

# PROTECT

MUNICIPAL YEAR 2016/2017 REPORT NO: **KD 3258 (a)**

**MEETING TITLE AND DATE:**

**Agenda – Part:** 1 **Item:**

**Subject: Enfield Youth Offer**

**Wards: All**

**Key Decision No: KD 3258 (a)**

**REPORT OF:** Tony Theodoulou  
Director of Children's Services

**Cabinet Member consulted:** Cllr Ayfer Orhan

Contact officer and telephone number: Paul Sutton 0208 379 5840

E mail: paul.sutton@enfield.gov.uk

## 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report sets out the Enfield Youth Offer for the next four years. The underpinning vision of this report, expanded upon in the new Enfield Youth Strategy, is that Enfield Council wants all children and young people in the borough to have access to youth activities that keep them safe, help them learn and encourage them to be confident and happy, which develops them, and helps them reach their full potential.

It is our intention that all children and young people continue to have access to a quality youth offer that supports their development. This report sets out the innovative and sustainable way the youth offer will be delivered in future ensuring a sufficiency of quality and quantity of youth activities. Demand for Children's Services continues to increase and in common with Local Authorities across the UK Enfield Council is dealing with considerable financial challenges. As a result a new delivery model of youth provision, one that is co-produced with the community and voluntary sector, has been developed and is detailed in this report and the new youth strategy that supports it. This development ensures the future of youth provision in Enfield.

This is a youth offer that supports all four priorities in the Children's Plan and creates resilience and ownership in the community. It puts us in the vanguard of exciting and dynamic change that will see us become even more efficient, effective, economically viable and sustainable.

## 2. RECOMMENDATIONS

That this report, the values that under pin it, and the new youth offer be adopted

That the following posts be deleted:

- ED0821 1 x Ft Head of Service [1 x Vacant]
- ED0821 5 x Ft P3 Youth Workers [3 vacant 2 occupied]
- ED0821 9 x Ft and 1 x PT P2 Youth Workers [10 posts 6 occupied 4 vacant]
- ED0821 1 x PT P1 Youth Worker [1 x Vacant].
- ED0821 1 x Ft and 12 Pt A2 Youth Workers [4 occupied 9 vacant]
- ED0821 20 Pt A1 Youth Workers [9 occupied 11 vacant]
- ED0821 1 x MM1 Manager of ETE Team [Occupied]
- ED0821 8 x SO2 ETE Team IAG workers [5 occupied and 3 vacant].
- ED0801 2 x Ft Sc 3 NEET Tracking Assistant Posts. [1 vacant 1 occupied]

That the following codes have budget removed:

- ED0802
- ED0803
- ED0807
- ED0809
- ED0815
- ED0821
- ED8022
- ED8030

That the following codes will have parts of their budget removed:

- ED0801
- SS0069

That the following posts be created:

- 1 x MM1 Enfield Youth Work Development Manager
- 1 x FT P3 Senior Youth Work Development Workers
- 2 x PT [12 hrs] A2 Youth Worker Posts.
- 1 x FT P2 Looked After Children Advice and Advocacy Youth Worker [Paid from £71K LAC contract].
- 1 x S02 LAC Education Training Employment Information Advice and Guidance worker

That Budget for ED0806 be retained.

### **3. BACKGROUND**

Enfield Council wants all children and young people in the borough to have access to youth activities that keep them safe, help them learn and encourage them to be confident and happy, which develop them, and help them reach their full potential. It is our intention that all children and young people continue to have access to a quality youth offer that support their development. However demand for Children's Services continues to increase and in common with local authorities across the UK Enfield Council is dealing with considerable financial challenges creating a budgetary pressure for children's services. As a result, and like other local authorities, difficult choices have to be made regarding reductions in discretionary, and a concentration on statutory, services. As a result a new delivery model of youth provision, one that is co-produced with the community and voluntary sector, and which creates resilience, has to be developed and is detailed in this report and the new youth strategy that underpins it.

As a result, after a consultation process, a decision was taken at Cabinet, and then at full Council, in February to reduce the budget of the YFSS YDSU. Staff and unions advised and consulted immediately after council decision. Consultation and advice sessions have been carried out with service users and the Youth Parliament and with third sector partners this is now concluded and this report sets out the implementation of the new youth offer which will be concluded by October 2016. This development ensures the future of a coordinated youth offer in Enfield.

\*YDSU = Youth Development and Support Unit

### **4. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

Due to the Council's reducing budget coupled with the increasing pressure on statutory children's services the only option is to reduce the Council's spending on discretionary services and focus on new ways of delivery giving a greater role to the voluntary sector and doing more to develop community resilience and create sustainability through community co-production.

### **5. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

The reason for the recommendation is to maintain a youth offer in Enfield that is more sustainable. A mapping exercise has clearly shown that Enfield has a great selection of positive youth activities on offer in the borough provided by the council and various voluntary sector and other providers. This is advised in Youth Enfield.

Whilst the budget for the YDSU will be reduced Enfield will still have a good Youth Offer: There are no plans to close any youth centres, good financial management means that these are starting to become self-sustainable; We have a vibrant voluntary youth offer in Enfield and the Council is committed to supporting its continued development and growth through helping with bids for funding; A charity is being developed to ensure that further options regarding a youth offer are developed and volunteers are being recruited to help the delivery of the Youth Offer.

In the future youth workers directly employed by the council will be targeted at developing, coordinating and supporting a partnership youth offer and providing targeted

support to those young people most in need of support e.g. Looked After young people; Those at risk of sexual exploitation and Homeless young people etc.

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

### **6.1 Financial Implications**

The recommendation proposes ongoing savings of £1,698,750 that will be achieved, by deleting 61 posts (FTE 36.98). The full year cost of the posts to be deleted, based on current pay scales, is £1,272,900. In addition six posts will be created, four full time and two part time posts, costing £187,400 per annum. There will also be savings in running costs associated with the posts to be deleted, excluding those associated with the LAC contract.

These recommendations will meet the ongoing savings of £1,698,750.

There is a risk of redundancy payments for staff that are not part of the new structure any such costs will be met corporately and not from the Youth and Family Support Service.

### **6.2 Legal Implications**

The Council has a duty to ensure continuous improvement to ensure value for money in accordance with the Local Government Act 1999. Therefore, the restructure must be in accordance with the Council's current applicable policies and procedures to ensure such continuous improvement/value for money is achieved. The changes outlined in the report could assist in achieving value for money.

By section 139 (1) of the Employment Rights Act 1996 (the 1996 Act) a redundancy situation arises where the Council needs to reduce its work force in a particular area. Redundancy is deemed one of the fair reasons for dismissal under S.98 of the Act provided proper consultation has taken place with the employee and/ or their representative and the employee was not unfairly selected for redundancy. Where an employee is threatened with redundancy, the Council must take steps to find the employee suitable alternative employment.

The report proposes the potential deletion of posts through redundancy, if redundancy does occur, it should be carried out with reference to HR and adherence to the Council's Redundancy Policy.

The report proposes the potential creation of new posts; under the Local Government Act 1972 the Council is able to appoint such officers as it thinks fit for the proper discharge of its functions. However, any new posts must be advertised and recruited to in accordance with the Council's applicable policy and procedure.

Employees of local authorities are subject to the provisions of the Superannuation Act 1972, and the detailed regulations made thereunder, including the Local Government Pension Scheme Regulations 1997 (as amended).

### **6.3 Property Implications**

The Council intends that all youth centres will continue to operate and provide youth activities and will be sustained through increased rental income.

## 7. KEY RISKS

The following are key risks:

- That the existing voluntary sector reduces in size impacting on the youth offer. The mapping exercise clearly demonstrates a vibrant youth offer in Enfield provided by very viable organisations of long standing.  
**Low to Medium risk**
- That the new Youth charity, Enfield Youth Action, is not constituted in time. This process almost completed and is being supported by a Council manager and this will continue. There is no indication that it will not go all to plan. All indications are that charity will be fully operational and will be able to access funding not available to Enfield Council.  
**Low risk**
- Insufficient grants to sustain the charity. This activity is being supported by a Council manager and various additional forms of funding including sponsorship are being pursued.  
**Low to Medium risk**
- Insufficient amount of trained volunteers. A recruitment and selection programme for volunteers and students to work in the centres is ongoing. Additionally a contingency plan is in place for experienced sessional support workers to be utilised for some months to make up for any staffing deficit caused by a reduced number of volunteers.  
**Low to Medium risk**
- Insufficient amount of trained young leaders to augment the work of the volunteers to deliver the offer. The young leaders programme has, and continues to be, popular a large number of young leaders have been recruited and trained and are able to support the delivery of youth work in the youth centres.  
**Low risk**

- Insufficient rental income to meet the running costs of the centres. The centres are well located, provide good opportunities for a wide range of activities and are proving popular with a wide range of providers. Work ongoing to ensure all centres become fully self-sufficient and a post has been retained to ensure this work is achieved.

**Low to Medium risk**

**Risks reviewed with no comment by Peter Bullen, Corporate Risk Management**

## **8. IMPACT ON COUNCIL PRIORITIES**

### **Fairness for All**

Enfield Council remains committed to ensuring the provision of a good youth offer within the available resources. The new Youth offer for Enfield ensures the continuation of a range of activities for young people, particularly those facing the most disadvantage including children in care, those at risk of sexual exploitation, young offenders, children at risk of abuse and disabled children. Please see PEIA.

### **Growth and Sustainability**

It is our intention that all children and young people continue to have access to a quality youth offer that support their development. It is our intention to provide a sustainable youth offer delivered in partnership with the community. This development ensures the future of youth provision in Enfield.

### **Strong Communities**

This report supports the development of stronger communities including increased resilience and sustainability.

## **9. EQUALITIES IMPACT IMPLICATIONS**

*Please see PEIA attached.*

A youth offer will continue in Enfield: the council will work with communities and the third sector to build a sustainable offer that is co-produced with them. The targeting of youth work at coordinating, supporting and empowering communities and creating resilience and at specific targeted groups such as those at risk of CSE will mitigate against the impact on young people and communities.

## **10. PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS**

The council will continue to monitor the rate of young people not in Education, Employment and Training.

## **11. HEALTH AND SAFETY IMPLICATIONS**

Staff will ensure volunteers are trained in health and safety.

## **12. HR IMPLICATIONS**

This restructuring of the Y&FSS YDSU has been driven by continued financial pressure to make significant savings in areas where the provision to the public is not statutory or specifically targeted. Despite sustained and primarily successful efforts in recent years to maintain services as far as possible, extremely difficult decisions have now had to be made resulting in the cessation of the majority of Authority retained youth services.

Though the report seeks authorisation for the deletion of 61 posts, the number of staff currently at imminent risk of redundancy is 26.

Consultation meetings with staff and unions took place in February, March and again in May 2016 where the proposals to cease the majority of current youth services were shared to affected parties.

Affected staff were written to in June 2016 to confirm early warning of risk of redundancy.

Human Resources wrote to affected staff and held Individual Redundancy Consultation Meetings with staff who wished to attend in July 2016.

All affected staff have been given access to redeployment opportunities and efforts will now also be made to identify suitable alternative employment via matching to suitable posts across the Council.

Affected staff have been invited to attend available training courses and access support programmes to assist them in securing suitable alternative employment.

Role profiles for the new posts have been submitted to HR.

The newly created posts will be ring fenced to affected YDSU staff for their registrations of interest following initial assimilation exercises where appropriate.

In the event that redeployment, whether within the service or elsewhere in the Council, proves unsuccessful, a redundancy payment and early retirement benefits will be payable as appropriate to eligible employees, in accordance with the Council's current policy.

In the event that redundancy proves unavoidable, the Redundancy Payment Approval Form must be completed and signed off by the Director of the service and the Director of Finance before any redundancy payments can be released.

### **13. PUBLIC HEALTH IMPLICATIONS**

Public health initiatives will continue to be promoted through schools, colleges and the universal youth Enfield magazine.

#### **Background Papers**

*Please see PEIA attached.*



**Predictive: assessing and analysing proposed changes to services, policies and budgets.**

# Enfield Council

## Predictive Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA) – Equality Analysis



### Restructure of the Youth and Family Support Service – Youth Development and Support Unit

#### *Predictive equality impact assessment/equality analysis template*

Please complete this cover sheet

<p><b>Proposed change to service/policy/budget</b></p>	<p>The report this PEIA refers to sets out the changes to the Enfield Youth Offer for the next four years. The underpinning vision of that report, expanded upon in the new Enfield Youth Strategy, is that Enfield Council wants all children and young people in the borough to have access to youth activities that keep them safe, help them learn and encourage them to be confident and happy, which develop them, and help them reach their full potential.</p> <p>However due to the Council's reducing budget coupled with the increasing pressure on statutory children's services the only option is to reduce the Council's spending on discretionary services and focus on new ways of delivery giving a greater role to the voluntary sector and doing more to develop community resilience and create sustainability.</p> <p>The intention is that all children and young people</p>
--	---

	continue to have access to a quality youth offer that support their development. The DAR and Strategy set out the innovative and sustainable way the youth offer will be delivered in future ensuring a sufficiency of quality and quantity of youth activities. Demand for Children's Services continues to increase and in common with Local Authorities across the UK Enfield Council is dealing with considerable financial challenges. As a result a new delivery model of youth provision, one that is co-produced with the community and voluntary sector, has been developed This development ensures the future of youth provision in Enfield and supports all four priorities in the Children's Plan and creates resilience and ownership in the community. It puts us in the vanguard of exciting and dynamic change that will see us become even more efficient, effective, economically viable and sustainable.
<b>Officer completing the assessment</b>	Paul Sutton
<b>Extension Number</b>	Extension:5840
<b>Service</b>	Youth and Family Support Service
<b>Department</b>	Children's Services
<b>Date impact assessment completed</b>	18 <sup>th</sup> March 2016

### **Section 1 – About the service, policy or budget, and proposed change**

#### **Q1. Please provide a brief description of the service/ policy/budget**

Enfield's Youth Offer; the provision of targeted and open access positive leisure activities to young people aged 11 to 19 [24 if special needs].

#### **Q2. Please provide a brief description of the proposed change(s) to the service/ policy/budget**

Enfield is changing its Youth Offer to young people aged 11 to 19 [24 if special needs] see DAR see 2016/20 Youth Strategy. A higher proportion of the new youth offer will be co-produced with the community and the voluntary sector will have a greater involvement in its delivery.

#### **Q3. Does equalities monitoring of your service show that the beneficiaries in terms of the recipients of the service, policy or budget, and the proposed change, include people from the following groups?**

<b>R</b>	Yes. Young people from BME communities make up a high proportion of YDSU clients attendance youth clubs as most clubs are sited east of the A10. Close work with the existing third sector providers, who already provide most of the youth activities in Enfield, and the development and support of a new youth charity to augment them will mitigate the impact of the budget reductions and ensure that a youth offer is still provided. These changes provide an opportunity for building community resilience and cohesion and empowering the community.
----------	--

<b>D</b>	Yes. As stated above the work with the voluntary sector and community will mitigate the impact. In addition to this a life skills course for young people with disabilities has previously moved to a traded services model with parents paying for places and it is likely this will be maintained in the new model but this is dependent on places being filled
<b>G</b>	Yes. The proportion of female YDSU clients is approximately commensurate with demographics of the borough. The work with the voluntary sector and community will mitigate the impact of the changes and ensure that a youth offer is maintained.
<b>A</b>	Yes. Vast majority of YFSS clients are aged 11 to 18 but some are aged 19 to 24 if they have special needs.
<b>F</b>	Yes, YFSS clients are of many different faiths and none. Current council service provision is secular but we do work with faith youth groups and this will continue.
<b>S</b>	Yes, young people who are LGBT are clients of the service. The service currently provides a small, specific youth provision, Proud Enfield, for this group of young people [attended by approximately 10 young people]. It is envisaged that volunteers will continue to deliver this service.
<b>T</b>	Yes, service does very occasionally have some clients who are Transgender.
<b>M</b>	N/A
<b>P</b>	Yes, the ETE team works with a very small number of teenage parents and some, though very few, also access youth clubs. Work by the ETE Providers, careers service, DWP and voluntary sector providers will mitigate against any loss caused by the disbanding of the ETE support team.

**Q4. If you answered 'no' to any of the groups listed in Q3, please state why?**

Not applicable – see answer above

**Q5. How will the proposed change eliminate discrimination, promote equality of opportunity, or promote good relations between groups in the community?**

A youth offer will continue in Enfield: It is our intention that all children and young people continue to have access to a quality youth offer that support their development. The council will work with communities and the third sector to build a sustainable offer that is co-produced with them. The targeting of youth work at coordinating, supporting and empowering communities and creating resilience and at specific targeted groups such as those at risk of CSE will mitigate the impact on young people and communities.

Enfield Council remains committed to ensuring the provision of a good youth offer within the available resources. The new Youth offer for Enfield ensures the continuation of a range of activities for young people, particularly those facing the most disadvantage including children in care, those at risk of sexual exploitation, young offenders, children at risk of abuse and disabled children. Please see PEIA.

This report supports the development of stronger communities including increased resilience and sustainability It is our intention to provide a sustainable youth offer delivered in partnership with the community. This development ensures the future of youth provision in Enfield.

## Section 2 – Consultation and communication

**Q6. Please list any recent consultation activity with disadvantaged groups carried out in relation to this proposal**

<b>R</b>	An internal, ongoing, process has been implemented: Staff and Unions have and are being consulted on as per the Council's processes, policy and procedure. Staff affected
<b>D</b>	
<b>G</b>	

A	are a cross section of the community and thus of different races and gender etc.
F	
S	
T	
M	
P	There was a pre-budget consultation with the community regarding the specifics of the budget reductions and implications. Specifically in regards to clients managers have met with the Youth Centres User Group; Groups attending each youth centre, Kratos [Children in Care Council] and the Youth Parliament. In one youth centre some parents have been consulted. There has been discussion at full council and commentary and discussion in the media. Meetings have been held with specific voluntary sector organisations and the umbrella group and they have been advised of the changes.
<b>Q7. Please state how you have publicised the results of these consultation exercises, and what action you have taken in response</b>	
R	
D	The council consulted on budgets proposals and there implications including the changes to the YDSU budget and this was in relevant council papers.
G	
A	
F	
S	Following Corporate Human Resources Principles of Managing Reorganisations a consultation process was held. Verbal and written communication with staff. Meetings have been held with unions and with groups and with individual staff affected.
T	
M	
P	Regarding dialogue with youth parliament this was minuted at their meeting. Regarding dialogue with the users of individual youth clubs this was minuted and response sent out. There has been discussion at cabinet and council [minuted] and there has been commentary and discussion press and a press release was sent out in February.

