offences, using cameras wherever possible. Emergency vehicles operated by the police, London Ambulance Service or London Fire Service will be able to use bus lanes at all times. All bus stops on routes with 24-hour bus services or routes in the ondon Bus Initiative or London Bus Priority Network will have 24-hour bus stop clearways. At other stops there will be a general presumption in favour of 24-hour clearways, but as a minimum, there must be clearways that cover the operating hours of the bus route. (Camera enforcement by April 2002 – see Proposal 4G.Pr4. Bus stop clearways programme to be covered in boroughs' Parking and Enforcement Plans, with completion by the end of 2006 – see Proposal 4G.Pr17.)	Boroughs must include a summary or reference to the boroughs' enforcement Service Level Agreements (or equivalent) with TfL, and details of how these will be regularly reviewed and monitored.	No	p38 8.10	Enfield makes reference to the former London Bus Initiative but does not specifically mention the Service Level Agreement. The borough must refer to the agreement and make reference to its enforcement strategy.	3. Enfield supports, fully, effective enforcement. However, Enfield's view is that all considerations must be based on actually AUDITED BUS USAGE figures by relevant time periods and location and not based on the mere number of bus routes. We clearly refer to Service Level Agreement and enforcement in our draft LIP. Enfield are also presently seeking legal clarification on this issue with regard to the Disability Discrimination Act; as this is a common issue for all boroughs, the ALG is engaged in this process.
			Boroughs must set out the local clearways programme.	Yes	LIP matrix p. 29	There is a statement that all bus stops on the LBI network are now fully accessible and protected by 24-hour bus stop clearways. This is welcome, as is a statement that a programme for bus stop clearways is currently being prepared.	4. Acceptable on LBI network and main roads but Enfield will not accept 24 Hour clearways on roads which are essentially residential in character and there are the reasonable parking needs of residents who have no realistic alternatives. The criterion should be based on AUDITED BUS USAGE figures on LBI and major roads.

REF	PRIORITY	POLICY OR PROPOSAL	BOROUGH RESPONSE	MUST OR ENCOURAGED INCLUDED	LIP PAGE REF	OBSERVATION IN TFL'S Response to ENFIELD'S Draft LIP	ENFIELD'S POSITION / PERSPECTIVE
4F.Pr8	III	<p>Proposal 4F.Pr8: TfL and the boroughs will promote and implement a package of whole route enhanced, intensified and enforced bus priority measures on major bus corridors. Together with other complementary measures, this will provide a high quality, fully accessible bus network on the London Bus Initiative BusPlus routes. (The target date for the completion of Stage One is April 2002 and, by the end of 2002, elements complementary to central London congestion charging scheme will be completed. High levels of priority will be given on all major bus corridors by 2011.)</p>	<p>Boroughs must include agreed programmes, plans and proposals to demonstrate delivery of high levels of bus priority on 'A' Roads and Busy Bus Routes.</p>	No		<p>There is a statement that high levels of bus priority were delivered on the A1010, A105 and A110 as part of the LBI project, as well as on Flagship route 149. There is considered to be limited opportunities for further enhancement on main bus corridors, but they will be kept under review.</p> <p>The Final LIP must include more of a commitment towards future development of bus priority, in addition to a reference and support for the recently agreed scoping studies (arising from pre-scoping 68 routes) selected for progression which includes route 329 within LB Enfield would be of benefit.</p>	<p>5. Bus priority should be as appropriate and not for the sake of a general principle and should be based on AUDITED BUS USAGE figures; Enfield will take due account of scoping studies.</p>

