

MUNICIPAL YEAR 2015/2016 REPORT NO.

ACTION TO BE TAKEN UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY

PORTFOLIO DECISION OF:
Cabinet Member for Environment

REPORT OF:
Director – Regeneration &
Environment

Agenda – Part: 1	KD Num: N/A
Subject: Junction Protection Programme – Mandeville Road Area	
Wards: Enfield Lock	

Contact officer and telephone number: Craig Gough – 020 8379 3566

E mail: craig.gough@enfield.gov.uk

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1. In recent years, the Council has received concerns from local residents and businesses regarding inconsiderate and obstructive on-street parking that can occur on residential roads within an area indicated in the drawings contained in Appendix B of this report.
- 1.2. Concerns have been raised that vehicles being parked at and in close proximity to junctions can restrict access, impair visibility and cause obstruction to pedestrians, particularly those with impaired mobility.
- 1.3. These concerns have also been raised by the Council's waste services team who have complained that parked cars are restricting access and impacting on their ability to undertake refuse and recycling collections.
- 1.4. We have therefore been asked to consider parking restrictions to keep junctions in the affected area clear of parked vehicles. This report considers the issues raised by local residents, discussions with local ward Councillors and the response to recent consultation with residents.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1. To consider and note comments in relation to a recent consultation on proposals to introduce new waiting restrictions at junctions.
- 2.2. To approve the making of the Traffic Management Order under the Road Traffic Regulations Act 1984 for the introduction of waiting restrictions as detailed in Appendix B of this report and at an estimated cost of £4,000. This is to be met from the Corridors, Neighbourhoods and Supporting Measures allocation for 2015/16 provided by TfL.

Corrected on master

3. BACKGROUND

- 3.1. Concerns have been raised with regard to vehicles being parked at or close to junctions and in a manner that is considered to be inconsiderate and obstructive. Those junctions are ~~of~~ roads that fall within an area indicated in drawings contained in Appendix B of this report.
- 3.2. The area in which these junctions are located is predominantly residential in nature. Those properties are a mixture of detached and semi-detached housing, high density terraced housing and apartment blocks.
- 3.3. All roads within this area are single carriageway and two-way. The area is street lit and all roads are subject to a speed limit of 30mph.
- 3.4. Access to off-street parking varies in this area. Some off-street parking is available in the form of private residential parking in car parks and garage areas. Many properties have converted front gardens in to areas of hard standing with footway crossovers for vehicle access, while a small proportion of properties have no access to off-street parking.
- 3.5. Parking restrictions currently existing at junctions at the northern end of Mandeville Road and partially cover some junctions of side roads along Park Road. Parking at junctions throughout the remainder of this area is currently unrestricted.
- 3.6. The concerns we have received generally relate to vehicles being parked at, or in close proximity to junctions. Those vehicles are said to be restricting access and visibility of oncoming traffic for motorists waiting to turn to or from the junction.
- 3.7. The Council's waste services team has also advised us of problems with access to properties in this area, due to vehicles being parked at, or close to junctions. This has led to missed or delayed collections.
- 3.8. Vehicles that are parked at or close to junctions can also restrict access for pedestrians who may wish to cross a road at a junction. This is a particular concern for pedestrians with impaired mobility. In such instances, pedestrians have no option but to cross the road between parked vehicles, or seek an alternative location away from their preferred crossing point.
- 3.9. To address these concerns, we have been asked to consider parking restrictions at junctions of roads throughout this area.

4. COLLISION RECORDS

- 4.1. We have analysed the collision records for all roads within the area. These records cover a three year period up to 28th February 2015.
- 4.2. Within this area, a total of four collisions have occurred, which have resulted in personal injury to a road user. All four resulted in slight injuries, one of which being to a cyclist and one to a pedestrian.

- 4.3. Of the four collisions, two occurred at or close to a junction. These being at the junction of Mandeville Road and Totteridge Road and the junction of Putney Road and Allandale Road. Both collisions involved turning vehicles.

5. PROPOSALS

- 5.1. We propose to introduce double yellow lines at junctions throughout this area. Many of the junctions are similar in character where high levels of on-street parking can often occur at or close to those junctions. Most junctions are currently unrestricted, although at a small number of those junctions, the proposals will include an extension of the existing double yellow lines.
- 5.2. Our proposals also include double yellow lines at sharp bends in three locations. These are being treated in a similar manner to junctions where vehicles are being parked at or close to the bends and cause obstruction to through and turning traffic.
- 5.3. Details of our proposals can be found in Appendix B of this report.

6. CONSULTATION

- 6.1. On 8th April of this year, we advertised our proposals. This was in the form of a public notice placed in the local press and the London Gazette. Copies of this notice were also placed on lamp columns throughout the affected area.
- 6.2. In addition to our statutory requirements, consultation leaflets were delivered to residents of properties that fronted our proposals. A copy of this leaflet was also sent to the relevant ward Councillors. A copy of this leaflet can be found in Appendix A of this report.
- 6.3. The consultation period closed on 29th April 2015.