**Section 3 – Assessment of impact**

**Q8. Please describe any other relevant research undertaken to determine any possible impact of the proposed change**

Discussion with voluntary sector regarding capacity and mapping exercise regarding youth provision in borough. New youth strategy development.

**Q9. Please list any other evidence you have that the proposed change may have an adverse impact on different disadvantaged groups in the community**

<b>R</b>	There is no evidence known of that shows these changes will have an adverse effect on any disadvantaged groups.
<b>D</b>	
<b>G</b>	
<b>A</b>	
<b>F</b>	
<b>S</b>	
<b>T</b>	
<b>M</b>	
<b>P</b>	

**Q10. Could the and if so, is it justifiable under legislation? Please refer to the guidance notes under the heading, 7. Useful Definitions**

The YDSU is a discretionary non-statutory open access function; these changes are being made to maintain children's services commitment to targeted and statutory work with the most at risk and disadvantaged young people e.g. unaccompanied asylum seeking minors. It is held that this proposal is fully justifiable, there is no requirement for Enfield Council to provide a Youth Offer/Positive Activities, just to ensure that one is provided in the borough [regardless of who provides it] and a mapping exercise has clearly shown that Enfield has a great deal of positive youth activities on offer in the borough provided by various voluntary sector and other providers. Whilst the YDSU budget is reducing Enfield will still have a good Youth Offer: There are no plans to close any youth centres, good financial management means that these are starting to become self-sustainable; We have a vibrant voluntary youth offer in Enfield and the Council is committed to supporting its continued development and growth through coordination and helping with training and bids for funding; A charity is being developed to ensure that further options regarding a youth offer are developed and volunteers are being recruited to help the delivery of the Youth Offer. It is not believed to be the case that proposal discriminates, directly or indirectly, again any group or individual and thus any changes are justifiable under legislation. It is intended to involve communities and individuals more in the provision of these services to empower them and create resilience.

**Q11. Could the proposal have an adverse impact on relations between different groups? If so, please describe**

There is no evidence to suggest that this proposal will have an adverse impact on relationships between any groups.

**Q12. How could this proposal affect access to your service by different groups in the community?**

<b>R</b>	No, this is not considered to be the case.
<b>D</b>	
<b>G</b>	
<b>A</b>	
<b>F</b>	
<b>S</b>	
<b>T</b>	
<b>M</b>	
<b>P</b>	

**Q13. How could this proposal affect access to information about your service by different groups in the community?**

<b>R</b>	The Youth Communications post within the YFSS will remain and will continue to coordinate information to the community regarding youth activities.
<b>D</b>	
<b>G</b>	
<b>A</b>	
<b>F</b>	
<b>S</b>	
<b>T</b>	
<b>M</b>	
<b>P</b>	

**Section 4 – Tackling socio-economic inequality**

<p><b>Q14. Will the proposal in any way specifically impact on communities disadvantaged through the following socio-economic factors? Please explain below. If it does not, please state how you intend to remedy this (if applicable to your service), and include it in the action plan</b></p>
<p><b>Communities living in deprived wards/areas</b></p> <p>The majority of YDSU clients are from lower socio economic groups, mainly grouped east of the A10. The work of training young leaders and volunteers and working with the third sector and the development of the new youth charity is designed to ensure a sustainable open access offer that is co-produced with these communities building resilience and cohesion.</p>
<p><b>People not in employment, education or training</b></p> <p>Work with young people who are not in education training or employment will still be delivered by the DWP, Careers Service and specialist services such as LAC, YOU and FASH etc.</p>
<p><b>People with low academic qualifications</b></p> <p>There is no evidence to suggest this group will be specifically affected by these changes.</p>
<p><b>People living in social housing</b></p> <p>The youth offer will continue to support young people who live in social housing. The development of the new youth strategy aimed at empowering communities and creating resilience and the work with the voluntary sector etc will allow for a youth offer to be maintained to these young people.</p>
<p><b>Lone parents</b></p> <p>Will continue to be supported as part of the youth offer.</p>
<p><b>People on low incomes</b></p> <p>The work of training young leaders and volunteers and working with the third sector and the development of the new youth charity is designed to ensure a sustainable open access offer that is co-produced with the community. It will actually help people on low incomes through developing skills that they will be able to use in gaining higher paid employment.</p>
<p><b>People in poor health</b></p> <p>It is envisaged that the offer to these people that exists currently will be replicated in the new youth offer.</p>
<p><b>Any other socio-economic factor</b></p> <p>As above</p>
<p><b>No.</b></p>

**Section 5 – Impact on staff**

**Q15. How have you consulted, or otherwise engaged with, all relevant staff about this proposal (including any staff on sickness or maternity leave)?**

Staff have been widely consulted. There has been formal consultation process with staff and unions based on Corporate Human Resources guidelines. Meetings have been held and emails, letters and presentations and FAQs etc sent out.

**Q16. If your proposal involves a staff restructuring, how have you discussed this with relevant trade unions?**  
**Discussed with TU meeting in February.**

**Q17. Does job matching of existing staff against the new proposed staff structure, following any assimilation process, indicate that any particular groups of staff are adversely affected more than others?**

<b>R</b>	All YDSU staff are effected. Incumbents of the posts affected are from a cross section representing the demographic of Enfield. Normal HR policies and procedures are being followed. All efforts are being made to reduce redundancy. However scale of the budget, and thus post, reduction is such that there will be redundancies made. There is no evidence suggesting any disproportionate negative impact on any group with a protected characteristic as a result of the proposed changes.
<b>D</b>	
<b>G</b>	Staff whose posts change by less than 20% will be assimilated, those whose posts change by more than 20% will be put in a pool and can apply for any of the newly created posts or any posts currently vacant via redeployment.
<b>A</b>	
<b>F</b>	
<b>S</b>	
<b>T</b>	
<b>M</b>	
<b>P</b>	

**Q18. Are there any proposed changes to working hours, work locations or duties likely to have a negative impact on particular groups of staff?**

<b>R</b>	The majority of the posts being deleted are part time unqualified ones however these are occupied by a cross section of the community so no one group is affected more than another.
<b>D</b>	
<b>G</b>	
<b>A</b>	
<b>F</b>	
<b>S</b>	
<b>T</b>	
<b>M</b>	
<b>P</b>	

**Section 6 - Miscellaneous**

**Q19. Do you plan to publicise the results of this assessment? Please describe how you plan to do this**

It is envisaged that this equality impact assessment/analysis will be published and available to the public via the Council's Equality Scheme Annual Report.

**Q20. How and when will you monitor and review the effects of this proposal?**

Feedback from young people once the new Youth Strategy has been in operation for 18 months.

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

Proposed change to, or new, service, policy or budget

### Restructure of the Youth Development and Support Unit

#### Children's Services

Service manager:

Issue	Action required	Lead officer	Timescale	Costs	Comments
Implementation of the proposals once approved	Implement changes, and budget reduction.	Paul Sutton	Will be fully implemented by 1 <sup>st</sup> November 2016. Last of YDSU budget will have been used by this date.	Management / Staff time and existing resources.	Degree of change and timescale reflects the budget situation and pressures on statutory children's services.
Evaluation of impact on disadvantaged groups	A review will occur in April 2018 regarding the implementation, development and effect of the new youth strategy	Paul Sutton	April 2018	Management / Staff time and existing resources	Degree of change and timescale reflects the budget situation and pressures on statutory children's services.
Monitoring	A monitoring system will be developed by the area youth manager in conjunction with the youth charity.	Paul Sutton	April 2017.	Management / Staff time and existing resources	Degree of change and timescale reflects the budget situation and pressures on statutory children's services.

APPROVAL BY THE RELEVANT ASSISTANT DIRECTOR - NAME: SIGNATURE:



Paul Sutton, AD, Service Development and Youth Services



**MUNICIPAL YEAR 2016/2017 REPORT NO.**

**ACTION TO BE TAKEN UNDER  
DELEGATED AUTHORITY**

**PORTFOLIO DECISION OF:**  
Cabinet Member for Environment

**REPORT OF:**  
Director – Regeneration &  
Environment

<b>Agenda – Part: 1</b>	<b>KD Num: 4342</b>
<b>Subject:</b>  <b>Approval of Cycle Enfield Proposals for the A105</b>	
<b>Wards: Grange, Bush Hill Park, Winchmore Hill and Palmers Green</b>	

Contact officer and telephone number: Paul Rogers, 020 8379 3304

E mail: [paul.rogers@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:paul.rogers@enfield.gov.uk)

**1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This report sets out the results of the A105 statutory consultation and seeks approval to make traffic management orders and approval of the final scheme design for implementation.

These proposals are part of the Mayor's Cycle Vision for London and will be fully funded by Transport for London (TfL). The proposals contained in this report are expected to deliver economic, health and transport benefits for local residents, businesses and visitors to Enfield.

**2. RECOMMENDATIONS**

2.1 To approve the final design of the proposals for the A105 shown on the plans in Appendix A and to take all necessary steps to implement the scheme including:

- a) Making the traffic management orders specified in Schedule 1 of Appendix C as advertised and without modification
- b) Making the traffic management order specified in Schedule 2 of Appendix C with modification to remove the time restriction on bays in residential areas.
- c) Implementing the raised entry treatments, flat top speed tables and raised junctions specified in Schedule 3 of Appendix C

- d) Implementing the Zebra crossings and associated zig-zag markings specified in Schedule 4 of Appendix C
- e) Implementing the 'Tiger crossings' and associated zig-zag markings specified in Schedule 5 of Appendix C
- f) Introducing designated disabled persons parking places at least in the general locations specified Schedule 6 of Appendix C and all waiting and loading restrictions using the experimental powers provided by S9 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.

### **3. BACKGROUND**

- 3.1 On 10 February 2016, Cabinet granted approval to undertake detailed design and statutory consultation for lightly segregated cycling facilities and public realm improvements along the A105 between Enfield Town and Palmers Green. Cabinet also delegated authority to the Cabinet Member for Environment to approve and implement the final design of the scheme subject to consultation and completion of all necessary statutory procedures.
- 3.2 On 25 May 2016, a co-design workshop was held at the Dugdale Centre to enable local residents who represent the interests of the area to put forward ideas for public realm improvements at Compton Road and the Palmers Green Triangle. This workshop was facilitated by Living Streets, the charity for everyday walking. Most of the ideas put forward by participants have been further developed by the Council's designers and landscape architects and are included in the final scheme design.
- 3.3 On 20 July 2016, officers met with representatives from the Centre for Accessible Environments (CAE) to run through the designs to make sure that they take account of the needs of older people and people with disabilities. The initial meeting focussed on bus stop boarders, pedestrian crossings, segregation and materials. Whilst CAE conclude that the overall scheme will offer significant benefits to all users, they continue to have concerns about some aspects of the design. Officers will continue to work with CAE and others to mitigate these concerns as much as possible given the overall scheme objectives.
- 3.4 On 15 June 2016, Cabinet approved the Cycle Enfield spending plans for 2016/17, including £3.1m for the A105 scheme.
- 3.5 Cycle Enfield represents a significant investment in the borough that can help improve our high streets and town centres; deliver long-term health benefits; and enable people to walk and cycle in safety. The overall Cycle Enfield programme includes not just cycle lanes on several of the borough's main roads, but also an extensive network of Greenway routes, cycle hubs and a wide range of supporting measures to encourage more people to cycle.

### **4. THE PROPOSAL**

- 4.1 The proposal involves the introduction of lightly segregated cycle lanes on both sides of the A105 between Enfield Town and Palmers Green and public realm improvements. Further details are shown on the drawings in Appendix A.
- 4.2 The main works will be delivered by Ringway Jacobs via the London Highways Alliance Contract.

## **5.0 STATUTORY CONSULTATION**

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

- Cycle lanes with exemptions to allow picking up and setting down by blue badge holders and maintenance vehicles
- Various parking places
- Goods vehicle loading bays
- Alterations to bus lanes and taxi ranks
- Closure of existing slip roads and service roads

- 5.2 The procedure for making TMOs is set out in the Local Authorities' Traffic Order (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996. As a minimum, the regulations require the council to publish notice of its intentions in the London Gazette and a local newspaper, as well as notify the following bodies:

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

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

- 5.4 The council also has discretion to consult other organisations it thinks appropriate and routinely consults the following additional groups:

- Enfield Disability Action
- Federation of Enfield Residents' & Allied Associations
- London Travel Watch

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

- Erecting site notices along the corridor

- Promoting the consultation for three consecutive weeks in local newspapers
  - Publishing information on the Cycle Enfield website.
  - Distributing 17,000 consultation leaflets to properties within 400m either side of the A105 corridor.
- 5.6 The A105 statutory consultation leaflet was a non-technical document that sets out what has happened so far; lists the key aspects of the scheme and changes made as a result of the July 2015 consultation; includes a plan and visualisations of the route; includes answers to frequently asked questions; informs the reader how to access further information e.g. the air quality assessment, the economic impact assessment and the traffic modelling report and how to object to any aspect of the draft traffic management orders. A facility was provided on the Cycle Enfield website to make it easy for objections and representations to be made.
- 5.7 The statutory consultation period commenced on 6 July 2016 and continued until 29 July 2016.
- 5.8 The Council received approximately 1,600 objections, most of which were made on-line. Details of the responses are provided in Appendix B but some of the key comments made by the statutory and other respondents are summarised in the paragraphs below.

#### **Comments from Statutory Consultees**

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

#### **Metropolitan Police**

- 5.10 The Metropolitan Police Traffic Management Unit have been involved with the development of the scheme from the outset and provided comments that have helped shape the design. A further meeting with the Police took place on 22 July 2016 to outline the latest design proposals and no objections have been received.
- 5.11 Previous comments from the Police in response to the earlier consultation process stated:

*“Overall, the Metropolitan Police supports these proposals, which should improve safety for cyclists using these routes. It is possible that, in some reasonably foreseeable circumstances, the reduction in capacity for general traffic will result in increased response times for police when responding to emergency calls. However, this is impossible to measure, and we fully anticipate that once all works have been completed and scoot is fully operational, that any such delays will be minimal.*”

*However, there may be circumstances in which police vehicles may have to be driven on the cycle lanes or segregated cycle tracks, and it is therefore essential that the relevant TRO's include the appropriate exemptions for emergency services”.*

- 5.12 The traffic management orders relating to the introduction on the cycle lanes do include provision for emergency service vehicles to enter the lanes as and when required.

#### **London Fire Brigade**

- 5.13 The email response from the London Fire Brigade Borough Commander states:

*“London Fire Brigade (LFB) have no objections to the A105 proposals as presented. This response is the official response of the LFB, no further consultation with other LFB persons is required. Thank you for ensuring LFB were consulted on this project”.*

#### **London Ambulance Service**

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

*“I think generally I stick to previous comments made around traffic flow and calming measures. In essence the LAS needs 24/7 access to routes unhindered. Any changes to roads that increase congestion or slow down traffic and our access would be disappointing. I'm aware some parts of London have reduced the width of roads to allow the CSHW, this has caused concern for the LAS in some areas”.*

- 5.15 The previous comments referred to were:

*“Concerns around the width of the road and access past vehicles at bus stops. Parked vehicles and potential issues around flow if a vehicle should break down or there is an accident blocking the road. My concern is I need the LAS fleet to be able to have unhindered access so progress can be made while engaged on 999 calls. Needless to say I also need the LAS fleet to be able to remain mobile and not be gridlocked at peak times of the day. Therefore, the road network needs to be able to deal with everyday events and traffic while still keeping the road network moving. I'm not suggesting this system will not allow this but I note the width of the roads seems to be less with more potential bottlenecks around parking bays and bus stops”.*

- 5.16 The use of traffic separators to segregate cyclists from other traffic will help to minimise the impact on emergency service response times, allowing broken down vehicles etc. to pull into the cycle lane if necessary. This

distinguishes the scheme from many parts of the Cycle Superhighway, where the cycle lane is physically separated from the carriageway. In addition, the detailed traffic modelling demonstrates that the scheme will not cause gridlock, or indeed have a significant impact on journey times at most times. The impact of the scheme on journey times at peak times is summarised in paragraph 5.34 below.

### **Arriva London**

- 5.17 Objections have been received from Arriva London, who operate the 121, 329 and W6 bus routes along or on parts of the A105:

*"It is impossible to assess, from the information given, the impact on bus services of the various revocations and introduction of parking places and the introduction of prescribed routes;*

*Parts of the A105 are wide, but parts are sufficiently narrow that reduction in carriageway width will delay buses;*

*We have major concerns over the introduction of speed tables or any other vertical deflection. These have a disproportionate impact on buses and their passengers, even before the constant impact of heavy vehicles coming off the deflection affects the road surface on the exit side;*

*We rely on bus lanes to help give some predictability to journey times, and we object to the proposed removal;*

*I seek clear and specific assurance that the bus stands on, or adjacent to, Green Lanes at Green Dragon Lane, Fords Grove and Hedge Lane are protected for continued use by buses".*

- 5.18 A meeting was held with Arriva London following receipt of their objection to clarify the proposals and to discuss their concerns. 3.25m clear lane widths are provided in both directions along the corridor and the carriageway narrowing will not in itself delay buses. However, it is acknowledged that some additional junction delay along the corridor will impact on bus journey times, expected in the worst case to be in the region of 1 minute for buses heading south in the PM peak hour. This has been the subject of extensive discussion with TfL and a commitment has been made to identify measures elsewhere on the route (mainly in Haringey) to mitigate this impact.
- 5.19 A number of speed tables are proposed along the corridor to reduce speeds in critical locations, such as crossing points and junctions with connecting Greenway routes. These will all be designed to standards prepared by TfL and previously agreed with the bus operators, which incorporate gentler gradients to reduce the impact on bus drivers and passengers.
- 5.20 A section of southbound bus lanes between Oakthorpe Road and Ecclesbourne Gardens is removed as part of the scheme as the carriageway

is too constrained where it passes over the New River to accommodate both a bus lane and cycle lanes on both sides of the road. Queue length surveys demonstrate that average peak hour maximum queues do not extend beyond the length of the retained bus lane so the loss of the bus lane is not anticipated to have a significant impact on bus journey times.