REF	PRIORITY	POLICY OR PROPOSAL	BOROUGH RESPONSE	MUST OR ENCOURAGED INCLUDED	LIP PAGE REF	OBSERVATION IN TFL'S Response to ENFIELD's Draft LIP	ENFIELD's POSITION / PERSPECTIVE
			Boroughs must demonstrate that consistent and high levels of traffic enforcement will be integral to their proposals and that there is consistency with the accessible bus network proposals.	No		The LIP matrix refers to 9 bus lane enforcement cameras and 3 other cameras in Enfield town centre. However this is rather too limited a response to this proposal which should be expanded in the Final LIP. Cameras are not the only form of enforcement of bus routes and priority measures. No standards are provided for gritting of bus routes. These must be set out in the Final LIP.	6. Enfield supports good and effective Enforcement but it needs to be resource effective. Enfield will include reference to winter maintenance plans in final LIP.
			Boroughs must demonstrate that all boroughs' road proposals and programmes include measures that mitigate any significant adverse impacts on buses on major bus corridors.	No		The LIP contains no specific statement concerning this proposal; this must be included in the Final LIP.	7. Major Bus corridors are covered. It is also to be pointed out that all such relevant activity is the subject of appropriate consultation and liaison with bus operators.

REF	PRIORITY	POLICY OR PROPOSAL	BOROUGH RESPONSE	MUST OR ENCOURAGED INCLUDED	LIP PAGE REF	OBSERVATION IN TFL'S Response to ENFIELD's Draft LIP	ENFIELD'S POSITION / PERSPECTIVE
4F.Pr1 1	V	Proposal 4F.Pr11: TfL and the London boroughs will develop and implement a long-term programme so that all bus stops have appropriate passenger facilities and can be served effectively by low floor buses. (The initial phases will be included in the London Bus Initiative, so will be delivered within the timetable of that programme. The Mayor wants TfL and the London boroughs to develop a further programme and costed timetable by early 2002.)	Boroughs must set out their programme for making all bus stops accessible.	No	Matrix p31 App A 4-6, 5-88, p29, Form 12 - BSA	Many bus stops in the borough are already accessible; the borough proposes to roll out bus stop improvements on all borough roads. The Final LIP should indicate any further plans for enforcement of clearways at bus stops and any plans to review accessibility of bus stops through user consultation/survey The wording of the borough's response needs to be strengthened to demonstrate how the borough will make all bus stops accessible as well as timescales.	8. Audited figures of Bus Stop usage will be the basis for priority; the needs of residents where there is no adequate off street parking also need to be considered particularly in the outer London context. The council is not aware of significant public demand for such measures; the public are far more concerned about bus services.
4G.Pr2		Proposal 4G.Pr2: TfL will work with the Police, the Association of London Government, the boroughs, the Driver and Vehicle Licensing Agency and other relevant parties to develop and begin implementation of the Outline Enforcement Plan to deliver better traffic enforcement and vehicle registration throughout Greater London. (Outline Enforcement Plan implementation to begin by the end of 2002.)	Boroughs are encouraged to work with other agencies to improve data sharing protocols, including their participation in or support of the work of the ETF.	No	p39 8.14-8.16	The LIP acknowledges the persistent evader problem but the recommendation in their PEP uses the word 'should seek to' and gives no specific details of a policy. The borough should give consideration to contributing to the Persistent Evaders Database which is held by the ALG on behalf of the ETF.	9. Enfield are actively engaged through projects such as those initiated by our Environmental Crime Unit . Enfield will consider participating in the Database subject to fee considerations.

REF	PRIORITY	POLICY OR PROPOSAL	BOROUGH RESPONSE	MUST OR ENCOURAGED INCLUDED	LIP PAGE REF	OBSERVATION IN TFL'S Response to ENFIELD's Draft LIP	ENFIELD's POSITION / PERSPECTIVE
4G.Pr3		Proposal 4G.Pr3: TfL in conjunction with the London boroughs will press the Government to introduce new legislation to allow further non-endorsable traffic offences to be enforced on all streets through the decriminalized system. (New legislation to be introduced by the end of 2002.)	Boroughs are encouraged to set out any relevant plans.	Yes	p40 8.20	The borough states that it is enforcing the powers set out in Section 14 of the London Local Authorities and Transport for London Act 2003 to allow enforcement against obstructive parking across driveways / dropped footways. The borough is encouraged to adopt the powers relating to enforcement of moving traffic contraventions contained within the same piece of legislation.	10. Agreed – Will include in final LIP