6.4. Consultation Response

- 6.4.1. We received a total of 23 responses to the consultation.
- 6.4.2. Those responses consisted of four comments in support of the proposals and 15 objections. We also received four responses that contained comments but did not specially indicate either support or objection to the proposals. The objections received made specific reference to the following locations:
- Junction of Mandeville Road and Forest Road – 4 Objections;
 - Junction of Princes Avenue and Bedford Crescent – 2 Objections;
 - Junction of Mandeville Road and Park Road – 1 Objection;

6.5. Reasons for Objections

- 6.5.1. 12 residents refer to existing parking problems. It is a concern that levels of on-street parking have increased in recent years. It is claimed that it has

become increasingly difficult for residents to park their vehicles close to their own properties. They are concerned that the proposals will further exasperate those problems.

- 6.5.2. However, rather than being opposed to the provision of yellow lines, six of those residents consider the lengths of the double yellow lines to be excessive. They agree there is a need for yellow lines but suggest the proposed lengths be reduced.
- 6.5.3. Two residents who have access to off-street parking are concerned that a reduction in the availability of on-street parking will see access to their driveway blocked more frequently. Another resident is concerned that double yellow lines across their own access will also prevent them from parking there.
- 6.5.4. We have received four objections on the basis that on-street parking is not causing a problem in this area. They do not agree that access for large vehicles is being restricted, that waste collections are not affected, that pedestrian access is affected or that there is an increased risk of accidents.
- 6.5.5. Rather than provide double yellow lines, one resident has suggested the provision of single yellow lines that apply between the hours of 8am and 7pm. This to make the road more accessible for waste collections, deliveries etc. Outside of those hours, on-street parking would then be unrestricted and available to residents.
- 6.5.6. One resident refers to parking problems caused by parents of children who attend local schools. They also refer to commuters who use Enfield Lock Railway Station. The resident considers the proposals will bring no benefit to local residents and is concerned this was instigated by non-residents.
- 6.5.7. A resident disagrees with the opinion that vehicles are being parked in a manner that is inconsiderate, obstructive and even dangerous. They agree there is a problem with parking but have asked for an alternative solution stating "it is not a punitive solution needed but a constructive one".
- 6.5.8. One residents has objected on the basis that no accidents have occurred and there have been no injuries at their junction and questioned why these proposals have been made.
- 6.5.9. Adjacent to the junction of Mandeville Road and Cunningham Avenue is a car mechanic. One resident has commented that vehicles associated with this premises are being left on the road, in some cases for a prolonged period of time.
- 6.5.10. One resident is concerned that yellow lines will give the area a "high street look".

6.6. Response from Ward Councillors

6.6.1. We did not receive a response from ward Councillors during the consultation period.

6.7. Officer Response to Consultation

6.7.1. These proposals have been put forward in response to concerns that have been raised by local residents. The Council's Waste Services team has also reported difficulties in gaining access to some roads in the area which has led to late or missed collections. While some residents may not directly experience problems as a result of inconsiderate and obstructive parking, these concerns are clearly affecting others.

6.7.2. Access for the emergency services is also a particular concern. While the times of refuse collections can normally be predicted, emergency access cannot. It is therefore essential that the turning areas at junction should be kept clear of parked vehicles at all times.

6.7.3. Rule 243 of the Highway Code states: **DO NOT** stop or park opposite or within 10 metres (32 feet) of a junction, except in an authorised parking space. However, we do acknowledge that in some circumstances, to provide a length of yellow line over this distance can be excessive. To minimise the impact of yellow lines we do seek to provide the minimum length that is necessary to maintain unobstructed access.

6.7.4. We therefore use swept path analysis to assess the space that is required for an emergency vehicle to turn at each junction in a single movement. However, we would not recommend reducing those lengths of yellow line any further as any risk of unnecessary delay to emergency access is not considered acceptable.

6.7.5. Visibility for and of pedestrians waiting to cross at a junction can be impaired by parked vehicles and often, access to a safe and convenient crossing point can be restricted. This can be a particular concern for vulnerable road users, including those with impaired mobility, users of mobility scooters, push chairs, prams etc.

6.7.6. We would not consider part time restrictions to be appropriate at junctions as these are areas that should be kept clear at all times for a number of reasons as indicated above.

6.7.7. To address concerns of non-residents parking in this area, a controlled parking zone (CPZ) may be an appropriate. However, these schemes also have drawbacks such as the cost of residential permits, the need to introduce yellow lines across any driveways in the zone and the transfer of parking to streets outside the zone. Public consultation on such schemes is lengthy, resource intensive and always controversial.

6.7.8. The Council therefore expects residents to demonstrate that the majority of households in an area support the proposed CPZ. There is an also further criterion that must be met for an area to be considered suitable for a CPZ.

Residents may contact the Council's Traffic and Transportation team for further information.

- 6.7.9. However, this option would not address the immediate concerns caused by vehicles being parked at and in close proximity to junctions.

7. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 7.1. **Do nothing** – This would see some drivers continue to park their vehicles at or close to junctions and corners in this area. Access would continue to be affected which could impact on waste collections and potentially the emergency services.
- 7.2. **Alternative Measures** – Residents have asked for the proposed lengths of yellow lines at junction to be reduced. As indicated in this report, the Highway Code states drivers are not park a vehicle within 10 metres of a junction. We have analysed turning movements at these junctions and where possible, have put forward options for reduced lengths of yellow lines. We would not recommend any further reductions.
- 7.3. A controlled parking zone would only be considered if residents are able to demonstrate that the majority of households support that proposal. However, there is no clear indication and insufficient evidence to suggest this proposal would be supported at present and as such we would not recommend delaying this scheme by pursuing that option at this time.

8. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 8.1. Vehicles that are parked at, or close to junctions can cause obstruction and prevent larger vehicles from gaining access. Access for refuse collections and the emergency services can be restricted. Visibility for and of pedestrians waiting to cross at a junction can be impaired, as can access to a safe and convenient crossing point. This can be a particular concern for vulnerable road users, including those with impaired mobility.

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

9.1. Financial Implications

- 9.1.1. The estimated cost of implementing the traffic management order and proposed waiting restrictions is £4,000 and this will be met from the 2015/2016 Local Implementation Plan (LIP); TfL allocations; set aside for transport improvements in Enfield.
- 9.1.2. Expenditure once approved by Transport For London; it will be fully funded by means of direct grant from TFL; governed through the TFL Borough Portal, hence no costs fall on the Council. The release of funds by TFL is based on a process that records the progress of works against approved spending profiles. TFL makes payments against certified claims as soon as expenditure is incurred; ensuring that the Council benefits from prompt reimbursement of any expenditure.

9.1.3. LIP financial assistance is provided by TFL under Section 159 of the GLA Act 1999. The funding is provided to support local transport improvements that accord with the Mayor's Transport Strategy Goals and Outcomes.

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

9.2. Legal Implications

9.2.1. Under section 39 Road Traffic Act 1988 the Council has duties to promote road safety, to monitor road traffic accident locations and to take measures to prevent such accidents. This includes the improvement of roads, the movement of road traffic and traffic restrictions. The proposed waiting restrictions are in accordance with the discharge of those duties.

9.2.2. Pursuant to section 6 Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, the Council as traffic authority for the roads mentioned in this report, may make orders (Traffic Management Orders) for controlling or regulating vehicular traffic including orders that impose waiting restrictions.

9.2.3. Regulations contained in the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 prescribe the procedure to be followed in making a Traffic Management Order and require consultation with specific persons, publication of proposals in the local press and the giving of adequate publicity as appropriate by, for example, the display of notices or the delivery of letters to premises likely to be affected by any provision of the Order.

9.2.4. Before making an order the order making authority must conscientiously take in to account and consider all objections made in accordance with the regulations and not withdrawn.

9.2.5. The recommendations contained within this report are within the Council's powers and duties.

10. KEY RISKS

No significant risks have been identified.

11. IMPACT ON COUNCIL PRIORITIES

11.1. Fairness for All

11.1.1. These proposals will benefit the community by reducing congestion and road safety concerns that can be contributed to inconsiderate and obstructive on-street parking.

11.1.2. We do not anticipate any adverse impact on local businesses.

11.2. Growth and Sustainability

Reduced congestion at junctions, together with greater access for all road users, in particular pedestrians, will help to improve road safety. This will benefit the local community by improving the local environment and encourage people to use more sustainable methods of transport.

11.3. Strong Communities

The consultation for this proposal involved the community in the process of improving their local area.

12. EQUALITIES IMPACT IMPLICATIONS

Corporate advice has been sought in regard to equalities, and an agreement has been reached that for the approval of these proposals, an equalities impact assessment/analysis is neither relevant nor proportionate.

13. PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

The implementation of this scheme should directly contribute to the Council Business Plan objective "Improved sustainability of transport and reduce its impact on the borough".

14. PUBLIC HEALTH IMPLICATIONS

The aim of these proposals is to improve road safety for all road users by reducing accidents. Improved access to safe and convenient crossing points and pedestrian facilities can encourage more people to walk and promote a healthier lifestyle.

However, increased visibility at junctions may encourage faster driving. Consideration should therefore be given to building the junctions out so that drivers need to slow down when turning into the respective roads.

15. BACKGROUND PAPERS

None.

MUNICIPAL YEAR 2015/2016 REPORT NO.

ACTION TO BE TAKEN UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY

PORTFOLIO DECISION OF:
Cabinet Member for Environment

REPORT OF:
Director – Regeneration &
Environment

Agenda – Part: 1	KD Num: N/A
Subject: Junction Protection Programme – Croyland Road Area	
Wards: Lower Edmonton	

Contact officer and telephone number: Craig Gough – 020 8379 3566

E mail: craig.gough@enfield.gov.uk

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1. In recent months, the Council has received concerns regarding inconsiderate and obstructive on-street parking that can occur on residential roads within an area bound by Bury Street to the North, A1010 to the east and Balham Road and Croyland Road to the west.
- 1.2. There are concerns that vehicles being parked at and in close proximity to junctions can restrict access, impair visibility and cause obstruction to pedestrians, particularly those with impaired mobility.
- 1.3. These concerns have also been raised by the Council's waste services team who have complained that parked cars are restricting access and impairing their ability to make refuse and recycling collections.
- 1.4. We have therefore been asked to consider the introduction of parking restrictions to keep those junction areas clear of parked cars. This report considers the issues raised by local residents, discussions with local ward Councillors and the response to recent consultation with residents.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1. To consider and note comments in relation to a recent consultation on proposals to introduce new waiting restrictions at junctions.
- 2.2. To approve the making of the Traffic Management Order under the Road Traffic Regulations Act 1984 for the introduction of waiting restrictions as detailed in Appendix B of this report and at an estimated cost of £4,000. This is to be met from the Corridors, Neighbourhoods and Supporting Measures allocation for 2015/16 provided by TfL.