- 5.21 The existing bus stands by Fords Grove and Hedge Lane are both retained as part of the proposals. The infrequently used stand north of Green Dragon Lane is relocated to Firs Lane, accessed via Percy Road.

### **Comments from Other Respondents**

- 5.22 The campaign group Save Our Green Lanes (SOGL) is understood to have distributed c.15,000 leaflets, suggesting possible grounds that people could use for objecting to the A105 draft traffic management orders.
- 5.23 Overall there was a strong response to the consultation, with over 1,600 comments and objections received and a wide range of issues covered, including objections relating to air quality; economic impact; traffic congestion; road safety; the impact on blue badge holders; the loss of uncontrolled parking; value for money; and the design of bus stops. As well as being addressed in Appendix B, each of these issues is considered in the paragraphs below:

### **Air Quality**

- 5.24 An independent study was commissioned to assess the impact of the scheme for the A105 on air quality. The assessment was carried out by Cambridge Environmental Research Consultants (CERC) and the result reported to Cabinet in February 2016.
- 5.25 The full report was published on the Cycle Enfield website and the leaflet sent to residents as part of the statutory consultation directed people to the report for further information regarding air quality.
- 5.26 Several people objected to the proposals on the basis that they felt that the 2.5% reduction in traffic levels on the corridor would not be achieved and, even if it was, there would be a worsening in air quality at junctions and other locations along the route due to additional delays at junctions and traffic being held behind buses or right turning vehicles.
- 5.27 The air quality report acknowledges that there is likely to be some increase in NO<sub>2</sub> concentrations at junctions where there are some increases in queue length and delay time. However, the report states that the areas of these increases will be much smaller than the area of air quality improvements along the rest of the route, with reduced traffic flows at 2.5%. These improvements are small (between 0.25 µg/m<sup>3</sup> and 0.5 µg/m<sup>3</sup>) but have the potential to increase if a greater mode shift from private car to cycling is achieved in the future.

- 5.28 Increasing cycling infrastructure and encouraging more people to cycle is a key element of the Council's Air Quality Action Plan, which is produced in recognition of the legal requirement on the Council to work towards air quality objectives within the Borough; this is as required under Part IV of the Environment Act 1995 and the relevant air quality regulations.
- 5.29 Enfield currently has a very low proportion of trips made by cycle compared to some other outer London boroughs and a mode shift of 2.5% is not unrealistic given the level of infrastructure improvement proposed. However, as this shift from cars to cycle is not guaranteed it is possible that the resulting air quality improvements will not be achieved.

### **Economic Impact**

- 5.30 An independent town centre study was commissioned to assess the impact of the scheme on town centre vitality. The assessment was carried out by Regeneris and the findings reported to Cabinet in February 2016.
- 5.31 The full report was published on the Cycle Enfield website and the leaflet sent to residents as part of the statutory consultation directed people to the report for further information on the impact of the proposals on Palmers Green, Winchmore Hill Broadway and Winchmore Hill Green Dragon town centres.
- 5.32 The core ground of the objection relating to economic impact is focused on the impact on car parking in the high street areas.
- 5.33 Following previous engagement and consultation events, the majority of high street car parking is retained in the designs, as much as 91% in some areas of Palmers Green, with 70% retention in the areas with the greatest reductions. Additional measures will be taken to increase shopper parking capacity by re-designing Council car parks and introducing zones of free parking for 45 minutes. The majority of people (approximately 75%) arrive to our town centres by walking or bus, but car parking remains an important component of developing successful town centres so rightly forms a central part in the design of the scheme. The proposals have been subject to an independent economic assessment, which took an analytical approach and identified a range of potential impacts that could result from the scheme. The report concluded that, although there may be some minor negative impact during construction, once the scheme was in place it was likely to have a negligible impact on town centre viability. A number of risk mitigation measures were proposed which the Council will implement, reducing further any risk that the scheme will adversely affect town centre vitality.

### **Congestion**

- 5.34 Further work has been carried out since Cabinet in February to refine the scheme design and the latest assessment of additional delay per mile are summarised in the table below, with the equivalent figures presented to Cabinet shown in brackets.



Additional delay per mile	Northbound (seconds)	Southbound (seconds)
AM Peak	35 (33)	16 (24)
PM Peak	35 (25)	34 (47)

5.35 Again, the traffic modelling report was published on the Cycle Enfield website and the leaflet sent to residents as part of the statutory consultation directed people to the report for further information. This assessment took account of the additional delays at junctions as well as delays at bus stops and due to removal of right turning pockets.

5.36 It currently takes 11-15 minutes to travel the length of the affected 3.2 mile corridor. The table below sets out the additional journey time forecast once the scheme has been implemented, assuming no reduction in vehicle trips takes place as a result of a shift from car to cycle use.

Additional delay	Northbound	Southbound
AM Peak	+ 1 min 52s	+ 51s
PM Peak	+ 1 min 52s	+ 1 min 49s

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

### Road Safety

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

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

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

- 5.40 Each of the points raised in the Stage 1 safety audit has been considered and taken into account in developing the detailed design. The detailed design itself will be subject to a Stage 2 safety audit prior to works commencing.
- 5.41 A particular concern raised by several consultees related to the risk of conflict between pedestrians and cyclists at bus boarders. Evidence from Camden and elsewhere suggests that bus boarders can be successfully introduced. In addition, the detailed design has been developed to include materials and signage to make it clear that pedestrians have priority at bus boarders. In addition, use of the bus boarders will be monitored and kept under review to help understand how they operate in practise, enabling further mitigation measures to be introduced if necessary.

### **Impact on Blue Badge Holders**

- 5.42 The Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Exemptions for Disabled Persons) (England) Regulations 2000 require that certain traffic orders made by local authorities under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 that prohibit or restrict the waiting of vehicles in roads and street parking places must include a provision exempting any disabled person's vehicle displaying a disabled person's badge. This exempts the holder from waiting conditions in certain circumstances, and from charges and time limits at places where vehicles may park or wait. The proposed traffic orders comply with these requirements. However, several consultees have raised concerns about the impact of the scheme on blue badge holders, mainly because the introduction of a mandatory cycle lane reduces the opportunity for casual parking.
- 5.43 The proposals for disabled parking are summarised below:
- Although reduced in number, blue badge holders will be able to park free of charge in on-street Pay and Display bays in Palmers Green and Winchmore Hill Broadway<sup>1</sup> for up to three hours;
  - Blue badge holders will be able to park free of charge in both the reconfigured Lodge Drive car park and Fords Grove car park (where Pay and Display is proposed to be introduced).
  - Designated bays for blue badge holders will be provided at least in the general locations specified in Schedule 6 of Appendix C, initially on an experimental basis so that they can be reviewed and amended in the light of demand, feedback and operational experience.
  - Blue badge holders will be able to park for up to three hours on both double and single yellow lines, providing there are no loading restrictions in operation at the time. These restrictions are also to be introduced experimentally so that they can be quickly modified in the light of feedback and operational experience.
  - The traffic order enabling the introduction of the mandatory cycle lane varies the national position so that vehicles with a blue badge can enter the lane to pick up and set down.

---

<sup>1</sup> The existing and proposed parking bays in Winchmore Hill Green Dragon provide free parking for everyone for up to two hours

- Along the length of the residential section of the corridor, gaps in the mandatory lane will be provided for loading/unloading which can also be used by blue badge holders to park for up to three hours. These restrictions are also to be introduced experimentally so that they can be adapted quickly if necessary;
- As at present, applications for disabled persons' parking bays will be assessed against the council's adopted criteria, acknowledging that bays may have to be located in nearby side roads rather than on the A105 itself.
- Although not restricted to blue badge holders, all residents fronting onto the A105 will be offered a dropped kerb free of charge to facilitate off-street parking, subject to safety and other relevant criteria.

### **Loss of Uncontrolled Parking**

- 5.44 There is an acknowledgment that the loss of uncontrolled on-street parking along the residential parts of the route may cause inconvenience to some residents in terms of parking and receipt of deliveries. Where possible, residential parking bays have been introduced and, following comments made during the statutory consultation, the relevant traffic management order will be modified so that there will no time constraint on their use.
- 5.45 It is accepted that these proposals will necessitate changes in the way deliveries are made to residential properties along the route, particularly where properties do not have their own private hardstanding areas. Delivery vehicles may need to park in side roads with goods delivered via trolley for the last part of the journey. Where there is not a side road in the vicinity, the design now incorporates a range of 'loading zones' in the residential areas of the route. Vehicles will be able to stop in these for loading and unloading, outside of peak hours (10am – 3pm). The designs have ensured that those residents with a dropped kerb will continue to be able to access their properties.
- 5.46 On balance, the wider benefits that the scheme will bring for the whole Borough in both the short and longer term are considered to outweigh the inconvenience generated for some residents.

### **Value for Money**

- 5.47 A number of respondents to the consultation cited their perception that the proposals would only benefit a very small percentage of the population. This suggests a misconception of what the scheme is trying to achieve. Currently, there are around 4,800 daily journeys by bicycle (less than 1% of total journeys). The initial target is to increase this fivefold to around 24,000 daily journeys. To achieve this, the scheme aims to open up the option of cycling to the full spectrum of the community so that more people can choose to cycle particular journeys where appropriate. Cycle lanes of the quality proposed will enable cycling to become a realistic option as part of the transport mix, a further choice alongside private cars, using public transport or walking. Therefore, the intention is not for a small percentage of the population to cycle

all their journeys, the aim is for a wide cross section of the community to cycle some of their journeys.

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

### **Bus Stops**

- 5.49 Several people made representations and raised objections about the potential for conflict between pedestrians and cyclists at bus stops, particularly the bus stop boarders.
- 5.50 Both the Stage 1 safety audit and the design appraisal undertaken by Centre for Accessible Environments (CAE) have also raised concerns about bus stop boarders. CAE state that:

*"The design of these stops is of particular concern as pedestrians are required to move onto the cycle lane when alighting and disembarking from the bus. This would be particularly dangerous for vulnerable passengers and wheelchair users using the bus ramps.*

*As the cyclists have not had a change of direction to use cross these facilities there is also a significant risk that they will be travelling at speed along these parts of the path and when accessing this shared surface fail to stop or by pass the area by cycling on the footway behind the bus stop.*

*This does not appear to be a recognised bus layout in any of TfL's guidance and we would strongly advise that this layout is not used as it does not appear to benefit either pedestrian or cyclist and could be a potential hazardous area for all users".*

- 5.51 Although CAE raise particular concerns about the treatment of bus stops, they acknowledge that the overall scheme will offer significant benefits to all users.
- 5.52 Evidence from elsewhere (such as Royal College Street in Camden) suggests that bus stop boarders can operate safely. However, they are a relatively new feature and people's concerns are understandable. To mitigate the risks a 0.5m buffer strip has been provided where feasible so that

someone alighting from a bus will not step directly into the cycle lane. In addition, signage will be erected, the cycle lane will ramp up to footway level, and materials used to highlight to cyclists that pedestrians have priority at bus stop boarders. Use of the boarders will also be monitored post-implementation, both in Enfield and in the other Mini-Holland boroughs where they are being introduced.

## **Conclusions**

5.53 All of the comments, representations and objections received following the statutory consultation have been considered and officers' responses are set out in Appendix B. This groups the responses into one of four categories:

- Objections about the principle of the proposals (Table 1)
- Objections about a common feature of the proposals (Table 2)
- Objections about a specific location (Table 3)
- Objections based on a technical or procedural matter (Table 4)

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

5.55 However, in response to representations received, it is recommended that the traffic management order introducing free parking places be modified pursuant to the provisions of section 14 of the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996. The effect of the proposed modification is to remove the two hour time restriction on all of the free parking bays along the residential section of the route. This modification is not considered to be substantial as it is reducing the level of control previously proposed and further consultation is not considered necessary in this instance.

## **6. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

6.1 The Council could decline the Mini Holland funding. However, this would mean forgoing £8.7 million of investment in the borough on this scheme, £33.7million of investment on other Mini Holland schemes and the associated economic, health and transport benefits.

6.2 At preliminary design stage, we investigated an alternative alignment along the banks of the New River. However, this was ruled out for the following reasons:

- Feeling of safety reduced for users as the route is not overlooked
- Poor access to the areas users wish to get to e.g. shops, banks, libraries, schools, post offices, doctors' surgeries, churches and police stations etc.
- Numerous break points require expensive works to create safe crossing environment for pedestrians and people using bikes

- Longer journey times due to the number of road crossings that would be required
- Little scope to expand infrastructure for future growth in cycling levels
- Insufficient width at several locations to create a two-way cycle facility
- Potential impacts to local wildlife by constructing next to the river
- Lack of connectivity with other transport modes e.g. train
- Would not address road safety for people on Green Lanes

## **7. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

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

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

### **8.1 Financial Implications**

8.1.1 The total estimated cost of construction is £7.6m, which comprises of:

Main works	£6,611,000
Traffic signal works	£544,000
Car Park works	£313,000
Client costs	£120,000
Total	£7,588,000

8.1.2 The above costs will be fully funded by TfL (£6.4m from the Mini Holland programme and £1.2m from the LIP programme (Principal Road Maintenance)).

8.1.3 On 16 September 2015, Cabinet approved the 2016/17 LIP programme, including £1.2m for Principal Road maintenance on the A105.

8.1.4 On 15 June 2016, Cabinet approved the Cycle Enfield spending plans for 2016/17, including £3.1m for the A105 scheme. Of this, £600K is for detailed design and £2.9m is for construction. A further £3.5million will be spent in 2017/18 to complete the A105 scheme..

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

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

### **8.2 Legal Implications**

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

- 8.2.2 In certain circumstances, a public inquiry needs to be held where objections are made: paragraph 9 of the 1996 Order. That does not apply here (see comments to consultation response at paragraph 76).
- 8.2.3 The proposed orders include a number of experimental traffic controls. These are permitted by section 9 of the 1984 Act for a period of up to 18 months. The use of experimental traffic controls is permitted in a wide range of circumstances, including where the Council wishes to be able to make changes quickly in light of operational experience.
- 8.2.4 It would be open to the Council to hold a public inquiry even though not required to do so. In view of the extensive consultation and engagement that has already taken place, it is not considered that it is either necessary or proportionate to do so in this instance.
- 8.2.5 In deciding whether or not to make the orders, section 122 of the 1984 Act provides that:

“(1) It shall be the duty of every local authority upon whom functions are conferred by or under this Act, so to exercise the functions conferred on them by this Act as (so far as practicable having regard to the matters specified in subsection (2) below) to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians) and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway .

(2) The matters referred to in subsection (1) above as being specified in this subsection are—

(a) the desirability of securing and maintaining reasonable access to premises;

(b) the effect on the amenities of any locality affected and (without prejudice to the generality of this paragraph) the importance of regulating and restricting the use of roads by heavy commercial vehicles, so as to preserve or improve the amenities of the areas through which the roads run;

(bb) the strategy prepared under section 80 of the Environment Act 1995 (national air quality strategy);

(c) the importance of facilitating the passage of public service vehicles and of securing the safety and convenience of persons using or desiring to use such vehicles; and

(d) any other matters appearing the local authority to be relevant.

(3) The duty imposed by subsection (1) above is subject to the provisions of Part II of the Road Traffic Act 1991.



### 8.3 Property Implications

There are no property implications arising from this report.

## 9. KEY RISKS

<b>Strategic</b>	Failure to deliver the scheme for the A105 would impact on the council's strategic aim to deliver a successful Cycle Enfield programme that achieves the associated health, transport and town centre benefits.
<b>Operational</b>	The scheme is forecast to have some impact on both parking levels and journey times along the A105, as outlined in the report. This is balanced by the wider benefits of the scheme (such as better safety for cyclists, improved health of residents and enhanced public realm) and mitigated by a range of measures including the increase in parking at Lodge Drive, the introduction of P&D at Fords Grove, and the provision of dropped kerbs for residents. In addition, the impact of the scheme on journey times has been modelled in detail and agreed with TfL. The council is also committed to monitor the operational impact of the scheme.
<b>Financial</b>	The scheme is estimated to cost the council £7.6m to implement. This risk is mitigated by the funding provided by TfL, which fully covers this cost.
<b>Reputational</b>	By implementing a scheme despite substantial local opposition, it may be perceived that the council is not listening to the views of residents. This is mitigated by clear and on-going communication explaining the wider benefits of the scheme.

## 10. IMPACT ON COUNCIL PRIORITIES

### 10.1 Fairness for All

10.1.1 Extensive consultation and engagement has taken place in relation to the Cycle Enfield proposals for the A105 and a wide range of views have been expressed.

### 10.2 Growth and Sustainability

10.2.1 With forecast growth in the borough, the A105 scheme will help to provide a safe and efficient means of accessing both Winchmore Hill and Palmers Green, contributing to their long-term vitality.

10.2.2 Cycling is a sustainable mode of transport with virtually no environmental impact compared to motorised transport. GLA population projections of an additional 45,526 people in the borough by 2040 indicate that congestion will

become ever more common without a modal shift towards more sustainable transport.

### **10.3 Strong Communities**

10.3.1 The A105 scheme will have a positive impact on people living in deprived wards/areas by improving personal health and fitness, with the potential to improve air quality (save for the situation at junctions: see section on 'Air Quality' above). It is recognised that more people on the streets will provide 'passive surveillance' making streets more accessible for communities to use for play, meeting and social activities.

## **11. EQUALITY IMPACT IMPLICATIONS**

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

11.2 With respect to the proposals for the A105, Council officers have produced an Equality Impact Assessment ("EQIA") (see Appendix E). This identifies whether or not (and to what extent) the proposals have an impact (positive or negative) on a particular equality target group, or whether any adverse impacts identified have been appropriately mitigated.

11.3 Cabinet considered the Predictive Equality Impact Assessment for the A105 scheme in February 2016, before granting approval to proceed to detailed design and statutory consultation. This is appended hereto, and due regard should be had to the public sector equality implications. The EQIA and its action plan continue to be reviewed to ensure delivery of the EQIA action plan and impact on the protected characteristic groups are minimised or mitigated.