REF	PRIORITY	POLICY OR PROPOSAL	BOROUGH RESPONSE	MUST OR ENCOURAGED INCLUDED	LIP PAGE REF	OBSERVATION IN TFL'S Response to ENFIELD's Draft LIP	ENFIELD'S POSITION / PERSPECTIVE
4G.Pr1 2	III	Proposal 4G.Pr12: The Strategy adopts a target for 2011 of absolute reductions in weekday traffic of 15 percent in Central London, zero growth across the rest of inner London, and reducing growth in outer London by a third, with the aim of achieving zero growth or absolute reductions in outer London town centres. This will provide a context for the London boroughs' road traffic reduction responsibilities. The London boroughs will be expected to play a key role in achieving or exceeding these targets through road traffic reduction initiatives introduced at local level. This target will be kept under review in the light of monitoring evidence.	Boroughs must include their local traffic growth forecasts and set out how they expect their policies to contribute to meeting the traffic reduction targets in Proposal 4G.Pr12.	No		A target has not yet been determined by the borough. The borough states that with the current statistics it is not possible to set a target. It is unclear from the LIP how the borough will seek to control traffic volumes as one of the underlying focuses of the LIP appears not to attempt to restrict the use of the car, but rather ensure the expeditious movement of traffic within the borough. This must be fully addressed in the Final LIP.	11. The difficulties of not having adequate baseline data, lack of proper definition in the target as set by TfL, rising real levels of public transport fares, lack of orbital transport and limitation of alternatives to car dependency, safety and security considerations as obstacles to traffic reduction and how these aspects make it extremely difficult to induce traffic reduction in outer London situations, the need for the council to honour the explicit manifesto commitment at the recent council elections ,held earlier this month, to facilitate traffic movement and to address the issue of congestion rather than traffic reduction against the background of particularly high levels of car ownership of the order of 1200 cars per 1000 households. The council will not accept an anti-car attitude. However, Enfield will maximise its' contribution to encouraging and inducing modal shift in order to reduce congestion, particularly in the peak hours, rather than make unrealistic attempts to pursue ill defined traffic reduction targets. Enfield will also seek to contribute to growth in car sharing and car clubs. It is to be appreciated that by 'traffic', TfL implies the totality of movement and TfL appreciates that the situation in outer London is clearly different from that which obtains in central London.

REF	PRIORITY	POLICY OR PROPOSAL	BOROUGH RESPONSE	MUST OR ENCOURAGED INCLUDED	LIP PAGE REF	OBSERVATION IN TFL'S Response to ENFIELD's Draft LIP	ENFIELD's POSITION / PERSPECTIVE
			Boroughs must also set out schemes and activities to reduce traffic growth.	No		The two proposal forms associated with the delivery of this proposal relates to school travel plans and travel awareness. Yet on page 9-9 of the LIP it is stated that it appears that mode shift is not influenced by the STP/SRtS programme. The borough must set out schemes and activities that reduce traffic growth and this could be far more wide reaching and specific than those proposed, for example parking controls, improvements to walking and cycling, traffic management schemes etc. In addition, the borough must explain how their proposals and policies will contribute towards traffic reduction targets.	<p>12. Enfield Council are not anti motorists; it needs to be borne in mind that legislation on parking was never intended to serve traffic reduction objectives as such but for the proper management of traffic.</p> <p>Enfield is keen to support innovative ideas aimed at reducing traffic growth. In particular, Enfield wishes to address the problems of peak hour traffic through advocating provision of dedicated Schools Transport by bus. Enfield contributed significantly to the research study on the potential of schools buses carried out by London Buses. Enfield is seeking pump priming funding to initiate pilot studies on local schools bus services.</p>