3. BACKGROUND

- 3.1. Concerns have been raised with regard to vehicles being parked at or close to junctions and in a manner that is considered to be inconsiderate and obstructive. Those junctions are of roads that fall within an area bound by Bury Street to the North, A1010 to the east and Balham Road and Croyland Road to the west.
- 3.2. The area in which these junctions are located is predominantly residential in nature consisting mainly of high density terraced housing. The only exception being the southern part of Balham Road which is fronted by a number of commercial units.
- 3.3. All roads within this area are single carriageway and two-way. The area is street lit and all roads are subject to a speed limit of 30mph.
- 3.4. Access to off-street parking is limited with only a small proportion of properties having private driveways or garages.
- 3.5. Some parking restrictions do exist at present. However these are limited to single yellow lines that apply Monday to Saturday, 8 am to 6.30pm. At all other times, on-street parking throughout the area is unrestricted.
- 3.6. The concerns we have received generally relate to vehicles being parked at, or in close proximity to junctions. Those vehicles are said to be restricting access and visibility of oncoming traffic for motorists waiting to turn to or from the junction.
- 3.7. The Council's waste services team has also advised us of problems with access to properties in this area, due to vehicles being parked at, or close to junctions. This has led to missed or delayed collections.
- 3.8. Vehicles that are parked at or close to junctions can also restrict access for pedestrians who may wish to cross a road at a junction. This is a particular concern for pedestrians with impaired mobility. In such instances, pedestrians have no option but to cross the road between parked vehicles, or seek an alternative location away from their preferred crossing point.
- 3.9. To address these concerns, we have been asked to consider parking restrictions at junctions of roads throughout this area.

4. ACCIDENT RECORDS

- 4.1. We have analysed the accidents records for all roads within the area as detailed in section 1.1. These records cover a three year period up to 29th November 2014.
- 4.2. Within this area, a total of six personal injury accidents have been recorded by the police. Two of those accidents resulted in serious injuries, while the remaining four accidents resulted in slight injuries.

- 4.3. Of the six accidents, three occurred at or close to a junction. Two of those at the junction of Bury Street and Croyland Road. One resulting in serious injuries, the other resulting in slight injuries. The third accident occurred at the junction of Croyland Road and Salmons Road and resulted in slight injuries.

5. PROPOSALS

- 5.1. Many of the junctions in this area are similar in layout and have similar characteristics. In terms of parking, most are unrestricted, while some have existing single yellow lines, or short lengths of existing double yellow lines.
- 5.2. In the absence of parking restrictions, high levels of on-street parking regularly occur at or close to these junctions. We therefore propose to introduce double yellow lines at junctions where none are currently present, to replace single yellow lines with double yellow lines, or to extend double yellow lines at junctions where only short lengths currently exist.
- 5.3. Our proposals also include double yellow lines at sharp bends in three locations. These are being treated in a similar manner to junctions where vehicles are being parked at or close to the bends and cause obstruction to through and turning traffic.
- 5.4. Where existing parking restrictions are present, we have taken the opportunity to review those restrictions. To offset the impact of some of the double yellow lines, we also proposed to reduce the length of yellow lines in two locations.
- 5.5. Details of our proposals can be found in Appendix B of this report.

6. CONSULTATION

- 6.1. On 25th March of this year, we advertised our proposals. This was in the form of a public notice placed in the local press and the London Gazette. Copies of this notice were also placed on lamp columns throughout the affected area.
- 6.2. In addition to our statutory requirements, consultation leaflets were delivered to residents of properties that fronted our proposals. A copy of this leaflet was also sent to the relevant ward Councillors. A copy of this leaflet can be found in Appendix A of this report.
- 6.3. The consultation period closed on 15th April 2015.

6.4. Consultation Response

- 6.4.1. We received a total of 21 responses to the consultation. This includes a petition consisting of 15 signatures. However, within that petition two of the signatures are from individuals who have made separate representations to the consultation. Accounting for those duplicate responses, we have received representation from a total of 33 individual households.

6.4.2. Those responses consisted of four comments in support of the proposals and 28 objections. We also received one response that contained comments but did not specifically indicate either support or objection to the proposals. The objections received made specific reference to the following locations:

- Junction of Millbrook Road and Beamish Road – 13 Objections;
- Junction of Kenwood Road and Beamish Road – 1 Objection;
- Junction of Croyland Road and Salmon Road – 2 Objections;
- Junction of Croyland Road and Junction Road – 1 Objection;
- Junction of Balam Road and Hendon Road – 1 Objection;
- Junction of Bury Street and Millbrook Road – 1 Objection;
- Junction of Bury Street and Findon Road – 1 Objection;
- Bend in Salmon Road outside No. 35 – 1 Objection.