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

- Make blue badge holders exempt from vehicular restrictions to enable them to pick up and set down in mandatory cycle lanes
- Introduce disabled persons' parking bays at the general locations specified in Appendix C, Schedule 6
- Provide gaps in mandatory cycle lanes for loading and unloading in residential parts of the corridor. Blue badge holders can park in these for up to three hours.

- Convert uncontrolled crossings to zebra crossings e.g. near Regency Court retirement/sheltered housing
- Provide designated loading bay to the rear of the Ruth Winston Community Centre
- Provide buffer strips, ramps, signage and distinctive paving at bus stop boarders
- Provide three rows of setts to demarcate cycle lanes from pedestrian areas in town centres

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

- Offering site visits to disability groups to familiarise their members with the new infrastructure
- Arranging for travel ambassadors to be available to explain how bus stop boarders work

## **12. PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS**

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

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

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

## **13. PUBLIC HEALTH IMPLICATIONS**

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

13.2 Compared to those who are least active, sufficient physical activity reduces all-cause mortality and the risk of heart disease, diabetes, breast and colon cancer, energy balance, mental health issues and musculo-skeletal disease by approximately 20 to 40%. These conditions account for 70% of the NHS budget.

13.3 The greatest gain in the health of the public will be from increased physical activity. However, other benefits are likely to accrue to the wider Enfield community including the avoided costs of motorised transport. These include avoided air pollution, congestion, noise, community segregation and increased financial resilience that result from a long-term modal transport shift towards cycling.

## **Background Papers**

None

## **List of Appendices:**

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

## **Appendix C – Traffic Orders and Feature to be Implemented**

### **Schedule 1 - Orders to be made without modification**

- a) Enfield (Cycle Lanes) No. 1 Order 20\*\*,
- b) Enfield (Parking Places) (Pay and Display) (No. \*) Order 20\*\*
- c) Enfield (Goods Vehicles Loading Bays) (No. \*) Order 20\*\*
- d) Enfield (Prohibition of stopping on Cab Ranks) (Special Parking Area) Traffic Order 20\*\*
- e) Enfield (Residents' Parking Places) (Enfield Town) (No. \*) Order 20\*\*,
- f) Enfield (Residents' and Shared Use Parking Places) (Queens Avenue) (No. \*) Order 20\*\*
- g) Enfield (Bus Lanes) (No. \*) Traffic Order 20\*\*
- h) Enfield (Prescribed Routes) (No. \*\*) Traffic Order 20\*\*
- i) Enfield (Prescribed Route) (No. \*\*) Traffic Order 20\*\*

### **Schedule 2 - Order to be made with modification**

- a) Enfield (Free Parking Places) (No. \*) Order 20\*\*

Proposed modification: Removal of the restriction on free parking places in residential areas limiting the length of stay to a maximum of two hours.

### **Schedule 3 – Traffic Calming Features to be introduced**

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

### **Schedule 4 – Zebra Crossings to be Introduced**

- a) outside No. 436 Green Lanes N13
- b) outside No. 1 to No. 6 Crestbrook Place, Green Lanes N13
- c) outside 10 to 20 Stefan House, Green Lanes N21,
- d) outside No. 701 to No. 713 (Compton Lodge), Green Lanes N21
- e) outside No. 140 and No. 142 Park Avenue EN1
- f) outside No. 105 London Road EN2.

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

### **Schedule 5 – Tiger Crossings to be Introduced**

- a) outside No. 239 Green Lanes N13
- b) outside No. 604 Green Lanes N13

- c) outside No. 792 Green Lanes N21
- d) outside No. 824, No. 826 and No. 828 Green Lanes N21
- e) outside No. 944, No. 946 and No. 948 Green Lanes N21
- f) outside No. 123 Park Avenue EN1
- g) outside No. 79 London Road EN2

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

### **Schedule 6 – Disabled Persons’ Parking Bays to be Introduced Experimentally**

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

- a) London Road, south of Roseneath Walk
- b) Village Road (not A105) by St Stephen's Church
- c) A105 near to Vicars Moor Lane junction
- d) A105 close to Shrubbery Gardens junction, by Post Office
- e) Station Road near to its junction with Green Lanes
- f) Compton Road near to junction with The Broadway
- g) A105 near to Woodberry Avenue (day time only)
- h) A105 near to Gillian House Surgery
- i) Hazelwood Lane, near to Green Lanes
- j) Lodge Drive, near to Green Lanes

## **A105 Statutory Consultation – Response to Objections**

### **1.0 Statutory Consultation Period**

1.1 Statutory consultation for the A105 project was held from Wednesday 6<sup>th</sup> July to Friday 29<sup>th</sup> July 2016. The purpose of this consultation was for interested parties to consider the published draft Traffic Management Order (TMO). There was also an opportunity for the revised drawings and associated impact assessments to be considered. Following consideration of this information, if they felt appropriate, interested parties were invited to submit objections to the proposals.

1.2 Notice of the statutory consultation period and publication of the TMO was carried out in the prescribed way, through publication in the Enfield Independent, Advertiser and London Gazette Press. The draft TMO was also fixed to lampposts along the route. However, in addition to this, over 17,000 thousand leaflets were also distributed to homes and business on and around the proposed route.

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

1.4 Both the draft TMO and the additional leaflet clearly stated that any objections that wish to be raised should be done so in writing. In order to streamline this process for respondents, a simple objection form was added to the Cycle Enfield website where individuals could state the specific location and nature of their objection. If individuals did not wish to use the online form, the postal address to write to was stated on both the distributed leaflet and the draft TMO.

### **2.0 Participation**

2.1 Objections were received via the online process, by e-mail and in writing. All objections, however they were received, have been considered. It should be noted that the use of references on draft TMO is standard practice in order to help differentiate objections from different draft TMOs that maybe published concurrently at different locations across the borough. However, in this high profile statutory consultation, it was clear which objections referred to the A105 scheme and as such, all objections were considered, irrespective of whether they included the reference stated on the draft TMO or not.

2.2 Objections were received via a range of sources. This included the online objection form on the website, copies of a paper based version of the online questionnaire, templated letters of objection from local businesses, individual letters from local residents / businesses and e-mails to a corporate Enfield Council e-mail address. The number of objection received totalled a little less than 1600. It should be noted that this represents a high number of overall objections. However, when considering the total number of objections, the following points are also relevant:

a. There is evidence that some objections were duplicated and submitted both electronically and in writing. There is no suggestion that this was an attempt to increase the number of objections, rather just a desire to ensure that the objection was received. It was not deemed necessary to allocate resources to the task of quantifying the level of duplication. Instead the focus of the review was to ensure that the full range of objections was considered.

b. Likewise, it is the substance of the objections that must be evaluated when considering responses. All objections have been considered, ensuring singular

issues raised by just one individual were considered in the same way as the broader objections that were received in greater volume.

c. Finally, it should be noted that there was an active campaign to increase the level of objections and a local campaign group distributed approximately 15,000 leaflets encouraging people to object and providing a series of objections that people may wish to express. A copy of this leaflet is at Annex A and content of this should be reviewed<sup>1</sup>. It is not possible to determine the extent to which individuals who raised objections relied solely on the information provided by this campaign group, or the extent to which they individually reviewed the detailed information available and formed their own view. However, it is clear that when asked for the location of the objection, in the region of 75% of the online responses (accounting for approximately 1000 of the objections) used the phrase 'The whole of the A105 cycle lane scheme from Enfield Town to Palmers Green' (or very similar) as directed in the campaign leaflet. These responses predominantly provided objections in principle to the scheme rather than a specific objection. Furthermore, the majority of the letters that were received from local businesses (received collectively in one envelope) are all based on one of 4 generic templates which have then been signed by individual business owners. Copies of these generic letters are at Annex B (any personal details are redacted).

### 3.0 Objections Raised

The statutory consultation resulted in objections that can broadly fall into one of four groupings. Objections within each of these groupings will be addressed in the following sections of this report:

- a. Objections about the principle of the proposals (Table 1)
- b. Objections about a common feature of the proposals (Table 2)
- c. Objections about a specific location (Table 3)
- d. Objections based on a technical or procedural matter (Table 4)

#### 3.1 Objections about the principles of the proposals

3.1.1 These objections are listed in no particular order:

**Table 1**

Ref	Nature of Objection	LBE Response
1	Objection to the proposals on the grounds that they will have a negative impact upon businesses along the route.	The grounds of the objection appeared to be focused on the impact on car parking in the high street areas. Following previous engagement and consultation events, the majority of high street car parking is retained in the designs, as much as 91% in some areas of Palmers Green, with 70% retention in the areas with the greatest

<sup>1</sup> One suggested objection appeared to cause significant concern. The leaflet encouraged people to 'Object to preventing Blue Badge holders from parking along the entire length of the cycle lane route. **Enfield will be the first Outer London Borough to remove the Blue Badge scheme from its shopping areas**'. The suggestion that this was part of the draft TMO is completely inaccurate and may well have caused distress to those who may have believed that this was part of the proposals.



		<p>reductions. Additional measures will be taken to increase shopper parking capacity by re-designing Council car parks and introducing zones of free parking for 45 minutes. The majority of people arrive to our town centres by walking or bus, but car parking remains an important component of developing successful town centres so rightly forms a central part in the design of the scheme. The proposals have been subject to an independent economic assessment. This report identified a range of potential impacts that could result from this scheme. Whilst it is not possible to predict the exact impact of this scheme, the report concluded that although the scheme may have some minor negative impact during construction, once the scheme was in place the scheme was likely to have a negligible impact on town centre viability. A number of risk mitigation measures were proposed which the Council would implement, reducing further any risk in the shorter term.</p>
2	<p>Objection to the proposals on the grounds that there is insufficient evidence to support the proposition that these proposals will increase cycling levels.</p>	<p>The development of safe cycling infrastructure in towns and cities across the UK has seen an increase in cycling levels. Enfield have conducted surveys across the Borough and were told that the best thing that the Council could do to encourage people to cycle is to create safe cycle routes.</p>
3	<p>Objection to the proposals on the grounds that the Borough already has cycle lanes that seem to be little used.</p>	<p>Whilst the Borough does have a number of cycle lanes, these do not form part of a considered network. To encourage mode shift, a coherent network needs to be created that enables people to find a route that connects the different destinations that they wish to travel between. The mini Holland funding enables the Borough to create this network over a relatively short period of time. Like any other transport system, this network is comprised of key main road routes, allowing direct and convenient travel and a further series of (greenway) routes on quieter streets. It is the accumulation of this comprehensive network which should accelerate the increase in cycling journeys.</p>
4	<p>Objection to the proposals on the grounds that they will increase pollution, considering the changes to junctions and narrowing of lanes.</p>	<p>The air quality report for this scheme acknowledges that there is likely to be some increases in some increase in NO<sub>2</sub> concentrations at junctions where there are some increases in queue length and delay time. However, the report states that the areas of these increases will be much smaller than the area of air quality improvements along the rest of the route, with reduced traffic flows at 2.5%. These improvements are small (between 0.25 µg/m<sup>3</sup> and 0.5 µg/m<sup>3</sup>) but have the potential to increase if a greater mode shift from private car to cycling is achieved in the future. This shift is unlikely to occur if the Council does not adjust the road network to create safe infrastructure to</p>

		encourage more people to cycle.
5	Objections to the proposals on the grounds that they will have a negative impact on the emergency services and response times.	<p>Through the majority of the route, the cycle lanes are formed from 'light segregation' a series of rubber blocks placed at intervals along the route to provide some separation between motor vehicles and people cycling. However, this does not mean that this space is completely inaccessible to motor vehicles in an emergency scenario. The scheme is designed to encourage modal shift and is intended to reduce the number of private motor vehicles on the road. If achieved, this will help reduce the pressure on the network which would ultimately improve the ability of emergency response vehicles to navigate the Borough. Conversely, as the population grows, if alternative transport methods are not pursued, the network will come under increasing strain, hindering further the ability for emergency vehicles to navigate the streets.</p> <p>The Metropolitan Police have been involved with the development of the A105 scheme since the outset and provided comments that helped shape the design. Previous comments from the Police stated "Overall the Metropolitan Police support the proposals, which should improve safety for cyclists using these routes....."</p> <p>The London Ambulance Service has not objected to the proposals but would be concerned about changes to roads that increase congestion or hinder the movement of ambulances responding to emergencies or taking patients to routine appointments.</p> <p>The London Fire Brigade has no objections to the A105 proposals as presented.</p>
6	Objection to the proposals on the grounds that private residences along the route will be unable to receive deliveries including building materials, placement of skips and ability for removal vans to load when residents move home. The Council should consider this impact in line with its obligations to provide a means to provide normal facilities to all households.	In the residential sections of the corridor, where there is no side road in close proximity to a property, it is proposed to introduce sections of single yellow line that will permit off-peak loading, which will allow for deliveries and loading. Applications for skips to be placed in the cycling lane for extended durations are likely to be refused.
7	Objection on the basis that the proposals are a waste of public money and funds should be spent on other council services.	The Mini Holland funding can only be spent on delivering the Mayor's Cycle Vision for London. If Enfield doesn't use it, it is likely the funding would be allocated to another London borough. This investment cannot be spent on other council services.
8	Objection on the grounds that motor vehicle drivers will turn surrounding roads into 'rat runs' as drivers seek to avoid any congestion that is created on the A105.	The Quieter Neighbourhood initiative, part of the overall programme, will follow implementation of the main road route routes. This will be a community-led initiative where interventions to prevent 'rat running' can be explored.
9	Objection to the proposals on the basis that alternative routes have not been	Alternative routes have been considered. The New River route at this intersection was not

	considered prior to the publication of the draft TMO and throughout the informal consultation stages.	deemed to be suitable as a primary route and the reasons for this have been described on the Cycle Enfield website. This explanation is still online and has been in place prior to the informal consultation which started in July 2015.
--	---	---

### 3.2 Objections about a common aspect of the proposals

3.2.1 These objections are listed in no particular order:

**Table 2**

Ref	Nature of Objection	LBE Response
10	Objection that cycle lanes will cause difficulty of access to those properties along the route with a crossover to property. Including the potential for causing congestion when leaving properties, having to reverse into a narrowed lane and potentially hindering traffic progression in both directions, leading to congestion.	Properties with crossovers will retain them as part of the proposed scheme. The light segregation will be positioned to enable residents to access their properties so there will be little or no impact on the existing situation in terms of property access.  The frequency of vehicles exiting residential properties on the corridor will be low and will have a negligible impact on congestion, compared to the existing situation, for vehicles reversing out of properties.
11	Objection to all speed tables, raised junctions and entry treatments because they are perceived to hinder emergency services, cause discomfort to bus passengers and damage motor vehicles.	Speed tables, raised junctions and entry treatments are recommended treatments to reduce traffic speeds, increasing safety for all road users. Ramps will be designed to the latest standards, which seek to minimise the impact on emergency vehicles and bus passengers. These have been successfully used elsewhere.
12	Objection to the reduction of residential parking along the route.	Parking along the corridor has been retained where possible. Parking surveys have been carried out which show spare capacity on the side roads to offset the loss of on-street parking. The majority of properties also benefit from off-street parking and the Council will consider requests for vehicle crossovers where on-street parking is displaced by Cycle Enfield.
13	Objection to the reduction of parking in town centre areas on the grounds that this will negatively impact business.	An economic assessment has been undertaken which takes into consideration the loss of parking and this assessment showed a negligible impact on businesses.
14	Objection to the removal of additional parking that becomes available in the evening to support the night time economy (parking on yellow lines).	To offset the loss of yellow line parking in the town centres the car parks at Lodge Drive and Fords Grove will remain open later into the evening, with free parking after 6.30p.m.
15	Objection on the grounds that the proposals include the restriction of parking to one side only of the road almost throughout the entire route and this will cause considerable difficulties for both residents and businesses.	Locating parking on one side of the road allows for a greater number of spaces to be provided, as opposed to staggering them on either side of the road. It is not possible to accommodate parking on both sides of the road, along with cycle facilities. The vast majority of parking has been retained in the retail areas and is supplemented by additional retail parking in the