REF	PRIORITY	POLICY OR PROPOSAL	BOROUGH RESPONSE	MUST OR ENCOURAGED INCLUDED	LIP PAGE REF	OBSERVATION IN TFL'S Response to ENFIELD's Draft LIP	ENFIELD's POSITION / PERSPECTIVE
			Appropriate boroughs must not adopt policies nor implement projects that compromise the traffic reduction benefits achieved by the Central London CCS.	N/A			
4G.P5		Policy 4G.Po5: The creation of new or extended Controlled Parking Zones will be supported, particularly in inner London, outer London town centres, and around Underground and rail stations where parking pressures and conflicts are acute.	Boroughs are encouraged to include in their Parking and Enforcement Plans a programme for identification, review and implementation of potential new CPZs, including funding assumptions. Boroughs are encouraged to refer to 'Parking and Enforcement Guidance for Local Authorities' contained in Appendix E of LIP Guidance. It is noted that the introduction of CPZs is subject to public consultation.	No		The PEP should make reference to the funding assumptions for CPZs contained within Form 18-PC.	13. There is a need to provide adequately for Park & Ride because a high proportion of residents have no realistic alternative and , without such provision , they will be constrained to make even longer car trips. At certain stations, without the provision of on street parking within a reasonable distance, people will be compelled to make longer car journeys.

REF	PRIORITY	POLICY OR PROPOSAL	BOROUGH RESPONSE	MUST OR ENCOURAGED INCLUDED	LIP PAGE REF	OBSERVATION IN TFL'S Response to ENFIELD's Draft LIP	ENFIELD's POSITION / PERSPECTIVE
4G.Pr26	VIII	Proposal 4G.Pr26: TfL will work with the London boroughs to develop a long term approach to the funding and management of all aspects of street maintenance throughout London. (Long-term approach to be developed by 2003.)	Boroughs must refer to the Street Maintenance Strategy (published by TfL in June 2003) and Street Maintenance Plans in preparing their LIP.	Yes	P356	The borough has stated their commitment to creating a Highway Asset Management Plan detailing how it plans to manage the highways over the next 10 years.	
			Boroughs are encouraged to include a statement of their policy regarding hours of operation of roadworks.	No		No policy on hours for roadworks could be located: the Final LIP would benefit from the inclusion of such a statement.	14. Enfield accepts the consideration on appropriate main roads.

REF	PRIORITY	POLICY OR PROPOSAL	BOROUGH RESPONSE	MUST OR ENCOURAGED INCLUDED	LIP PAGE REF	OBSERVATION IN TFL'S Response to ENFIELD'S Draft LIP	ENFIELD'S POSITION / PERSPECTIVE
4H.Pr2	IV	Proposal 4H.Pr2: TfL, working with Railtrack and train operating companies, in consultation with local authorities and Regional Assemblies, will review current provision of car parking at Underground and National Rail stations, bringing forward plans to upgrade and extend provision where this will result in shortening of car journeys and an overall reduction in car use within and beyond London. A high priority will be given to accessible parking for disabled motorists. (Review to be completed by the end of 2002.)	Boroughs must include an indication of any sites the borough considers suitable for park-and-ride, or any plans the borough has to conduct a review of potential sites in line with the criteria in 4H.Pr2. (This is particularly relevant for outer London boroughs.)	Yes	PEP 12.5, 12.6 PEP p58 Matrix p52, PEP73	The borough has looked into the possibility of park and ride and identified two potentially suitable areas, if the opportunity arises it will look further into the demonstrable benefits. PEP 73 states that the borough will look to introduce P&R where there are clear benefits in doing so. While 2 sites have been investigated, the Final LIP would benefit by an explanation as to why these sites have been identified and how they would use the Park & Ride Framework as part of any assessment. If any of the sites are to be utilised the borough must detail how they will be progressed.	15. Essentially dependent on specific consultation outcomes ; Enfield will provide explanations about the two sides.