6.5. Reasons for Objections

6.5.1. 25 of the 28 objections received, refer to existing parking problems. It is a concern that levels of on-street parking have increased in recent years. It is claimed that it has become increasingly difficult for residents to park their vehicles close to their own properties. They are concerned that the proposals will further exasperate those problems.

6.5.2. However, rather than being opposed to the provision of yellow lines, 19 residents consider the lengths of the double yellow lines to be excessive. Those residents acknowledge there is a need for double yellow lines, but suggest the proposed lengths be reduced.

6.5.3. A resident who has access to off-street parking is concerned that a reduction in the availability of on-street parking will see access to their driveway blocked more frequently. Another resident is concerned that double yellow lines across their own access will also prevent them from parking there.

6.5.4. One resident has acknowledged that large vehicles may experience difficulties in accessing some roads due to obstruction caused by parked vehicles. However, the resident adds "We have survived thus far and I have not noticed any recent incidents indicating that a change should be made". The resident also suggests that if the proposals go ahead, the length of the proposed yellow lines should be reduced.

6.5.5. As this area is near to Edmonton Green railway station and shopping centre, it has been suggested that commuters, shoppers and workers are the main cause of parking problems during the daytime period. They also claim that holidaymakers park their vehicles in this area for longer periods. To address those concerns, four of the consultation responses have requested a permit parking or residents parking scheme.

6.5.6. Rather than provide double yellow lines, one resident has suggested the provision of single yellow lines that apply between the hours of 8am and 5pm. This to make the road more accessible for waste collections,

deliveries etc. Outside of those hours, on-street parking would then be unrestricted and available to residents.

- 6.5.7. As an alternative to yellow lines, it has been suggested that an enforcement officer could be sent to issue fines against vehicles that cause obstruction.
- 6.5.8. We have received three objections on the basis that on-street parking in this area is not a problem. They do not agree that access for large vehicles is being restricted, that pedestrian access is affected or that there is an increased risk of accidents.
- 6.5.9. One resident has suggested a one-way system would reduce congestion along their road as the roads are not wide enough to accommodate two-way traffic.
- 6.5.10. Other comments received during the consultation include a request for speed humps to reduce traffic speeds, or measures to prevent local roads being used as a route to avoid traffic on the nearby main roads.

6.6. Response from Ward Councillors

- 6.6.1. We did not receive a response from ward Councillors during the consultation period.

6.7. Officer Response to Consultation

- 6.7.1. These proposals have been put forward in response to concerns that have been raised by local residents. The Council's Waste Services team has also reported difficulties in gaining access to some roads in the area which has led to late or missed collections. While some residents may not directly experience problems as a result of inconsiderate and obstructive parking, these concerns are clearly affecting others.
- 6.7.2. Access for the emergency services is also a particular concern. While the times of refuse collections can normally be predicted, emergency access cannot. It is therefore essential that the turning areas at junctions should be kept clear of parked vehicles at all times.
- 6.7.3. Rule 243 of the Highway Code states: **DO NOT** stop or park opposite or within 10 metres (32 feet) of a junction, except in an authorised parking space. However, we do acknowledge that in some circumstances, to provide a length of yellow line over this distance can be excessive. To minimise the impact of yellow lines we do seek to provide the minimum length that is necessary to maintain unobstructed access.
- 6.7.4. We therefore use swept path analysis to assess the space that is required for an emergency vehicle to turn at each junction in a single movement. However, we would not recommend reducing those lengths of yellow line any further as any risk of unnecessary delay to emergency access is not considered acceptable.

- 6.7.5. Visibility for and of pedestrians waiting to cross at a junction can be impaired by parked vehicles and often, access to a safe and convenient crossing point can be restricted. This can be a particular concern for vulnerable road users, including those with impaired mobility, users of mobility scooters, push chairs, prams etc.
- 6.7.6. We would not consider part time restrictions to be appropriate at junctions as these are areas that should be kept clear at all times for a number of reasons as indicated above.
- 6.7.7. The Council's Civic Enforcement Officers (CEO's) powers are limited to carrying out enforcement against vehicles that are parked on yellow lines or in contravention of other similar parking restrictions. CEO's are not able to issue fines against vehicles that are parked in areas where parking restrictions are not present and as such, this alternative option is not available.
- 6.7.8. In recent years, residents of this area have been consulted on a proposal to include their road as part of an extended Controlled Parking Zone for Edmonton Green. Due to local opposition, we did not progress this proposal.
- 6.7.9. Comments regarding speeding vehicles, measures to restrict through traffic and proposals for one-way systems are to be assessed separate to this proposal and will be passed to the Road Safety team for consideration.

7. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 7.1. **Do nothing** – This would see some drivers continue to park their vehicles at or close to junctions and corners in this area. Access would continue to be affected which could impact on waste collections and potentially the emergency services.
- 7.2. **Alternative Measures** – Residents have asked for the proposed lengths of yellow lines at junction to be reduced. As indicated in this report, the Highway Code states drivers are not park a vehicle within 10 metres of a junction. We have analysed turning movements at these junctions and where possible, have put forward options for reduced lengths of yellow lines. We would not recommend any further reductions.

8. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 8.1. Vehicles that are parked at, or close to junctions can cause obstruction and prevent larger vehicles from gaining access. Access for refuse collections and the emergency services can be restricted. Visibility for and of pedestrians waiting to cross at a junction can be impaired, as can access to a safe and convenient crossing point. This can be a particular concern for vulnerable road users, including those with impaired mobility.

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

9.1. Financial Implications

- 9.1.1. The estimated cost of implementing the traffic management order and proposed waiting restrictions is £4,000 and this will be met from the 2015/2016 Local Implementation Plan (LIP); TfL allocations; set aside for transport improvements in Enfield.
- 9.1.2. Expenditure once approved by Transport For London; it will be fully funded by means of direct grant from TfL; governed through the TfL Borough Portal, hence no costs fall on the Council. The release of funds by TfL is based on a process that records the progress of works against approved spending profiles. TfL makes payments against certified claims as soon as expenditure is incurred; ensuring that the Council benefits from prompt reimbursement of any expenditure.
- 9.1.3. LIP financial assistance is provided by TfL under Section 159 of the GLA Act 1999. The funding is provided to support local transport improvements that accord with the Mayor's Transport Strategy Goals and Outcomes.
- 9.1.4. Use of the funding for purposes other than those for which it is provided may result in TfL requiring repayment of any funding already provided and/or withholding provision of further funding. TfL also retains the right to carry out random or specific audits in respect of the financial assistance provided.

9.2. Legal Implications

- 9.2.1. Under section 39 Road Traffic Act 1988 the Council has duties to promote road safety, to monitor road traffic accident locations and to take measures to prevent such accidents. This includes the improvement of roads, the movement of road traffic and traffic restrictions. The proposed waiting restrictions are in accordance with the discharge of those duties.
- 9.2.2. Pursuant to section 6 Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, the Council as traffic authority for the roads mentioned in this report, may make orders (Traffic Management Orders) for controlling or regulating vehicular traffic including orders that impose waiting restrictions.
- 9.2.3. Regulations contained in the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 prescribe the procedure to be followed in making a Traffic Management Order and require consultation with specific persons, publication of proposals in the local press and the giving of adequate publicity as appropriate by, for example, the display of notices or the delivery of letters to premises likely to be affected by any provision of the Order.
- 9.2.4. Before making an order the order making authority must conscientiously take in to account and consider all objections made in accordance with the regulations and not withdrawn.

- 9.2.5. The recommendations contained within this report are within the Council's powers and duties.

10. KEY RISKS

No significant risks have been identified.

11. IMPACT ON COUNCIL PRIORITIES

11.1. Fairness for All

- 11.1.1. These proposals will benefit the community by reducing congestion and road safety concerns that can be contributed to inconsiderate and obstructive on-street parking.

- 11.1.2. We do not anticipate any adverse impact on local businesses.

11.2. Growth and Sustainability

Reduced congestion at junctions, together with greater access for all road users, in particular pedestrians, will help to improve road safety. This will benefit the local community by improving the local environment and encourage people to use more sustainable methods of transport.

11.3. Strong Communities

The consultation for this proposal involved the community in the process of improving their local area.

12. EQUALITIES IMPACT IMPLICATIONS

Corporate advice has been sought in regard to equalities, and an agreement has been reached that for the approval of these proposals, an equalities impact assessment/analysis is neither relevant nor proportionate.

13. PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

The implementation of this scheme should directly contribute to the Council Business Plan objective "Improved sustainability of transport and reduce its impact on the borough".

14. PUBLIC HEALTH IMPLICATIONS

The aim of these proposals is to improve road safety for all road users by reducing accidents. Improved access to safe and convenient crossing points and pedestrian facilities can encourage more people to walk and promote a healthier lifestyle.

However, increased visibility at the junction may encourage faster driving. Consideration should therefore be given to building the junctions out so that drivers need to slow down when turning into the respective roads.

15. BACKGROUND PAPERS

None.

RE 15.100

APPENDIX A

Public Consultation Leaflet

Dated 22nd October 2014

MUNICIPAL YEAR 2015/2016 REPORT NO.