		Ford's Grove and Lodge Drive car parks.
16	Objection to the introduction of 'tiger crossings' on the grounds of safety.	The proposed parallel pedestrian and cycle crossings form part of the latest 'The Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions' and are a recommended design in the London Cycle Design Standards. These are proposed across the five main corridors and will become a locally recognised feature. Monitoring will take place post implementation to review the operation of the crossings.
17	Objection that a number of zebra crossings will have central refuge removed which means having to cross both direction at one time and leads to longer waiting time for motorists / cyclists.	The resulting delay by the removal of the central islands at the crossings is not considered to be significant and will benefit pedestrians, as well as cyclists, where the crossings also provide a cycle priority crossing. It was necessary to remove the islands at crossing to accommodate a cycle lane and traffic lane of a safe width through the crossing.
18	Objection that the cycle track through the town centres and in certain other locations has created shared space that will generate conflict between pedestrians and cyclists.	The cycle lane is located between the parking and footway to mitigate conflict between vehicles and cyclist and to create a visibly wider public realm with better separation between cars and pedestrians. If the cycle lane were to be located between the parking and carriageway, there would be conflict between cars entering and exiting the parking and cyclists. A 0.5m buffer has been introduced between the cycle lane and the parking to mitigate 'dooring'. The cycle lane will have a distinct material and tonal difference to the footway and a border, a textured finish is provided for greater clarity and segregation to assist visually impaired users.
19	Objection to the bus stop boarder design on the grounds that it creates a danger for pedestrians.	Monitoring of the bus boarder on Royal College Street has been undertaken by Camden who reported no incidents since its implementation. Monitoring of the bus boarders will be carried out following implementation and also at locations across the other mini-Holland boroughs, where they have been or will be implemented.  The proposed design introduces signage, different materials and a change in level at on the bus boarders, so that cyclists are aware that they should slow down and that pedestrians have priority.
20	Objection to the bus stop boarder design on the grounds that the buses will need the hydraulic step to be lowered to enable people to reach the carriage way level (in the cycle lane) prior to reaching the pavement.	This is not the case. The bus boarder will be at footway level, so the bus will pull into a kerb with an upstand, as currently takes place.
21	Objections that the bus boarder design will prevent buses from waiting at stops to help regulate the service.	Whilst a number of bus stops are relocated in-carriageway and therefore buses will not be able to stop to regulate services, there are stops on the route that still allow overtaking, where waiting can take place. It should also be noted that only the 329 route runs for the length of the corridor, and therefore other routes using the corridor would have scope to wait on other sections of the

		route before or after they join the A105.
22	Objection about restrictions for blue badge holders on the grounds that the proposals prevent blue badge parking along the whole route.	Under the proposed scheme blue badge holders will be permitted to pick-up and set-down within the mandatory cycle lanes. Blue badge guidance states that when you are being carried as a passenger, or when you are being set-down or picked up, the driver is allowed time to accompany you to your destination, including taking you into premises near to the vehicle. Blue badge holders are also permitted to park where provision for loading is proposed along the route. Should a resident wish to apply for a dedicated disabled bay, then this will be considered by the Council, although it is acknowledged that it may not be possible to locate a dedicated bay on the A105, directly outside someone's' home.
23	Objection to the design of the cycle lane running on the inside of parking and loading bays on the grounds that this is unsafe.	Cycle lanes have been located between the parking/loading bays and the footway to remove the conflict between vehicles entering and exiting the parking/loading bays and people cycling, if the lanes were located between the parking/loading bays and the carriageway. A 0.5m buffer strip is proposed between all bays and the cycle lane to mitigate the risk of 'dooring'.
24	Objection to the reduction in lane width on the grounds that it will create difficulty for buses on the route.	Consultation with TfL bus teams has taken place and they accept that 3.25m per lane is sufficient for 2 large vehicles to pass each other. All lane widths are a minimum of 3.25m in each direction.
25	Objection to the draft TMO in respect of restrictions for motor vehicles entering the cycle lane on the grounds that this will have a negative impact on the loading and unloading provision for both business and residents along the route.	The volume of formal loading bays within the town centres has been retained or increased. In some locations loading has been relocated within the town centre to accommodate as many parking bays as possible. Loading on the residential sections will be possible either from side roads, or where side roads are not within a reasonable distance to a property, regular 'loading zones' will be provided to allow off-peak loading within the cycle lane.
26	Objection that in a number of locations (e.g. Barrowell Green) the zebra crossing does not span the full area from one pedestrian space to another, leaving pedestrians to cross cycle lanes without any suggestion that they have priority of movement.	Where there is a parallel pedestrian and cycle priority crossing, linking in with a Greenway, such as the crossing at Barrowell Green, it is necessary to introduce a section of shared space so that cyclists can access the crossing to and from the Greenway. The shared space will be clearly marked so that pedestrians and cyclists are aware of the shared space.
27	Objection that the cycle lanes are not wide enough and will cause danger to cyclists when attempting to overtake slower riders by having to move into the lane of motor traffic.	Where there is scope to do so, cycle lanes are 2.0m wide. However, there is a need for some sections of the cycle lane to be narrower to accommodate traffic lanes, parking and footways of an acceptable width. Cyclists pulling into the carriageway to overtake would be expected to wait for a suitable gap in motor traffic to undertake this manoeuvre safely.
28	Objection on the grounds that more 20mph zones are not proposed along the route.	Carriageway widths have been narrowed in order to achieve a slower average speed on the corridor. Post implementation monitoring will take place and should this highlight areas where traffic speeds remain high then a formal 20mph

		limit will be considered.
29	Objection on the grounds that there is nothing to prevent motor cyclist using the lanes.	The Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2016 stipulates that motorcyclists are not permitted within mandatory cycle lanes and this will be enforced along the route.
30	Objection because refuse collection vehicles will block the carriage way causing more congestion.	Council vehicles, including refuse collection vehicles, will be permitted in the cycle lanes to minimise the impact on congestion.
31	Objection on the grounds that there insufficient capacity in side roads for additional parking.	Surveys have shown that whilst some side roads are heavily used for parking, there is spare capacity on some sides and this along with the retention of some on-street parking and the existing off-street parking at the majority of properties on Green Lanes will provide sufficient space. It should also be noted that the Council will consider applications for crossovers, where properties do not currently have a crossover.
32	Objection to the proposed introduction of time restrictions to the residential parking bays along the route.	By introducing a time-limit during the working day the Council is seeking to prevent vehicles being left indefinitely along the residential sections, for example, by commuters, but retain the ability for residents to park overnight for free. By permitting free parking for 2 hours during the period 8am to 6.30 pm, this would allow visitors, deliveries etc. to residents to take place throughout the day. The Council have reviewed this and will implement the scheme without restrictions on the bays in the residential areas and review the usage as part of the monitoring strategy.

### 3.3 Objections about a specific location

3.3.1 These objections are listed in no particular order:

**Table 3**

<b>Ref</b>	<b>Nature of Objection</b>	<b>LBE Response</b>
33	The draft TMO states that cycle lanes will be introduced from Ecclesbourne Gardens N13 to Cecil Road EN2, but this is a mis-description because the cycle lane stops short of Cecil Road.	As part of this draft TMO the intention is to retain the bus lane. However, the cycle lane will extend the full length of this part of London Road, but this northern section will now be considered as part of the revised design for the Enfield Town project. Wherever possible, the ambition remains to build continuous routes, but the implementation of the complete network will need to be delivered in stages.
34	Objection to the design of the cycle lane where it joins the service road at the northern end of London Road. The objection is based on the suggestion that the design encourages people cycling to move from the road to the cycle lane at speed and that this has the potential to cause conflict with pedestrians moving	The radius of the proposed cycle lane entering the shared space is designed to reduce cycle speeds on the approach. Different materials will be used along the shared area, to make it clear to cyclists, pedestrians and general traffic that they are entering a shared space environment, and this will be complemented by signage.

	from the pavement to this shared space environment.	
35	Objection to the closure of the London Road service road on the grounds that it will have a negative impact on the businesses in this area owing to inability to deliver, in particular Majestic Wines and the Fish & Chip shop.	Access to the Majestic Wine car park will still be permitted under the proposed scheme. The parking in the service road has been relocated to the carriageway. The proposed bays are 2.5m wide to accommodate a loading vehicle.
36	Objection to the proposal to make Park Crescent part of the Enfield Town Controlled Parking Zone on the grounds that the majority of the residents of this road have not been consulted on this proposal.	The draft TMO did not make a proposal to consume Park Crescent into the Enfield Town CPZ. However it did make a proposal to create a 2 car bay at the very top of Park Crescent, to replace an existing bay that is being removed from London Road. These 2 bays would then form part of the Enfield Town CPZ.
37	Objection to the removal of the central refuges on the corner of Park Avenue, Bush Hill, Uvedale Road and London Road on the grounds that removal will increase the danger of collision, compounded by the narrowing of the lane, especially so at night.	The island has been removed to retain acceptable lane widths for large vehicles vehicle undertaking the turning movement. The retention of the island would result in lane widths which would be too narrow to safely accommodate a large vehicle.
38	Objection to the introduction of a new zebra crossing at the north end of Park Avenue on the grounds that the sight lines are insufficient.	<p>The proposed visibility splay is 33.8m. ATC data shows that the mean speed is 22.6mph and 85%ile of 25.9 at a comparable location (Green Dragons Lane to the south of Bush Hill on the A105).</p> <p>The proposed scheme reduces carriageway widths and the area is on a raised table and is therefore likely to reduce speeds, compared to existing.</p> <p>Assuming a speed of 25mph the recommended Stopping Sight Distance (SSD) is 33m, at 20mph this is 25m.</p> <p>The need for additional warning signs and other possible mitigation measures will be reviewed as part of the Stage 2 Road Safety Audit</p>
39	Objection to the footpath being narrowed to less than 2 meters by the South bound 'Church Street' bus stop on the grounds that it will be awkward for pedestrians to pass, particularly because of the sharp edge wall in this location.	The layout has been amended so that a footway width of 2.0m is available at the corner of property 122 Village Road. Land has been acquired to the south of this so that the bus stop can be retained in close proximity to the shops, as well as parking.
40	Objection to the design of the Village Road / Ridge Avenue junction on the grounds that there is confusion over whether the diagonal crossing is for pedestrians as well as cyclists, concerns over whether the time available will be sufficient to cross and concerns over conflict between pedestrians and cyclists. If the times available to cross are extended there are further objections to the congestion this will cause by vehicles having to wait for longer times at this junction.	<p>The diagonal crossings are for cyclists only and will be clearly marked with cycle logos and 'Elephants footprints' markings. The period of time provided for pedestrians to cross the Toucan crossings meets the latest design standards. Countdown timers will be provided on the signalised crossings to provide greater clarity on the time left to cross.</p> <p>Where Toucan crossings have been proposed the crossings have been widened to accommodate cyclists and pedestrians.</p> <p>The reason for the diagonal crossings operating</p>

		as cycle only, is to reduce the required time between signal phases, maintaining an acceptable level of capacity at the junction for general traffic and buses.
41	Objection that no loading is provided for businesses at Avenue Parade & Bush Hill Parade.	The service road at Avenue Parade has been retained, where loading can take place The existing parking has been retained on Church Street and two additional bays have been proposed on Village Road, south of the bus stop. Bush Hill Parade also benefits from rear access, which will not be affected by the scheme.
42	Objection to the design of the Green Dragon Lane junction on the grounds that congestion will be created by vehicles turning and that it is difficult for pedestrians to cross.	The traffic island on Green Dragon Lane has been retained, so pedestrians will not have to cross both movements at the same time. The proposed design also retained a right-turn pocket so it is not anticipated that there will be any impact on congestion at the junction. The crossing to the north replaces an existing advisory crossing, which will benefit pedestrian crossing the A105.
43	Proposal for contraflow cycling along Devonshire Road based on the perception that this will be dangerous.	The conversion of one-way roads to two-way working for cycling is recommended in the London Cycle Design Standards, with the following extract taken from the standards. <i>'Unless there are over-riding reasons not to, there should be a presumption that contraflow cycling should be provided in any one-way street'</i> This arrangement is already in place at several locations throughout the Borough with no reported problems.
44	Objection to the retention of taxi rank on Alderman's Hill, believed to be superfluous.	Taxi ranks are a vital part of the transport network and help ensure that taxi services can meet passenger demands. More than a third of taxi journeys completed in London each year originate from a taxi rank. Ranks are also of particular importance to passengers with mobility issues or those starting their journey in suburban areas. As a result the proposals look to retain the taxi rank in the vicinity of the station and the Palmers Green triangle, which are considered key trip generators.
45	Objection on the grounds that the Barclays Bank security vehicle will be required to stop in the carriageway and block left turning traffic moving down Aldermans Hill.	Under the proposed scheme a loading bay is located between Alderman's Hill and Devonshire Road which will allow loading, including a security vehicle, without blocking the left turn lane.
46	Objection that 'The Triangle' has not been merged into the footway space and t-junction created at Aldermans Hill which would have created a more enhanced area of public realm.	The concept design at the bid stage proposed the removal of the triangle island. However, a number of objections were raised against the removal of Palmers Green Triangle so the Council made the decision to take forward the option which retains the Triangle based on the objections at the time.
47	Objection to increased opening hours to Lodge Drive Car Park on the grounds that this will generate anti social behaviour (as previously experienced).	The upgraded and expanded car park is proposed remain open later into the evening to support the evening economy in Palmers Green. Access controls will be introduced so that vehicles cannot enter the car park after a



		specified time, but those already in the car park will be able to exit. This, together with amendments to the car park design, improved lighting and CCTV should ensure that past problems with anti-social behaviour do not recur.
48	Objection to the merger of the two northbound bus stops in Palmers Green on the grounds that this will increase the distance people need to walk to access a bus stop and increase pedestrian congestion around a singular stop.	The bus stops have been merged to retain more parking within the town centre. The distance between the existing Fox Lane bus stop and the proposed stop is 90m and from the Lodge Drive stop the distance is 70m, with the proposed stop centrally located on the high street. A bus by-pass with a 2.5m build-out has been proposed to accommodate passengers waiting to board.
49	Objection to the removal of the crossing just south of Hazelwood Lane on the grounds that pedestrians will continue to cross the road at this location which will be dangerous and create congestion.	The signalised crossing south of Hazelwood Lane has been relocated north as it is currently below the latest design standard regarding the proximity of a side road (Devonshire Road) to a crossing. The crossing to the north is offset further from a side road and also increases the amount of parking on the high street.
50	Objection to the proposal for a t-junction at Fox Lane on the grounds that it will create tailbacks along Fox Lane and encourage 'rat running'.	The replacement of a roundabout with a priority junction has been proposed to better protect cyclists through the junction, as recommended in the London Cycle Design Standards. The proposed priority junction will also reduce delays on the A105, which will benefit buses and general traffic. Post implementation monitoring will be carried out and mitigation implemented, where appropriate, should rat running be an issue.
51	Objection to the prevention of northbound vehicles turning left into Station Road.	Vehicles will be permitted to turn left onto Station Road via the slip road. However, vehicles will be banned from turning left at the signalised junction, due to the tight radius.
52	Objection on the grounds that traffic signals at Station Road will create tailbacks and congestion by the narrow bridges at Fords Grove and Farm Road.	Modelling of the proposed junction has been carried out and audited by TfL and the resulting impact on capacity and delays are considered acceptable by both Enfield and TfL for the proposed scheme.
53	Objection that the bus stand at Station Road is inadequate and that at times it is required to hold 2 waiting 125 buses and as such requires space for three buses.	The proposed stand can accommodate 2 standing buses with the third bus able to pull forward to the bus stop to the south, which will be the start of the northbound 125 route. The bus stand and stop locations have been agreed and approved by the TfL London Bus team.
54	Objection that the cycle lane cuts through the area by the Station Road bus stand making it unsuitable for pedestrians.	The width of the footway is approximately 6m, which is sufficient space to accommodate a cycle lane and adequate footway.
55	Objection that the pedestrian crossing provision from the bus stand to access Winchmore Hill railway station is inadequate.	Currently there are no formal crossings at the Fords Grove/Station Road roundabout. With a zebra crossing located to the south. It is not possible to provide signalised crossing facilities on all arms of the junction without oversaturating the junction, which would result in significant

		delays to buses and general traffic. The proposed scheme introduces a signalised crossing on Station Road, with a staggered signalised crossing on the southern arm of Green Lanes. The existing informal crossing on the northern arm of Green Lanes has been retained under the proposed scheme, which is comparable to the existing facility.
56	Objection to prevention of southbound vehicles using the slip road from the A105 into Hedge Lanes. It is perceived that this restriction will create difficulties for left turning HGVs and put pedestrians at risk.	Left hook collisions — where a motor vehicle turning left hits a cyclist — were involved in nine of London's fourteen cycling deaths in 2013. The left turn has been relocated to within the junction, to prevent left turn hook collisions occurring between ahead cyclists and left turning traffic. The traffic islands on Hedge Lane have been relocated east of their existing location to allow HGVs to safely make the left turn movement. The removal of general traffic from the slip road will make this easier to cross for pedestrians, with an average use of the stand being less than three times per day.
57	Objection to the lack of signalised pedestrian crossing points at the Hedge Lane / Green Lanes junction.	<p>Traffic controlled pedestrian crossings were considered at this junction. However, the modelling assessment showed that the introduction of signalised crossings would have a significant impact on the network resilience and would result in significant queues and delays to general traffic and the bus routes along the corridor. Therefore, based on the need to maintain network resilience, pedestrian crossings could not be implemented at this location.</p> <p>In the existing situation the time between the Green Lanes traffic phase terminating and the side roads receiving a green is 13 seconds. In the proposed situation there will be a period of 20 seconds where only cycle movements are permitted and the general traffic is held, where pedestrian could cross to the central islands or across the entire width of the carriageway.</p>
58	Objection to the upgrade of the informal crossing point by St Monica's Church to a zebra crossing. The objector acknowledges that it would create a safer crossing facility but objects on the basis that zig zag lines utilise space that could be otherwise used for car parking.	Given the need to remove the existing advisory crossing island to accommodate the cycle lane and feedback from the public consultation, it was considered essential to retain a crossing provision in this location, given the proximity to St Monica's Church.
59	Objection to how close bus stop boarders are located to junctions specifically at Firs Lane, Regency Court and Park Avenue, where there is a perceived issue of visibility and potential for conflict at junctions where people in motor vehicles are turning left and people cycling are travelling straight on.	<p>At Firs Lane the bus stop is located in carriageway and will therefore hold traffic until it pulls away, allowing visibility of a nearside cyclist for traffic behind the bus.</p> <p>At Park Avenue the cycle lane has been offset to allow a car to turn in and then give way to a cyclist, without blocking back onto the A105.</p>