REF	PRIORITY	POLICY OR PROPOSAL	BOROUGH RESPONSE	MUST OR ENCOURAGED INCLUDED	LIP PAGE REF	OBSERVATION IN TFL'S Response to ENFIELD's Draft LIP	ENFIELD's POSITION / PERSPECTIVE
			Boroughs are encouraged to identify appropriate proposals for other car parking at stations.	No	PEP 5.6, D101 PEP 5-69	The Final LIP would benefit by the inclusion of any plans to extend parking provision at stations where it will result in shortening of car journeys; giving consideration to disabled parking standards e.g. minimum of 6% parking spaces for disabled (Inclusive mobility guidelines).	16. The limitation of land availability is a severe constraint ; Enfield has a policy of adequate provision for disabled parking. There also appears to be a potential contradiction with TfL's position on CPZs.
4H.Pr3	III	Proposal 4H.Pr3: The London boroughs and businesses will be encouraged to support the development and introduction of car sharing schemes and city car clubs.	Boroughs with such schemes and clubs must set out their programme for the further establishment and development of car share and car club schemes, where justified by local conditions. Other boroughs are encouraged to set out their plans for such schemes and clubs.	No	P52 and 15.3 (P200)	A mention of car clubs and car sharing is present but there is no commitment or work programme provided. Further information on if/when they will be reviewing the introduction of these should be included in the Final LIP. It is also unclear whether the trial of a web based car sharing scheme in North London, launched in May 2002 and was planned to run for 2 years, is still being used.	17. Results of any actually quantifiable effects of the Website will be reported and will inform the consideration of car clubs. A strong limitation to progress is the fear of crime – attracting lift share propositions from undesirable elements through the web site. But Enfield will take reasonable measures to increase take up.

REF	PRIORITY	POLICY OR PROPOSAL	BOROUGH RESPONSE	MUST OR ENCOURAGED INCLUDED	LIP PAGE REF	OBSERVATION IN TFL'S Response to ENFIELD'S Draft LIP	ENFIELD'S POSITION / PERSPECTIVE
4l.Pr4	VI	Proposal 4l.Pr4: TfL will progress the World Squares For All Project, with the partial pedestrianisation of Trafalgar Square as the first stage. TfL will work in partnership with the London boroughs and the Police to ensure that these and other pedestrianised areas are effectively managed. (The first stage of pedestrianisation of Trafalgar Square, outside the National Gallery, should be completed by the middle of 2003.)	The City of Westminster must set out how scheme management will be continued in Trafalgar Square and developed, when appropriate, for Parliament Square. Boroughs must describe the management principles relating to the operation of other pedestrianised area projects that are being developed, where appropriate.	No		Enfield has not detailed any potential pedestrianised areas, nor its management principles for such areas.	18. Enfield Town is the only possibility but will depend very crucially on consultation outcomes.
4l.Pr7	VI	Proposal 4l.Pr7: TfL and the London boroughs will be required to review all traffic signal junctions and implement pedestrian phases wherever practicable, taking account of the impact on priority traffic, such as buses. (Twenty sites on TLRN to be investigated each year, with further sites investigated on London borough roads.)	Boroughs must set out the priorities and programme(s) for the investigation and introduction of pedestrian phases.	No		This has not been included in the LIP and it must be included in the Final LIP.	19. There are severe limitations of such a programme arising from TfL's own capacity problems in providing the relevant services. There are schemes such as Hedge Lane , London N13 which Enfield will support and include; this is an example of where , in view of the accident record , Enfield requested modifications to the signals at the junction but have been delayed on account of the demand pressures on the Traffic Technology Systems service within TfL . The demand pressure on TSS were in fact communicated to London Boroughs , by TfL , through letters .

REF	PRIORITY	POLICY OR PROPOSAL	BOROUGH RESPONSE	MUST OR ENCOURAGED INCLUDED	LIP PAGE REF	OBSERVATION IN TFL'S Response to ENFIELD's Draft LIP	ENFIELD's POSITION / PERSPECTIVE
			Mitigation measures to minimise significant adverse impacts on buses must also be taken into account. The programme must take account of any impacts on all the targets in Table 4-1.	No		This must be addressed in the Final LIP.	20 See 19 above and, Audited Usage Figures need to be taken into account.