ACTION TO BE TAKEN UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY

PORTFOLIO DECISION OF:

Cllr Ahmet Oykenner, Cabinet
Member for Housing &
Regeneration

REPORT OF:

Director – Regeneration &
Environment

Agenda – Part: 1	Item:
Subject: Post Tender Report for Edmonton Green – Major Works External Enveloping and Associated Repairs Wards: Edmonton Green Key Decision No: KD4172	
Cabinet Member consulted: Cabinet Member for Housing and Regeneration, Ahmet Oykenner	

Contact officer and telephone number: Paul Hemmant – 0208 375 8312

Email: paul.hemmant@enfield.gov.uk

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1. This report seeks approval to award a contract for enveloping works and associated repairs as part of the Council's Housing Capital works programme.
- 1.2. This is a Key Decision of the Council and is on the Key Decision List, reference KD4172.
- 1.3. Seven contractors from the Enfield Council Major Works Framework were invited to tender on the basis of single stage selective tender. Seven tenders were submitted. The tender offering the lowest price and which complies with the tender quality requirements of the Council is recommended.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 That the proposed scheme is to be funded from the Housing Capital Programme.
- 2.2 That approval is given to accept the lowest price tender complying with the tender requirements of the Council submitted by Contractor 1 (see Part 2 for details).

3. BACKGROUND

- 3.1. The scheme is part of Enfield's Major Works Programme. The scheme was selected after examination of the Council's stock condition survey and selected on the basis of chronological priority, type of work and scheme size respectively.
- 3.2. The scheme consists of major works to both the external elements of the properties and communal areas of six separate blocks within the Edmonton Green area which include Cumberland House, Grahame House, Goodwin House, Leicester House Hereford House and 2-20 St James Road. There are 216 properties in the scheme of which 79 are leasehold properties.
- 3.3. The scope of works that has been identified for inclusion within the scheme will typically include the following elements:

Roof covering replacement, Window and door replacement, Concrete repairs and redecoration of previously decorated external elements and internal communal areas, Upgrade/replacement of door entry systems. Upgrade/Installation of the Communal TV aerial system (IRS System), Asbestos removal works, Fire Precaution works, Balcony walkway coatings and balustrading repairs/replacement, Pram shed refurbishment, Replacement of rain water goods, Communal lighting replacement.
- 3.4. Consultants, who were appointed under separate approval after competitive tender, have prepared and administered tendering of the scheme.

4. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 4.1 The scheme forms part of the Council's major works programme, which includes for external refurbishment to ensure council property is maintained. It was assessed as a priority on the stock condition survey and therefore no other alternatives have been considered.

5. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 5.1 All contractors who tendered for this project have fulfilled the Council's criteria for undertaking this type and value of work.
- 5.2 The recommended contractor has submitted the lowest priced tender and has been judged capable of complying with the specification and quality requirements.

5.3 This scheme forms part of Enfield Homes' on-going programme to maintain its housing stock and fulfil its landlord obligations.

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

6.1 Financial Implications

6.1.1 The comments of the Director of Finance, Resources & Customer Services are detailed in Part 2 of this Delegated Authority Report. The scheme has been reported as part of both the five year and annual procurement plans.

6.2 Legal Implications

6.2.1 The contents of this report constitute a Key Decision as the recommendation to accept the recommended tender for the works will lead to capital expenditure exceeding £250,000. This item has been included in the Key Decision List reference. KD4172. Once approved the decision to proceed will be subject to the usual five day call-in period.

6.2.2 The Council has the power to alter, repair or improve its housing stock in accordance with Section 9 of the Housing Act 1985. Under section 20 of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1985, the Council as landlord has the ability to recharge leaseholders for major works via service charges, provided that there has been appropriate consultation pursuant to the Service Charges (Consultation Requirements) (England) Regulations 2003 (SI 2003/1987) The Council further has power under Section 111 of the Local Government Act 1972 to do anything which is calculated to facilitate, or is conducive or incidental to, the discharge of any of its functions. Additionally the Council is empowered to enter into contracts for the discharge of its legal powers (section 1 Local Government (Contracts) Act 1997). The Council moreover has a general power of competence under section 1(1) of the Localism Act 2011 to do anything that individuals generally may do, provided it is not prohibited by legislation and subject to Public Law principles.

6.2.3 Seven contractors were selected from the Enfield Council Housing Framework to tender for the opportunity, on the basis of single stage selective tender. The use of a compliant framework agreement is an exception permitted under Rule 9 to competitive tendering allowed for under the council's Contract Procedure rules. Seven tenders were submitted. This demonstrates that the requirements of the Council's Contract Procedure Rules, rule 7.2, have been met.

- 6.2.4 Throughout the engagement of the service provider, the Council must comply with its obligations with regard to obtaining best value under the Local Government (Best Value Principles) Act 1999.
- 6.2.5 Any resultant legal contracts required in association with this matter must be in a form approved by the Assistant Director of Legal Services. The works contract terms are in the form of the JCT Intermediate Contract with Contractor's Design 2011 Edition.
- 6.2.6 Given the proposed contract value for the works, the sealing requirements of the CPR rule 18.3 must be complied with (including attestation by or on behalf of the Assistant Director of Legal Services).
- 6.2.7 Also, in view of the proposed contract value for the works exceeding £250,000, a performance bond will be required on behalf of the Contractor, and must be executed and received before work starts on site (anticipated to be in early December).

6.3 Property Implications

- 6.3.1 The Council's standard residential lease places the obligation on the Council as landlord to undertake the proposed external repairs and enveloping works to preserve the fabric of the buildings. The council may recover a proportionate cost from the leaseholders.
- 6.3.2 As long as the Section 20 Notice procedures have been carried out correctly, the council will be able to recover a proportionate amount of the costs from leaseholders.
- 6.3.3 Undertaking the repairs and improvements should help extend the life of the buildings and reduce annual maintenance costs.