		The proposed bus stop near Regency Court has been relocated as a result of the feedback from the public consultation.
60	Objection to the removal of the southbound bus lane between The Triangle and the A406 on the grounds that will increase journey times.	The bus lane has been retained between Alderman's Hill and Oakthorpe Road. A section of bus lane has been removed between the junction of Oakthorpe Road and Ecclesbourne Gardens, to accommodate the cycle lanes. Modelling has been carried out, which shows the average peak hour queue does not block back beyond the length of the proposed bus lane. The effective length of the bus lane is extended by the two lane approach to the zebra crossing at Palmerston Crescent, which is fed by a single lane to the north with the bus lane starting immediately to the south. It has not been possible to retain the bus lane to its existing length due to the narrower carriageway on the bridge.
61	Objection that there is nowhere to park for disabled visitors to Gillian House Surgery at 457 Green Lanes, N13 4BS.	Access to the off-street parking at Gillian House would be retained as part of the scheme, with the current off-street parking restriction associated with the surgery retained. Parking is available on the eastern side of Green Lanes between Park Avenue and Osborne Road, as part of the proposed scheme, as well as the existing side road parking off the A105. Under the proposed scheme blue badge holders would be permitted to pick-up and set-down within the mandatory cycle lanes. Blue Badge guidance states that when you are being carried as a passenger, or when you are being set-down or picked up, the driver is allowed time to accompany you to your destination, including taking you into premises near to the vehicle. The Blue Badge should be displayed when this happens. It should also be noted that current guidance for Blue Badge holders restricts parking where there is a dropped kerb, which forms a large section of the western footway in the vicinity of Gillian House currently and these dropped kerbs would be retained as part of the proposed scheme.  On an experimental basis, the Council will now also introduce an on-street dedicated disabled bay as part of the high street parking bays opposite the surgery.
62	Objection to the merging of the two zebra crossings by Sainsbury's store. The objector suggests that this decision seems to have been taken in order to try and maximise delays for other road users.	Based on site observations the predominant movement between the bus stops is to and from the Sainsbury's store. The existing arrangement of the southbound bus stop and zebra crossings is therefore away from the pedestrian desire line. The proposed bus stop arrangement improves the pedestrian desire line for people travelling between the store and the southbound bus stop.
63	Objection to the installation of traffic signals at the entrance to Sainsbury's store on the	Left hook collisions — where a motor vehicle turning left hits a cyclist — were involved in nine

	grounds that there are no perceived benefits for the majority of road users.	of London's fourteen cycling deaths in 2013. The access to Sainsbury's has a high volume of left turning vehicles as well as HGVs accessing Sainsbury's. The signals have been introduced primarily to remove the left hook conflict but it also provides dedicated time to the Sainsbury's exit to allow vehicles to exit onto the A105.
64	Objection to the lack of formal pedestrian crossing points at the proposed traffic signals at the entrance to Sainsbury's store.	Traffic controlled pedestrian crossings were considered at this junction. However, the modelling assessment showed that the introduction of signalised crossings would have a significant impact on the network resilience and would result in significant queues and delays to general traffic and the bus routes along the corridor. Therefore, based on the need to maintain network resilience pedestrian crossings could not be implemented at this location.
65	Objection to the re-design of the Compton Road junction on the grounds that the removal of the current traffic island is unnecessary and undesirable. Further objection is on the basis that through tightening of the junction, HGV will find the left turn difficult.	The changes at Compton Road offer significant public realm benefits to the area. The tightening of the radius is proposed to reduce the speed of all left turning vehicles into Compton Road, which will increase safety for cyclists.  Based on surveys no articulated HGVs undertook the left turn movements in the surveyed periods 7-10am and 4-7pm and only 5 rigid good vehicles undertook the movement. The junction has been designed to accommodate large vehicles turning left, albeit at a slower speed than at present.
66	Objection to the introduction of the seven echelon parking spaces on the south side of Compton road on the grounds that it will be hazardous for drivers to reverse vehicles in and out of these spaces.	The echelon parking bays have been introduced as a result of the public consultation feedback requesting additional parking. The parking bays have been designed based on the guidance in the Traffic Signs Manual, which states <i>'When not at right angles, the bays should be angled so that drivers are required to reverse into them. This is safer than reversing out, when visibility might be restricted by adjacent parked vehicles.'</i>  It is acknowledged that not all vehicles will reverse into these bays but approaching vehicle speeds will be low and vehicles which do back out onto the carriageway will do so with caution.
67	Objection to the removal of parking outside of the North London Hospice on the grounds that charitable donations will not be able to be delivered.	Parking is available immediately opposite the North London Hospice. Parking is also available on Compton Road approximately 60m to the south or approximately 50m to the north on the Station Road service road.
68	Objection to the re-alignment of the Triangle on the grounds that it will create difficulties for westbound traffic turning right into Devonshire Road.	The re-alignment of the traffic island at Alderman's Hill will not affect westbound vehicles turning right into Devonshire Road. In both the existing and proposed situation there is a single eastbound lane passing Devonshire Road, which then flares to two lanes on the approach to Green Lanes.
69	Objection to the removal of parking on the west side of Green Lanes between	Parking has been reduced to accommodate the cycle facilities. By locating the parking on one

	Compton Road and Station Road on the grounds of a negative impact for local businesses.	side of the road it enables more parking to be retained. Echelon parking bays have been introduced at Compton Road and parking bays on the Station Road slip road retained following consultation feedback to further mitigate the loss of on-street parking on the west side of Green Lanes between Compton Road and Station Road.
70	Objection to the proposal to install traffic signals at the junction of Station Road / Fords Grove on the grounds that it is unnecessary and does not generate wider benefits other than increase safety for cyclists.	Left hook collisions — where a motor vehicle turning left hits a cyclist — were involved in nine of London's fourteen cycling deaths in 2013. The proposed design looks to retain the left turn slip roads on the northbound and southbound for general traffic to Station Road and Fords Grove respectively. However, to mitigate the risk of left turn hook collisions it has been necessary to signalise the junction. As well as cycle facilities the proposed design introduces a signalised pedestrian crossing on the southern arms which replaces a zebra crossing, to the south and a signalised pedestrian crossing on the western arm, which is currently uncontrolled.
71	Objection to the relocation of the zebra crossing south of Green Dragon Lanes on the grounds that this provides a safe interchange between south bound 329 and west bound 125 buses.	The zebra crossing has been relocated so a safe link can be provided to the Greenway route on Bush Hill, retaining the crossing at its existing location would require cyclists to share a narrow footway with pedestrians, which is not recommended. Should bus passengers alighting the southbound 329, to access the westbound 125 wish to use a formal crossing, then there would also be scope to make the interchange between the Shrubbery Gardens stops which are the stops immediately to the south, where there is a zebra crossing between stops and the walking distance is slightly shorter than the existing interchange at the Green Dragons Lane stops.
72	Objection to the route going along Palmerston Crescent on the grounds that it will have a negative impact on residents.	The proposed route will not result in loss of parking on Palmerston Crescent, cycle logos will however be provided along the road to highlight to all road users that it is a designated cycle route.

### 3.4 Objections based on a technical or procedural matter

3.4.1 These objections are listed in no particular order:

**Table 4**

Ser	Nature of Objection	LBE Response
73	Objection that the draft TMO was published and objections invited whilst this scheme is still subject to a Judicial Review.	An application for judicial review has been dismissed by the High Court. There was no inconsistency between defending the judicial review and consulting on the draft TMO.
74	Objection to the draft TMO which states	Schedule 9, Part 7, para. 12 of the Traffic Signs

	<p>exemptions to vehicles entering the cycle lanes for maintenance / blue badge holders for picking up and setting down passengers – the contention is that the Council does not have the power to make these exemptions and that there is an error in the clause and reference cited.</p>	<p>Regulations &amp; General Directions 2016 enables the introduction of a mandatory with-flow cycle lane without the need for a traffic order. Sub-paragraph 12 (5) provides for a number of exemptions but does not include an exemption for blue badge holders or council maintenance vehicles.</p> <p>The above provisions do not repeal or otherwise constrain the Order making powers contained in the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and the Council is therefore able to make an order to introduce the additional exemptions proposed.</p> <p>The clauses and references cited in the Order have been reviewed and are correct.</p>
75	<p>Objection that both designated disabled parking places and loading bays will be enacted using an Experimental Traffic Order.</p>	<p>Section 9 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act empowers traffic authorities to institute experimental traffic controls lasting not longer than 18 months.</p> <p>The introduction of waiting and loading restrictions and disabled bays on an experimental basis allows changes to be made quickly in the light of feedback and operational experience.</p>
76	<p>Objection to the 24/7 restriction as given in Article 3 of the cycle lanes Traffic Management Order which, in prohibiting entry to the cycle lanes 24 hours a day, seven days a week, serves to prohibit parking and, therefore, any loading/unloading. By so doing this restriction prohibits deliveries to a significant number of businesses and a large number of residents along the A105; prohibits loading and unloading as part of household removals for a large number of residents along the A105; prohibits unloading and delivery of bulk or heavy items to a large number of residents along the A105; and prevents unloading and therefore deliveries by any class of vehicles for more than 30 metres out of 50 metres in many places along the A105. The effect cumulatively is therefore to prohibit the loading or unloading of vehicles of any class in a road on any day of the week at all times as described in paragraph 3 (a) (i) of Regulation 9 of the 'Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996'. The Regulations state that in such cases the "order making authority shall cause a public inquiry to be</p>	<p>The proposal includes the same number of loading bays in both Palmers Green and Winchmore Hill town centres as currently exists. Along the residential sections of the A105, loading gaps are proposed at regular intervals. These will be introduced on an experimental basis so that they can be easily modified in the light of feedback and operational experience.</p> <p>At this stage, the Council is not making an order which prohibits the loading or unloading of vehicles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• at all times;</li> <li>• before 07.00 hours;</li> <li>• between 10.00 and 16.00 hours; or</li> <li>• after 19.00 hours,</li> </ul> <p>The requirement to hold a public inquiry, as set out in para 9 of the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure)(England and Wales) Regulations 1996, cannot therefore apply in this instance.</p>

	<i>held before making an order to which paragraph (3) applies".</i>	
77	Objection on the grounds of a belief that the traffic modeling report underestimates motor vehicle delays that the scheme will generate. More detail on this objection is at Annex C.	Traffic modelling has been independently audited by the TfL modelling team and approved. As part of the Traffic Management Act Notification an assessment has been carried out assuming 0% reduction in traffic to understand a worst case scenario. However, given the borough wide level of infrastructure and comparing cycle modal share to other outer London boroughs, Enfield feel that the proposed reductions in traffic reported and achievable. It should be noted that the corridor delays reported in the traffic modelling report are based on 0% reduction.
78	Objection on the grounds that the designs for the scheme do not meet the London Cycling Design standards. More detail on this objection is at Annex D.	The designs have been developed in close partnership with the TfL cycle team who wrote the London Cycle Design Standards, with bus boarders shown in the standards.
79	Objection on the grounds that LBE intends to revoke and introduce various Loading Bays. However, the relevant draft traffic annexed to the Notice omits the introduction of two loading bays indicated on the plans page 12. These are outside 267 -269 Green lanes N13 and outside 196 - 198. The omission of this from the relevant schedule invalidates the entire Notice published by LBE, which should now re-advertise it. Furthermore, it is difficult to see how these two loading bays will be implemented, due to the frequency of crossovers at this locations and in respect of the loading bay on the southbound side of the road, the proximity to the controlled junction (Oakthorpe Road/Broomfield Lane)	<p>All of the good vehicle loading bays specified in the schedule to the draft order are shown in yellow on the plans. Additional loading areas such are those in the vicinity of 267-269 and 166-196 Green Lanes (and elsewhere along the residential sections of the route) will be introduced experimentally pursuant to Section 9 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.</p> <p>These loading areas will be defined by introducing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a section of advisory cycle lane;</li> <li>• a section of double yellow line at the kerbside to prevent parking (except for blue badge holders for up to three hours);</li> <li>• a loading restriction that prevents loading and unloading during peak periods.</li> </ul> <p>The position of the loading areas will take account the location of crossovers and the proximity to junctions.</p>
80	Objection that the air quality report findings are flawed because they are based on an earlier inaccurate data within the traffic modelling report.	There has been considerable traffic modelling throughout the development of the scheme and the Council are content that the data generated from this process is fit for purpose for use in the air quality impact assessment.
81	Objection to a series of loading bays in residential areas on the grounds that they have not been subject to any previous consultation and that the specific length of these loading bays are not defined.	The introduction of these loading bays are in response to previous consultation feedback and demonstrate how the design has continued to evolve in response to previous feedback. These loading bays will be introduced on an experimental basis so that they can be easily modified in the light of feedback and operational experience.
82	Objection that there is no assurance that the scheme will be delivered on budget.	The A105 scheme is subject to strict change control and governance processes and monthly progress meetings are held with TfL to review the cost plan, programme, and risk register.


		Information from these meetings is reported to the Mini Holland Board.
83	Objection to the proposal that Enfield Council will offer free dropped kerbs for those people wishing to park their cars on their property on the grounds that this is environmentally unfriendly.	This proposal is intended to mitigate the impact of reduced residential parking along the A105. There are a range of ways in which residents could provide parking on their own property which can be achieved without excessive environmental impact.
84	Objection to the lack of a proper consultation as the scheme and its implications have not been properly explained to residents and businesses.	The engagement and consultation for this scheme has been extensive and way beyond the statutory minimum required. It has consisted of a series of public exhibitions for businesses and residents. The details of the proposals have been available for review and over the last 18 months there has been extensive publicity regarding the ongoing engagement and consultation. As a direct result of the consultation, a range of changes have been made to the design of this scheme.

**Annexes:**


- A – Campaign leaflet promoting objection responses to the A105 Statutory Consultation.
- B – Generic letter templates from businesses.
- C – FERRA survey of delays objection detail.
- D – London Cycling Design Standards objection detail.



## Annex A – Local Campaign Group Leaflet


July 2016


### How to object to The A105 Cycle Lane Statutory Consultation



Enfield Council are proposing to devote around a third of the road width from Enfield Town to Palmers Green Library for the exclusive use of cyclists 24/7.

**Have you read the A105 statutory consultation leaflet yet?**

Only objections that relate to the draft traffic management orders will be considered by the London Borough of Enfield.



The Council's leaflet does not give you the full picture.

Please read this leaflet to find out:  
**Why** you should object  
**How** you should object

**You ONLY have until JULY 29th to make your views known**

## How to object

Objections can be made both online or in writing and must state clearly the grounds on which the objections are being made.  
**QUOTE REFERENCE TG-52-1314**

**Online:**  
[www.consultations.cycleenfield.co.uk/traffic-and-transportation/a105-statutory-consultation](http://www.consultations.cycleenfield.co.uk/traffic-and-transportation/a105-statutory-consultation)

**Q6 What is the specific location to which your objection refers?**

Answer this question by saying  
"The whole of the A105 cycle lane scheme from Enfield Town to Palmers Green"

**Q7 Please describe the nature of your objection? (Required)**

Answer using the list opposite.

**In writing to:**  
**The Head of Traffic & Transport**  
**Enfield Council, Civic Centre, Silver Street**  
**Enfield EN1 3XD**  
**QUOTE REFERENCE TG-52-1314**  
**YOU MUST STATE YOUR GROUNDS FOR OBJECTION**

## What you should object to

Here is a list of suggested objections to the draft traffic management order:

**OBJECT TO** the proposal to install continuous cycle lanes along the kerb, from Enfield Town to Palmers Green on both sides of the road.

**OBJECT TO** the potentially massive increase in congestion which will result if you force all vehicles to share a **single** lane.

**OBJECT TO** the effect on response times for emergency services including fire tenders and ambulances.

**OBJECT TO** the proposed bus stops which would put passengers (and cyclists) at risk as they have to cross the cycle lane to get on and off a bus.

**OBJECT TO** parking and delivery bays being located **OUTSIDE** of the cycle lanes. There have been many accidents in places where similar cycle lanes are already installed.

**OBJECT TO** the massive loss of on-street parking which will be highly restrictive for residents and businesses. In addition, there will be other restrictions such as: no skips, no deliveries, and no visitor parking.

**OBJECT TO** preventing Blue Badge holders from parking along the entire length of the cycle lane route. **Enfield will be the first Outer London Borough to remove the Blue Badge scheme from its shopping areas.**

**OBJECT TO** the potential loss of local businesses, such as: restaurants, take-aways, charity shops, hairdressers etc. which provide important services and jobs for the community.

**OBJECT TO** the lack of proper consultation, as the scheme and its implications have not been properly explained to residents and businesses.

**Why is Enfield Council putting residents lives AT RISK?  
PLEASE OBJECT TODAY and quote reference TG-52-1314**

## Unsafe Uneconomic Undemocratic

### Impact assessments

Enfield Council has been "economical" with the truth about the traffic modelling, economic impact and air quality reports they commissioned.

This scheme will do nothing to improve local prosperity, local bus services or air quality.

[www.cycleenfield.co.uk/A105](http://www.cycleenfield.co.uk/A105)



Source: <http://cycleenfield.co.uk/bus-stops>

**Support SOGL**

-  [www.saveourgreenlanes.co.uk](http://www.saveourgreenlanes.co.uk)
-  [facebook.com/savegreenlanes](https://facebook.com/savegreenlanes)
-  @SaveGreenLanes
-  [savegreenlanes@gmail.com](mailto:savegreenlanes@gmail.com)
-  07464 780516

**Donate:**

Please send cheques to:  
**SOGL**  
C/O 29 Broomfield Avenue  
London N13 4JJ

Or pay direct into our bank account  
Account name: Save Our Green Lanes  
Bank sort code: 20 25-19 (Barclays)  
Bank account number: 30928276

**The A105 scheme is putting your way of life AT RISK  
PLEASE OBJECT BY FRIDAY JULY 29th**

## Annex B – Generic Letters Received from Businesses

24

London Borough of Enfield  
Civic Centre,  
Silver Street,  
ENFIELD, MIDDLESEX EN1 3XD

Date 25<sup>th</sup> July, 2016

Dear Sirs,

CYCLE ENFIELD – REF NO: TG-52-1314

I refer to the above scheme and I am very concerned about its negative impact on our business.

Removal of quite a lot of parking spaces along Green Lanes would be detrimental to our business, other retailers and service providers such as hairdressers, charity shops, take-aways and restaurants.

Also, the scheme prevents Blue Badge holders from parking along the entire length of this scheme. This means London Borough of Enfield will remove the Blue Badge scheme from its shopping areas.

I, therefore, object to this proposal.

Yours faithfully, ☺

16

28th July 2016

David Taylor  
Head of Traffic & Transportation  
Enfield Council  
Civic Centre  
Silver Street  
Enfield EN1 3XD

Dear Mr Taylor

**OBJECTION TO TRAFFIC ORDER REF TG/62/1314**

I am writing to object to the A105 cycle scheme and the impact it would have on my business on Winchmore Hill Broadway, as well as others on this shopping parade.

The letter Enfield Council sent to local businesses last week did not give clear information about the substantial reduction in the amount of car parking space on The Broadway that would occur if these proposals were to be implemented.

This letter also did not give any information about how long The Broadway would have to be closed for business during the building of these unnecessary and unwanted cycle lanes.

I do not understand how the proposed changes would be any help to Winchmore Hill Broadway or Winchmore Hill in general. In fact the proposed narrowing of Green Lanes would result in there being long traffic jams for most of the day - which would not be progress.

The proposed removal of the small traffic island, near the junction with Compton Road, and its replacement by a zebra crossing, near Holy Trinity Church, would mean that people would no longer have a safe place to cross this busy road where they need and want it.

I strongly object to the proposal to build of these cycle lanes, not just in Winchmore Hill but along the whole way from Palmers Green up to Enfield Town.

I wish to register my disgust with the way that long standing local businesses are being treated by Enfield Council.