REF	PRIORITY	POLICY OR PROPOSAL	BOROUGH RESPONSE	MUST OR ENCOURAGED INCLUDED	LIP PAGE REF	OBSERVATION IN TFL'S Response to ENFIELD'S Draft LIP	ENFIELD'S POSITION / PERSPECTIVE
41.Pr8	VI	Proposal 41.Pr8: Programmes of improvements will be developed by TfL and the London boroughs to make the street environment more accessible, removing barriers and obstructions that make it difficult or unsafe for pedestrians to use the street. (Programme to be developed by the end of 2002.)	Boroughs must set out their programmes of footway improvements, including access improvements and accessibility improvements to bus stops.	No	5-37 to 5-47 12.5 Table 5.22 5-76 5-80 – 5-88	Enfield has in place a programme of bus stop accessibility and bus stop upgrade works. This programme is ongoing and will continue over the period of the LIP. Detail is provided in the Form 1 but not within the main body of text. It would be beneficial to have page reference annotation in the Final LIP. As part of the borough's Bus Stop Accessibility proposal, improvements to footways are proposed. The Final LIP must provide a programme to improve the footways, for example, dropped / raised kerbs and the removal of barriers/obstructions.	21. Enfield has spent very considerable amounts of own resources on improving footways . Enfield's BVPI on dropped kerbs is very good .
			Boroughs must consult on local pedestrian priorities when preparing programme of access improvements.	No	5-37 to 5-47 Ch.1, 10 p. 13 form 12	Although the borough makes reference to consultation, it does not outline how it will undertake specific consultation on pedestrian priorities relating to access priorities. The Final LIP must fully address this.	

REF	PRIORITY	POLICY OR PROPOSAL	BOROUGH RESPONSE	MUST OR ENCOURAGED INCLUDED	LIP PAGE REF	OBSERVATION IN TFL'S Response to ENFIELD's Draft LIP	ENFIELD's POSITION / PERSPECTIVE
4M.Pr2		Proposal 4M.Pr2: TfL will work with relevant partners to identify options for increasing freight use of the River Thames and other waterways. (Proposals to be made by the end of 2002.)	Relevant boroughs are encouraged to set out any measures they are implementing on relevant issues e.g. safeguarding wharves and facilities, access to river.	No	LIP Matrix	The borough is encouraged to address this proposal. Ponders End Wharf exits in this borough. The Final LIP would benefit from a mention of this and how the borough intends to safeguard its development. The LIP Matrix states "Chapter 3 – Enfield's Transport Objectives". However, no measures (which they may be implementing on relevant issues e.g. safeguarding wharves and facilities, access to river) are set out.	22. Enfield will make a preliminary investigation but the economic viability considerations will be the prime determinant. The Council's policy is to remove all possible street clutter .

4N.Pr 1		<p>Proposal 4N.Pr1: TfL, in consultation with the taxi and private hire trade and other interested parties, is carrying out an extensive review of taxis and PHVs and will bring forward proposals, with the aim of improving personal safety for passengers, improving the supply, and enhancing passengers' travel experience. (Initial findings of the review will be reported in summer 2001, with specific short term proposals, following consultation with the trade. There will be a continuing review of policy and further proposals are expected to be put forward in 2002.)</p>	<p>Boroughs are encouraged to include proposals in line with the PCO best practice guidelines, to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - new provision, especially at key sites of new and improved taxi ranks, for example at railways / bus stations and in town centres, and - identification of key points of contact. 	Yes	<p>Chapter 3; Appx A p67, 5-69 11.1 p 170</p>	<p>As part of the borough's station access proposal, new taxi ranks are included. The PEP recommends drop off/pick up points in town centres but it is unclear whether this includes taxi ranks and this should be clarified in the Final LIP.</p>	<p>23. Taxi Ranks will be considered where appropriate ; the availability of taxi demand call provision privately provided will be taken into consideration in order to avoid unrequired provision.</p>
------------	--	---	---	-----	---	--	--