6.4 Leaseholder Implications

- 6.4.1 There are 79 leaseholders involved in this contract, within the 6 Blocks identified for the proposed works.
- 6.4.2 The Notices of Intention [schedule 3] were served on 29th October 2015
- 6.4.3 The Notices of Estimate are not required to be served during consultation under the frame work agreement.
- 6.4.4 The total cost to leaseholders is estimated at £1,335,530.11. The average cost per leaseholder is £16,905.44, the lowest charge per leaseholder is £9,861.63 and the highest charge is £28,678.52. Resident Leaseholders have a maximum period of 9 years repayment option to spread their payments, with two years

interest free, from the date of the invoice in accordance with the Councils Financial Assistance Package.

7 KEY RISKS

7.1 The main risks to the scheme are presented in tabular form below together with the corresponding mitigation actions.

• Key: H = High, M = Medium, L = Low

Item	Risk	Impact	Probability	Mitigation	Owner
1	Non Delivery of Project	H	M	Develop project delivery plan, commission consultants and contractor ASAP.	Housing Professional Services (HPS)
2	Quality Issues	H	M	Set benchmark, monitor site meetings through Contract Administrator (CA) & Clerk of Works (COW) reports, measure continuous improvements using KPIs.	HPS PM
3	Cost Overrun	M	L	Rigorous Cost Planning, early reporting, comprehensive specification, inclusion of contingencies, tender analysis.	HPS PM
4	Time Overrun	H	M	Manage approvals stage – instil sense of urgency by senior staff. Monitor programme, monthly progress reports & LADs.	HPS PM
5	Extended Consultation	M	M	Establish key milestones and communication strategy at the outset.	HPS
6	Additional Works Identified	M	M	Detail and agree scope of works, prioritise core DHS works and use contingency	HPS

7.2 Suitable steps to be taken to monitor/ensure mitigating actions identified are carried out for the risk register (including any actions) to be reviewed regularly to ensure the Council remains protected.

8 IMPACT ON COUNCIL PRIORITIES

8.1 Fairness for All

8.1.2 The proposed works will enhance the fabric and appearance of the Council's properties and provide better facilities to the residents. Undoubtedly, the proposed scheme will assist in meeting the Council's objectives by providing economically successful and socially inclusive communities.

8.2 Growth and Sustainability

- 8.2.1 The new double glazed windows will reduce heat loss and achieve noise reduction. In addition, the improvements will have positive impact on the energy performance of the Council's stock. Products specified and materials used will be sustainable and energy efficient. The contractor and manufacturers are required to have a stringent Environmental Policy in place in accordance with the Framework requirements.
- 8.2.2 All contractors' party to the Framework agreement are bound to participate in joint initiatives with the client and each other to establish Employment and Training Contracts so as to secure continuity of employment opportunities, co-ordinated training opportunities and sponsored college placements.
- 8.2.3 The client will employ a training co-ordinator who will work alongside the contractors to ensure the successful completion of training contracts, apprenticeships and any other employment opportunities pursuant to any call off contract. The training co-ordinator is funded by the contractors.

8.3 Strong Communities

- 8.3.1 The project promotes Key Council values and places emphasis on residents' empowerment and participation through involving residents groups in the consultation process from inception to completion. The scheme addresses the Council's objective by involving the public in the decision making process and help them play an active role in their local neighbourhoods.

9 EQUALITY IMPACT IMPLICATIONS

- 9.1 It is not deemed relevant or proportionate to carry out an equality impact assessment/analysis for the approval of the tender that represents the lowest price and complies with the tender requirements of the Council for external repairs as part of the Council's Decent Home Programme.

10 PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

- 10.1 The works will benefit 216 properties which will be made decent and others will be prevented from becoming non-decent. The performance of the contractor is measured by the implementation of Key Performance Indicators compiled on a monthly basis. These are scored by the Contract Administrator and representatives from the Councils officers.

11 HEALTH AND SAFETY IMPLICATIONS

- 11.1 The Health and Safety Policies statement have been submitted by all the contractors as part of the framework selection and tendering process.
- 11.2 The project is notifiable to the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) under the Construction (Design and Management) Regulations 2015 (CDM).
- 11.3 A Pre-Tender Health and Safety Plan was submitted with the tender and the Contractor will submit a Pre-Construction Health and Safety Plan once appointed. This will be updated throughout the contract and a Health and Safety File issued upon completion of the works.

12 PUBLIC HEALTH IMPLICATIONS

- 12.1 The proposed project, 'Edmonton Green, External Enveloping and Associated Works', overall, will improve the physical health of the residents by reducing fuel poverty, creating warmer homes and improving respiratory health of children and older people; and improve mental health by reducing noise transmission, and enhancing the sense of security related to new fabric.
- 12.3 To help alleviate condensation and mould, tenanted properties will be provided with trickle vents to new windows and the existing extract ventilation will either be overhauled or renewed.

13 Background Papers

- 13.1 Contain exempt information