Yours sincerely

25

London Borough of Enfield  
Civic Centre,  
Silver Street,  
ENFIELD, MIDDLESEX EN1 3XD

Date 25<sup>th</sup> July, 2016

Dear Sirs,

CYCLE ENFIELD – REF NO: TG-52-1314

We write to object to this proposal in Palmers Green Town Centre. We rely on our customers visiting our shop and other businesses by parking their cars for a short period and doing their shopping. This scheme means massive loss of on street parking hence driving our customers elsewhere.

It seems that there has not been proper consultation regarding this proposal with residents and businesses along A105.

Yours sincerely,

33

London Borough of Enfield  
Civic Centre,  
Silver Street,  
ENFIELD, MIDDLESEX EN1 3XD

Date 25<sup>th</sup> July, 2016

Dear Sirs,

CYCLE ENFIELD – REF NO: TG-52-1314

We object to this proposal on the following grounds:

1. Removal of a lot of parking spaces along Green Lanes in Palmers Green which will be hugely restrictive for both the residents and businesses. It will also mean restricting deliveries which is extremely vital for a lot of businesses.
2. This would lead to increase in congestion which would effect response times for emergency services such as fire engines, police and ambulances.
3. There is lack of proper consultation, as the scheme and its implications have not been properly explained to the businesses along the route.

We urge the Council to reconsider this scheme and think of running cycle lane away from the high streets.

Yours faithfully,

## **Annex C – FERAA survey of delays (objection responded to at Table 4, Ser 77)**

**Objection** to the massive undercalculation of the delays and congestion likely to be caused by the proposed “bus boarders” introduction of which would mean that all traffic, which would have to use a single lane in each direction, would be delayed by stationary buses. These vehicles would obviously be unable to overtake the stationary bus at most times of day, because of the volume of traffic flowing in the opposite direction.

L.B. Enfield’s consulting engineers have predicted that these changes would not result in any significant traffic delays. To test this hypothesis the Federation of Enfield Residents and Allied Associations (FERAA) arranged for a member of the Chartered Institution of Highways and Transportation to carry out a survey of the delays that would be caused to northbound vehicles, at the bus stop on Green Lanes at the junction with Compton Road. This survey was conducted on Friday 20 November 2015 during the evening peak period (1700 - 1800) on a typical weekday during school term time.

The results showed that during this hour eight northbound buses stopped at this bus stop and the average dwell time was 21 seconds. Consequently the total amount of time, during this hour, when it would have been impossible for other northbound vehicles to overtake a stationary bus was 2 minutes 48 seconds (4.6% of the hour). This effect would be exacerbated with further stop-start queuing and also at bus stops with high usage (for example, near schools). On any view, **this is not** a “negligible delay” as claimed by LBE and its consulting engineers. Given there is strong evidence that Jacobs, L.B. Enfield’s consulting engineers, have grossly underestimated the likely delays that would be imposed on other traffic by buses stopping in the traffic lanes and by the removal of right turn pockets; and that the estimates calculated of the impact on air quality (produced for L.B. Enfield by CERC) were based on these traffic estimates provided by Jacobs it is evident that these significant underestimates of likely delays have clear implications for the subsequent calculations of air quality. L. B. Enfield did not attempt to verify either set of data and has not asked its consultants to update their calculations of impact of the proposals on air quality to take these more accurate data into account.

There is therefore an **object** to the proposals because, contrary to the claims made by LBE based on use of the erroneous estimates made by Jacobs, **the impact on air quality will not be positive but negative.**

## **Annex D – London Cycling Design Standards (objection responded to at Table 4, Ser 78)**

Objection to the fact that the plans – contrary to the claims made by Cllr Daniel Anderson during the call-in meeting - **do not comply** with the London Cycling Design Standards, which require that “all infrastructure delivered through TfL-funded programmes [apply] the [Guiding principles].” L.B. Enfield’s proposals are mostly funded by Transport for London, so it would be expected that these principles would be followed. The third of these principles is:

*“Cycles must be treated as vehicles, not as pedestrians.....Cyclists and pedestrians should not be forced together where there is space to keep them apart, creating unnecessary conflict which can only increase as the number of cyclists rises. We have a strong preference against schemes requiring cyclists and pedestrians to share the same highway space, where they can be avoided. ...”*

The fourth principle is relevant to the proposed “bus boarder” arrangements:

*“Most main roads in London, are, however, also bus stops with frequent stops. The cycle lane would have to go between the bus and the pavement. Everybody getting off or on a bus would have to step straight into the safety concerns both for bus passengers and cyclists.”*

For this reason TfL caution against the use of bus boarder arrangements on busy main roads. L.B.E’s designs do not appear to comply with these design standards. The above points were made in the Stage 1 Safety Audit yet LBE and its consulting engineers chose to reject them. Given the plans now have significant points that are at odds with accepted safety practice relating to pedestrians and passengers they clearly pose a significant risk to these groups.

## **Appendix C – Traffic Orders and Feature to be Implemented**

### **Schedule 1 - Orders to be made without modification**

- a) Enfield (Cycle Lanes) No. 1 Order 20\*\*,
- b) Enfield (Parking Places) (Pay and Display) (No. \*) Order 20\*\*
- c) Enfield (Goods Vehicles Loading Bays) (No. \*) Order 20\*\*
- d) Enfield (Prohibition of stopping on Cab Ranks) (Special Parking Area) Traffic Order 20\*\*
- e) Enfield (Residents' Parking Places) (Enfield Town) (No. \*) Order 20\*\*,
- f) Enfield (Residents' and Shared Use Parking Places) (Queens Avenue) (No. \*) Order 20\*\*
- g) Enfield (Bus Lanes) (No. \*) Traffic Order 20\*\*
- h) Enfield (Prescribed Routes) (No. \*\*) Traffic Order 20\*\*
- i) Enfield (Prescribed Route) (No. \*\*) Traffic Order 20\*\*

### **Schedule 2 - Order to be made with modification**

- a) Enfield (Free Parking Places) (No. \*) Order 20\*\*

Proposed modification: Removal of the restriction on free parking places in residential areas limiting the length of stay to a maximum of two hours.

### **Schedule 3 – Traffic Calming Features to be introduced**

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

### **Schedule 4 – Zebra Crossings to be Introduced**

- a) outside No. 436 Green Lanes N13
- b) outside No. 1 to No. 6 Crestbrook Place, Green Lanes N13
- c) outside 10 to 20 Stefan House, Green Lanes N21,
- d) outside No. 701 to No. 713 (Compton Lodge), Green Lanes N21
- e) outside No. 140 and No. 142 Park Avenue EN1
- f) outside No. 105 London Road EN2.

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

### **Schedule 5 – Tiger Crossings to be Introduced**

- a) outside No. 239 Green Lanes N13
- b) outside No. 604 Green Lanes N13

- c) outside No. 792 Green Lanes N21
- d) outside No. 824, No. 826 and No. 828 Green Lanes N21
- e) outside No. 944, No. 946 and No. 948 Green Lanes N21
- f) outside No. 123 Park Avenue EN1
- g) outside No. 79 London Road EN2

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

### **Schedule 6 – Disabled Persons’ Parking Bays to be Introduced Experimentally**

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

- a) London Road, south of Roseneath Walk
- b) Village Road (not A105) by St Stephen’s Church
- c) A105 near to Vicars Moor Lane junction
- d) A105 close to Shrubbery Gardens junction, by Post Office
- e) Station Road near to its junction with Green Lanes
- f) Compton Road near to junction with The Broadway
- g) A105 near to Woodberry Avenue (day time only)
- h) A105 near to Gillian House Surgery
- i) Hazelwood Lane, near to Green Lanes
- j) Lodge Drive, near to Green Lanes

GREEN LANES N13/N21, RIDGE AVENUE N21, VILLAGE ROAD EN1, PARK AVENUE EN1 AND LONDON ROAD EN2 - TRAFFIC ORDERS ASSOCIATED WITH THE INTRODUCTION OF CYCLE LANES BETWEEN ECCLESBOURNE GARDENS N13 AND CECIL ROAD EN2.

GREEN LANES N13/N21, RIDGE AVENUE N21, VILLAGE ROAD EN1, PARK AVENUE EN1, GREEN DRAGON LANE N21 AND AVENUE PARADE RIDGE AVENUE N21 - REVOCATION AND INTRODUCTION OF FREE PARKING PLACES INCLUDING A ZONAL RESTRICTION BETWEEN SHRUBBERY GARDENS N21 AND ELSIEDENE ROAD N21.

GREEN LANES N13/N21, LODGE DRIVE N13, HAZELWOOD LANE N13, STATION ROAD N21, FORDS GROVE N21, COMPTON ROAD N21, WINDSOR ROAD N13 AND LONDON ROAD EN2 - REVOCATION AND INTRODUCTION OF PAY AND DISPLAY PARKING PLACES.

GREEN LANES N13/N21, FOX LANE N13 AND ALDERMANS HILL N13 - REVOCATION AND INTRODUCTION OF GOODS VEHICLES LOADING BAYS.

GREEN LANES N21 AT ITS JUNCTION WITH STATION ROAD N21 AND FORDS GROVE N21, GREEN LANES N13/N21 AT ITS JUNCTION WITH THE SLIP ROAD TO HEDGE LANE N13 AND AVENUE PARADE RIDGE AVENUE N21 AT ITS JUNCTION WITH BUSH HILL ROAD N21, THE ROADS LINKING COMPTON ROAD N21 TO GREEN LANES N13, THE ROAD LINKING VICARS MOOR LANE N21 TO GREEN LANES N21 AND THE SOUTHERN END OF THE SERVICE ROAD IN LONDON ROAD EN2 AT ITS JUNCTION WITH LINCOLN ROAD EN1 - INTRODUCTION OF PRESCRIBED ROUTES.

DEVONSHIRE ROAD N13 - INTRODUCTION OF PRESCRIBED ROUTE OVER ITS ENTIRE LENGTH.

LODGE DRIVE N21 AND ALDERMANS HILL N13 - REVOCATION OF EXISTING TAXI RANK ON LODGE DRIVE N21 AND EXTENSION OF EXISTING TAXI RANK ON ALDERMANS HILL N13.

GREEN LANES N13/N21, PARK AVENUE EN1, LONDON ROAD EN2 - REMOVAL AND INTRODUCTION OF CONTROLLED PEDESTRIAN CROSSINGS AT VARIOUS LOCATIONS BETWEEN ECCLESBOURNE GARDENS N13 AND CECIL ROAD EN2.

GREEN LANES N13/N21, RIDGE AVENUE N21, PARK AVENUE EN1, LONDON ROAD EN2, DEVONSHIRE ROAD N13, HAZELWOOD LANE N13, WINDSOR ROAD N13, OSBORNE ROAD N13, QUEENS AVENUE N21, COMPTON ROAD N21, FOX LANE N13, PARK AVENUE N13, MEADOWCROFT ROAD N13, EATON PARK ROAD N13, SHERBROOK GARDENS N21, DEVONSHIRE GARDENS N21, VICARS MOOR LANE N21 AND BERKELEY GARDENS N21 - INTRODUCTION OF SPEED TABLES, RAISED JUNCTIONS AND ENTRY TREATMENTS.

PARK CRESCENT EN2, VILLAGE ROAD EN1, LINCOLN ROAD EN1 AND LONDON ROAD EN2 - REVOCATION AND INTRODUCTION OF RESIDENTS PARKING PLACES WITHIN THE ENFIELD TOWN CPZ AREA.

**QUEENS AVENUE N21 - REVOCATION AND INTRODUCTION OF RESIDENTS PARKING PLACES WITHIN THE QUEENS AVENUE CPZ AREA.**

**GREEN LANES N13 - REVOCATION AND INTRODUCTION OF BUS LANE.**

Further information may be obtained from Traffic and Transportation, telephone number 020 8379 4830

**1. NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN** that the Council of the London Borough of Enfield (the Council) propose to make the Enfield (Cycle Lanes) No. 1 Order 20\*\*, the Enfield (Free Parking Places) (No. \*) Order 20\*\*, the Enfield (Parking Places) (Pay and Display) (No. \*) Order 20\*\*, the Enfield (Goods Vehicles Loading Bays) (No. \*) Order 20\*\*, The Enfield (Prohibition of stopping on Cab Ranks) (Special Parking Area) Traffic Order 20\*\*, The Enfield (Residents' Parking Places) (Enfield Town) (No. \*) Order 20\*\*, The Enfield (Residents' and Shared Use Parking Places) (Queens Avenue) (No. \*) Order 20\*\*, The Enfield (Bus Lanes) (No. \*) Traffic Order 20\*\*, The Enfield (Prescribed Routes) (No. \*\*) Traffic Order 20\*\* and The Enfield (Prescribed Route) (No. \*\*) Traffic Order 20\*\* under sections 6, 45, 46, 49, 51 and 124 of and Part IV of Schedule 9 to the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, Section 8 of the and Part I of Schedule 5 to the Local Government Act and Schedule 9 to the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Direction 2016.

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

- (a) introduce a mandatory cycle lane Order to amend Item (5) of paragraph 12 in Part 7 of the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2016 to include in the list of purposes
  - (i) Council maintenance vehicles (or approved contractors); performing maintenance along the route; and
  - (ii) Blue Badge holders, for the purpose of picking up and setting down passengers.
- (b) revoke and introduce Free Parking Places in parts of the streets specified in the second paragraph of the heading to this Notice, and a restriction between Shrubbery Gardens N21 and Elsievene Road N21 that prevents vehicles from returning to a free parking place within the same zone within 4 hours;
- (c) revoke and introduce Pay and Display Parking Places in parts of the streets specified in the third paragraph of the heading to this Notice;
- (d) revoke and introduce Goods Vehicles Loading Places in parts of the streets specified in the fourth paragraph of the heading to this Notice;

- (e) introduce prescribed routes in the streets specified in the fifth paragraph of the heading to this Notice, as follows:
  - (i) northbound vehicles in Green Lanes N21 would be prevented from turning left into Station Road N21;
  - (ii) southbound vehicles in Green Lanes N21 would be prevented from turning left into Ford's Grove N21;
  - (iii) south-westbound vehicles in Green Lanes N13 would be prevented from turning left into the slip road at its junction with Hedge Lane N13;
  - (iv) one way traffic in a north-easterly direction in Avenue Parade Ridge Avenue N21;
  - (v) closure of the roads linking Compton Road N21 with Green Lanes N13;
  - (vi) closure of the road linking Green Lanes N21 with Vicars Moor Lane N21
  - (vii) closure of the service road in London Road EN2 at its junction with Lincoln Road EN1.
  
- (f) introduce prescribed route in the street specified in the sixth paragraph of the heading to this Notice, as follows: Contra-flow Cycle Lane for the entire length of Devonshire Road N13
  
- (g) revoke and introduce Cab Ranks in the streets specified in the seventh paragraph of the heading to this Notice;
  
- (h) revoke and introduce Residents Parking Places as part of the Enfield Town Controlled Parking Zone in parts of the streets specified in the tenth paragraph of the heading to this Notice;
  
- (i) revoke and introduce Residents Parking Places as part of the Queens Avenue Controlled Parking Zone in part of the street specified in the eleventh paragraph of the heading to this Notice, and;
  
- (j) revoke and introduce a Bus Lane in part of the street specified in the final paragraph of the heading to this Notice.

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

- (a) raised entry treatments (flat top design road hump) which would be constructed at a maximum height of 75mm above carriageway level and cover the full width of



the road at each junction location specified in Schedule 1 to this Notice;

(b) flat top speed tables which would be constructed at the locations specified in Schedule 2 to this Notice; and

(c) raised junctions which would be constructed at a maximum height of 75mm above the carriageway level and cover the full width of the roads at the locations specified in Schedule 3 to this Notice.

**4. FURTHER NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN** that the Council has approved, under section 23 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, the provision of new zebra crossings in the following locations. Green Lanes N13/N21, outside No. 436 Green Lanes N13, outside No. 1 to No. 6 Crestbrook Place; Green Lanes N13, outside 10 to 20 Stefan House; Green Lanes N21, outside No. 701 to No. 713 (Compton Lodge) Green Lanes N21: Park Avenue EN1, outside No. 140 and No. 142 Park Avenue EN1: London Road EN2, outside No. 105 London Road EN2. The associated zig-zag markings would be placed adjacent to the crossing and between the points specified in Schedule 4 to this Notice and would prohibit all vehicles from stopping on them at all times.

**5. FURTHER NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN** that the Council has approved, under section 23 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, the provision of new tiger crossings (a crossing where traffic should give way to pedestrians and cyclists) in the following locations: Green Lanes N13/N21, outside No. 239 Green Lanes N13, outside No. 604 Green Lanes N13, outside No. 792 Green Lanes N21, outside No. 824, No. 826 and No. 828 Green Lanes N21, outside No. 944, No. 946 and No. 948 Green Lanes N21, outside No. 123 Park Avenue EN1, outside No. 79 London Road EN2. The associated zig-zag markings would be placed adjacent to the crossing and between the points specified in Schedule 5 to this Notice and would prohibit all vehicles from stopping on them at all times.

**6. FURTHER NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN** that the Council of the London Borough of Enfield (the Council) propose to convert the footway into shared-use cycle tracks using powers under sections 65(1) and 166(4) of the Highways Act 1980 in parts of the following streets: Green Lanes N13/N21, Ridge Avenue N21, Village Road EN1, Park Avenue EN1 and London Road EN2.

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

Fridays inclusive.

8. Any person desiring to object to the proposed Orders, or make any other representations in respect of them or the zebra and tiger crossings (including the zig-zag markings) should send a statement in writing to that effect, and in the case of an objection stating the grounds thereof, to the Head of Traffic and Transportation, the Civic Centre, Silver Street, Enfield, Middlesex, EN1 3XD, quoting the reference TG52/1314, by 29<sup>th</sup> July 2016 or by visiting cycle enfield at [www.cycleenfield.co.uk/A105](http://www.cycleenfield.co.uk/A105)

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

Dated 6<sup>th</sup> July 2016

David B. Taylor  
Head of Traffic and Transportation

**Note** - Waiting & loading restrictions and designated disabled persons parking places will be introduced on an experimental basis as part of separate proposals at various locations in Green Lanes N13/N21, Ridge Avenue N21, Village Road EN1, Park Avenue EN1 And London Road EN2 (between Ecclesbourne Gardens and Cecil Road).