			Boroughs are encouraged to promote the Mayor's 'Safer Travel at Night' initiatives and include their own proposals for improving safety and security including for woman and vulnerable groups.	No	Chapter 3; Appx A	There is some discussion but few specific proposals. The borough is encouraged to outline any other safer travel at night initiatives it proposes to adopt, for example, taxi hotlinks at key entertainment venues and distribution of safer travel at night information at key locations.	
4O.Pr 13	V	Proposal 4O.Pr13: Disabled parking should be provided in convenient locations, for existing and new developments, to enable easy access to activities and facilities. Existing facilities should be reviewed to ensure there is sufficient disabled parking provided at key locations. (The review is to be included in the London boroughs' Parking and Enforcement Plans.)	Boroughs must include plans for providing sufficient disabled parking at key locations.	No	Ch.5 20.3 p. 5-122 Appendix A, p.78, p.78 Draft PEP, Ch.7 p.32-36	No benchmark disability standards have been used. The borough proposes a disabled persons' parking review as part of its accessibility proposal.	24 The review will be carried out and Benchmarking will be considered
			Boroughs must seek views of local disabled motorists to determine potential key locations.	No	5-122 Appendix A pages 50 and 76.	The Disabled Parking Review on page 5-122 must be more specific as to the consultation strategy with disabled motorists. Enfield must also indicate how the views of disabled motorists will help determine key locations.	25 . Enfield will ensure that full consultations will be carried out.

4O.Pr 14	V	Proposal 4O.Pr14: TfL and the London boroughs will work with disability groups and the government to ensure the effective operation and enforcement of a reputable Blue Badge scheme and include a review of the central London disabled parking schemes. (The review is to be completed by the end of 2002.)	Boroughs must set out a programme which contributes to a robust and reputable Blue Badge scheme.	Yes	PEP Ch.7 p.33-36	As part of its action plan in the PEP, the borough plans to raise public awareness of misuse of the blue badge scheme. It is unclear which, if any proposals have incorporated this.	
4P.Pr 5	V	Proposal 4P.Pr5: TfL will work with the London boroughs, the British Transport Police, the Metropolitan Police, operators and trade unions to bring forward and implement initiatives for reducing transport-related crime and fear of crime. Interfaces will be managed to ensure consistent standards of safety are achieved.	Boroughs must set out their programme(s) to reduce transport related crime and the fear of crime. Boroughs must also state how this activity and its outcomes will be monitored.	No	3-7, 5-54, 5-69, Form 8-CS, Form 6-W, Form 10-SA, Appendix A p83,	Although the borough is promoting safety and security through its streets for people proposal, walking and station access, many of the initiatives are limited to lighting and CCTV. The borough is encouraged to consider other safer travel at night initiatives such as marshalled taxi ranks, taxi hot points, distribution of safer travel information and consulting people from equality target groups for which safety is a key concern, e.g. women, older people, BME, lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people. The Final LIP must explain in greater detail how they will achieve this, and must specify any performance indicators, policies and processes that will ensure any activity relating to safety and security and its outcomes are monitored.	26. Enfield will take steps to improve safety for all residents and visitors. We accept that women are particularly vulnerable and therefore give relevant consideration. It is to be noted that the council can only make a contribution and that other agencies, including TfL, have responsibilities in this area

			<p>Boroughs also encouraged to promote the Mayor's 'Safer at Night' initiatives particularly in terms of personal safety in getting to and from rail stations, bus stations and bus stops.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>55-169 p389</p>	<p>The borough is incorporating safer travel at night initiatives into its station access proposal by introducing new taxi ranks. The borough has a programme in place for improving street lighting and the expansion of CCTV.</p>	
--	--	--	--	------------	--------------------	---	--