**SCHEDULE 1**  
**(Raised entry treatment location)**

**Devonshire Road N13**, from a point 3.5 metres North-West of the South-Eastern boundary of No. 399 Green Lanes N13, for a distance of 11.5 metres in a South-Easterly direction along Devonshire Road N13.

**Hazlewood Lane N13**, from a point 1.0 metre South-East of the Northern boundary of No. 346 Green Lanes N13, for a distance of 10.0 metres in a North-Westerly direction along Hazlewood Lane N13.

**Fox Lane N13**, from the North-Western kerb-line of Green Lanes N13, for a distance of 10.5 metres in a North-Westerly direction along Fox Lane N13.

**Park Avenue N13**, from the eastern kerb-line of Green Lanes N13, for a distance of 9.5 metres in an Easterly direction along Park Avenue N13.

**Windsor Road N13**, from a point 8.0 metres South-East of the Northern boundary of No. 402 Green Lanes N13, for a distance of 14.5 metres in a North-Westerly direction along Windsor Road N13.

**Osborne Road N13**, from a point 5.0 metres South-East of the Northern boundary of No. 444 Green Lanes N13, for a distance of 12.0 metres in a North-Westerly direction along Osborne Road N13.

**Meadowcroft Road N13**, from the North-Western kerb-line of Green Lanes N13, for a distance of 15.5 metres in a North-Westerly direction along Meadowcroft Road N13.

**Eaton Park Road N13**, from the North-Western kerb-line of Green Lanes N13, for a distance of 11.0 metres in a North-Westerly direction along Eaton Park Road N13

**Queens Avenue N21**, from a point 1.0 metre South-West of the Southern boundary of No. 736 Green Lanes N21, for a distance of 8.5 metres in a North-Westerly direction along Queens Avenue N21.

**Compton Road N21**, from a point 36.0 metres South-West of the Northern boundary of No. 735 Green Lanes N21, for a distance of 12.0 metres in a North-Westerly direction along Compton Road N21.

**Vicars Moor Lane N21**, from the North-Western kerb-line of Green Lanes N21 for a distance of 24.5 metres in a North-Westerly direction along Vicars Moor Lane N21

**Sherbrook Gardens N21**, from the Northern kerb-line of Green Lanes N21, for a distance of 11.5 metres in a Northerly direction along Sherbrook Gardens N21.

**Devonshire Gardens N21**, from the Northern kerb-line of Ridge Avenue N21, for a distance of 13.5 metres in a Northerly direction along Devonshire Gardens N21.

**SCHEDULE 2**  
**(Speed table locations)**

**Green Lanes N21**, from a point 1.0 metres South of the Southern boundary of No. 759 Green Lanes N21, for a distance of 22.0 metres in a Northerly direction along slip road leading to Station Road N21.

**Green Lanes N21**, from a point 5.0 metres North of the Southern boundary of No. 792 Green Lanes N21, for a distance of 23.0 metres in a Northerly direction along slip road leading to Fords Grove N21.

**Berkeley Gardens N21**, from a point 2.5 metres North-West of the North-Western kerb-line of Ridge Avenue N21 for a distance of 12.0 metres in a North-Westerly direction along Berkeley Gardens N21 and from the South-Western kerb-line of Berkeley Gardens N21 for a distance of 11.5 metres in a North-Easterly direction along Avenue Parade Ridge Avenue N21.

**London Road EN2**, from a point 11.0 metres North of the common boundary of No. 57 and 59 London Road EN2 for a distance of 9.0 metres in an Easterly direction along the service road access to Roseneath Walk EN2.

**SCHEDULE 3**  
**(Raised junction locations)**

**Green Lanes N13**, from a point 3.5 metres North of the Southern boundary of No. 150 Green Lanes N13 for a distance of 26.5 metres in a Northerly direction and from the Eastern kerb-line of Green Lanes for the distance of 22.0 metres in a Westerly direction along Palmerston Crescent N13.

**Green Lanes N13**, from the common boundary of No. 244 and No. 246 Green Lanes N13 for a distance of 45.0 metres in a North-Easterly direction and from the North-Western kerb-line of Green Lanes for a distance of 17.5 metres in a North-Westerly

direction along the Southern arm of Alderman's Hill N13 and 14.0 metres along the Northern arm of Alderman's Hill N13.

**Green Lanes N13**, from the a point 11.0 metres North-East of the common boundary of No. 282 and No. 284 Green Lanes N13 for a distance of 36.0 metres in a North-Easterly direction and from the North-Western kerb-line of Green Lanes for a distance of 28.0 metres in a South-Easterly direction along Lodge Drive N13.

**Green Lanes N13**, from a point 10.0 metres North of the common boundary of No. 613 and No. 615 Green Lanes N13, for a distance of 54.5 metres in a Northerly direction, from the Western kerb-line of Green Lanes N13 for a distance of 18.0 metres in a Easterly direction along Barrowell Green N13 and from the Eastern kerb-line of Green Lanes N13 for a distance of 18.5 metres in a Westerly direction along Woodberry Avenue N13.

**Green Lanes N21**, from a point 2.0 metres North-East of the North-Eastern corner of No.1 Fernleigh Road N21 for a distance of 19.5 metres in a North-Easterly direction and from the South-Eastern kerb-line of Green Lanes N21 for a distance of 17.5 metres in a North-Westerly direction along Fernleigh Road N21.

**Green Lanes N21**, from a point 5.0 metres North of the common boundary of No. 822 and No. 824 Green Lanes N21 for a distance of 27.5 metres in a Northerly direction and from the Eastern kerb-line of Green Lanes N21 for a distance of 16.0 metres in a Westerly direction along Shrubbery Gardens N21.

**Green Lanes N21**, from a point 7.5 metres North of the common boundary of No. 936 and No. 938 Green Lanes N21 for a distance of 48.1 metres in a North-Easterly direction and from the South-Western kerb-line of Green Lanes N21 for a distance of 14.5 metres in a North-Westerly direction along Green Dragon Lane N21.

**Ridge Avenue N21**, from a point 61.0 metres North-East of the common boundary of No. 92 and No. 94 Ridge Avenue N21 for a distance of 38.5 metres in a North-Easterly direction along Ridge Avenue N21 and from a point 5.6 metres North of the common boundary of No. 8 and No. 10 Church Street N9 for a distance of 42.0 metres in a Northerly direction along Church Street N9 and Bush Hill Road N21.

**Park Avenue EN1**, from a point 11.5 metres West of the Northern most boundary of No. 56 Village Road EN1 for a distance of 24.0 metres in an Easterly direction along Park Avenue EN1 and from the Northern kerb-line of Park Avenue EN1 for a distance

of 12.5 metres in a Northerly direction along Village Road EN1.

**Park Avenue EN1**, from the common boundary of No. 160 and No. 158 for a distance of 69.5 metres in a North-Easterly direction along Park Avenue EN1 and from the Western kerb-line on Park Avenue EN1 for a distance of 16.0 metres in a South-Westerly direction along Bush Hill N21 and from the North-Western kerb-line of Park Avenue EN1 for a distance of 10.0 metres in a North-Westerly direction along Uvedale Road EN2.

**London Road EN2**, from a point 5.5 metres North-East of the common boundary of No. 81 and No. 83 London Road EN2 for a distance of 63.5 metres in a Northerly direction along London Road EN2 and from the Eastern kerb-line of London Road EN2 for a distance of 10.5 metres in a South-Easterly direction along Village Road EN1 and from the Western kerb-line of London Road for a distance of 10.0 metres in an Easterly direction along Lincoln Road EN1.

#### **SCHEDULE 4**

##### **(Length of zig-zag markings relating to the new zebra crossings)**

**GREEN LANES N13**, Both Sides, from the common boundary of No. 428 and No. 430 Green Lanes N13 for a distance of 43.5 metres in a North-Easterly direction.

**GREEN LANES N13**, Both Sides, from the North-East kerb-line of Oaktree Avenue N13 for a distance of 30.5 metres in a North-Easterly direction.

**GREEN LANES N21**, Both Sides, from a point 62.5 metres North of the Northern kerb-line of Carpenter Gardens N21 for a distance of 32.0 metres in a Northerly direction.

**GREEN LANES N21**, Both Sides, from a point 3.0 metres North of the Southern boundary of No. 699 Green Lanes N21, for a distance of 41.0 metres in a Northerly direction.

**PARK AVENUE EN1**, Both Sides, from a point 12.5 metres North of the common boundary of Nos. 136 and 138 Park Avenue EN1 for a distance 34.5 metres in a northerly direction

**LONDON ROAD EN2**, Both Sides, from a point 24.5 metres North-East of the North-Eastern kerb-line of Castleigh Court EN2 for a distance of 39.0 metres in a North-Easterly direction.

**LONDON ROAD EN2**, Both Sides, from a point 25.0 metres North of the Northern kerb-line of Lincoln Road EN1 for a distance of 38.5 metres in a Northerly direction.

**SCHEDULE 5**

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

**GREEN LANES N13**, Both Sides, from a point 11.0 metres North of the Northern boundary of No. 217 Green Lanes N13 for a distance of 40.5 metres in a Northerly direction.

**GREEN LANES N13**, Both Sides, from a point 10.5 metres North-East of the common boundary of No. 594 and No. 596 Green Lanes N13 for a distance of 51.0 metres in a North-Easterly direction.

**GREEN LANES N21**, Both Sides, from a point 3.5 metres North of the Northern kerb-line of Elm Park Road N21 for a distance of 54.0 metres in a Northerly direction.

**GREEN LANES N21**, Both Sides, from a point 14.5 metres North of the common boundary of Nos. 936 and 938 Green Lanes N21 for a distance of 55.0 metres in a Northerly direction.

**PARK AVENUE EN1**, Both Sides, from a point 2.5 metres North-West of the common boundary of Nos. 158 and 160 Park Avenue EN1 for a distance of 42.0 metres in a North-Westerly direction.

**LONDON ROAD EN2**, Both Sides, from a point 8.5 metres North-East of the common boundary of Nos. 83 and 85 London Road EN2 for a distance of 40.5 metres in a North-Easterly direction.

## Enfield Council Predictive Equality Impact Assessment/Analysis

<b>Department:</b>	<b>Regeneration &amp; Environment</b>	<b>Service:</b>	<b>Traffic &amp; Transportation</b>
<b>Title of decision:</b>	Cycle Enfield proposals for the A105	<b>Date completed:</b>	11/01/16
<b>Author:</b>	Paul Rogers	<b>Contact details:</b>	<a href="mailto:paul.rogers@enfield.gov.uk">paul.rogers@enfield.gov.uk</a> 020 8379 3340

### Equality Act 2010 – Section 149

#### Public sector equality duty

- (1) A public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to -
  - (a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;
  - (b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;
  - (c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.
- (2) A person who is not a public authority but who exercises public functions must, in the exercise of those functions, have due regard to the matters mentioned in subsection (1).
- (3) Having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to—
  - (a) remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic;
  - (b) take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it;
  - (c) encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low.
- (4) The steps involved in meeting the needs of disabled persons that are different from the needs of persons who are not disabled include, in particular, steps to take account of disabled persons' disabilities.
- (5) Having due regard to the need to foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to—
  - (a) tackle prejudice, and



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

**Type of change being proposed:** (please tick)

New project	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Policy change or new policy	<input type="checkbox"/>	Grants and commissioning	<input type="checkbox"/>	Budget change	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	---------------	--------------------------

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

**Background**

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

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

Between 17 July and 9 October 2015, Enfield Council undertook a public consultation on the A105 scheme. We wrote to all properties within 400 metres of the proposed route, inviting local residents and business owners/managers to attend an exhibition and participate in the consultation. We also consulted residents associations, disability groups, cycling groups, the Police, London Ambulance Service and London Fire Brigade, transport user groups and bus operators. Detailed information on the proposals was published at <http://cycleenfield.co.uk/have-your-say/a105-scheme-consultation>. We provided copies of the consultation documents to those people that requested them in hard copy and accessible formats e.g. large print, Braille and audio.

The focus of the A105 consultation was about shaping the scheme to provide high quality, segregated facilities to encourage more people to cycle whilst meeting the needs of residents, businesses and visitors to Enfield. Enfield Council received a total of 1,646 responses to the A105 consultation. The majority of respondents supported the overall proposals with 50.7% (835) fully supporting and 8.6% (142) partially supporting the scheme. 38.9% of respondents (640) did not support the scheme and 1.8% (29) either had no opinion or were unsure.

#### **Proposal**

The A105 is the first of our main road cycling schemes and involves the installation of lightly segregated cycle lanes on both sides of the A105 between Enfield Town and Palmers Green. Additional traffic lights will be installed to remove conflicts and enable cyclists to pass safely through junctions. The scheme also involves significant public realm improvements at Palmers Green and Winchmore Hill, the creation of two minor areas of 'shared space', installation of new zebra crossings, side road entry treatments, raised tables and the remodelling of key junctions. To accommodate the new cycle lanes, it will be necessary to remove all central refuges, two sections of bus lane and approximately 70 kerb-side parking spaces. Relevant guidance, best practice and further engagement with stakeholder groups will help to develop the detailed designs and address comments and concerns raised by or on behalf of older people and those with disabilities.

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

#### **Comments from Key Stakeholders**

Below are common issues raised by respondents, with officer responses shown in italics:

Concerns about response times for emergency service vehicles

*Officers met with the Metropolitan Police and London Fire Brigade to discuss possible impacts of the scheme on their emergency response times. No concerns were raised at these meetings or via the consultation. London Ambulance Service have so far turned down our repeated requests for a meeting. However, there will be other opportunities for them to provide comments during the statutory consultation.*

Concerns about the effects of the scheme on shops and businesses

*Loading bays at Winchmore Hill and Palmers Green will be retained in their existing locations. At Lodge Drive car park, we will create 20 new parking bays. These will be free for the first 45 minutes to enable people to visit local shops and takeaways. After 6.30 pm parking will be free to support the evening economy. At Ford's Grove car park, we will introduce pay & display parking to increase turnover of parking spaces. As at Lodge Drive, 20 parking bays will be free for the first 45 minutes to enable people to visit local shops and takeaways. After 6.30 pm parking will be free to support the evening economy.*

**Concerns about the effects of the scheme on the night time economy**

*Loading bays at Winchmore Hill and Palmers Green will be retained in their existing locations. At Lodge Drive car park, we will create 20 new parking bays. These will be free for the first 45 minutes to enable people to visit local shops and takeaways. After 6.30 pm parking will be free to support the evening economy. At Ford's Grove car park, we will introduce pay & display parking to increase turnover of parking spaces. As at Lodge Drive, 20 parking bays will be free for the first 45 minutes to enable people to visit local shops and takeaways. After 6.30 pm parking will be free to support the evening economy.*

**Concerns about cyclist behaviour**

*These will be addressed by cycle training and enforcement*

**Concerns about a lack of parking close to shops**

*As much on-street parking as possible is retained given the need to maintain continuous segregated cycle facilities. Additional parking is provided in Lodge Drive car park and Fords Grove car park will be managed to better support the town centre.*

**Concerns about the level of provision of disabled parking**

*Apart from the disabled bays in Lodge Drive and Ford's Grove car parks, there are currently no disabled parking bays along the A105. We will review disabled parking provision during the detailed design phase and statutory consultation, including looking at the need for additional dedicated bays for blue badge holders in side roads. Although not directly raised during the consultation it is acknowledged that some blue badge holders may be parking on the residential sections of the A105 even through there are no dedicated bays at present. This will be addressed at the detailed design stage and footway crossovers provided (subject to planning permission being granted) where parking is displaced by Cycle Enfield and parking can be safely provided off-street.*

**Concerns about Dial-a-Ride services**

*Dial a Ride vehicles will be able to stop briefly in cycle lanes to pick up and set down passengers*

**Concerns about loading**

*The loading bays at Palmers Green and Winchmore Hill will all be retained in their existing locations.*

**Concerns about the arrangements for pedestrians at bus stop boarders and bus stop by-passes**

*Bus stop boarders and bus stop by-passes have been successfully introduced in Camden, Central London and Lewes. Accident rates did not go up and people soon got used to the new arrangements. As a result of comments received, we have incorporated a 500mm wide buffer between the kerb and the cycle lane at most bus stop boarders.*

**Concerns about the removal of informal crossing points and central refuges**

*The proposals involve installing new zebra crossings and replacing some informal crossings with zebra crossings*

Conflict with the blind and partially sighted

*We will follow the relevant guidance during the detailed design phase.*

Allocation of spending

*The funding can only be used to deliver the Mayor's Cycling Vision for London.*

Below are the comments of disabilities groups consulted relevant to the EQIA. Officer responses are shown in italics.

#### **Over 50s forum**

The Enfield Over 50's forum partially supports the Cycle Enfield proposals for the A105 and submitted the following comments: We have no problem with the idea of the A105 corridor being safe for cyclists. However we are concerned about pedestrians getting off buses and having to cross the cycle lane to reach the pavement. In addition we oppose the loss of on-street parking, for residents on the route as well as for businesses, and the lack of convenient stopping places for service vehicles, e.g. minibuses picking up elderly or disabled people from their homes, because of the restriction of parking kerbside where there is a cycle lane. This is of particular concern because those who use such vehicles are less able physically, often have sight difficulty and find a particular problem in inclement weather.

*Officers have addressed these concerns by:*

- *Improving the design of most of the bus boarders so they incorporate a buffer strip between the bus and the cycle lane.*
- *Minimising the loss of parking in residential sections and allowing blue badge holders and dial-a-ride vehicles to park in the cycle lane to set down and pick up.*
- *Providing additional parking in Lodge Drive and Ford's Grove car parks which will be free for blue badge holders.*
- *Reviewing the provision of parking for blue badge holders as part of the development of detailed design.*

#### **Guide Dogs for the Blind**

Guide Dogs for the Blind do not support the Cycle Enfield proposals for the A105 and submitted the following comments. The comments provide a useful checklist of issues to be addressed as part of the detailed design but officers' initial responses are set out below in italics.

#### **Shared surface streets**

The shared space concept is intended to be a way to provide an attractive environment, with slower traffic, less street clutter and a people friendly space. All of which we would support. However, one of the ways of implementing a shared space scheme is by introducing a shared surface street, sometimes called a level surface. This is where the footway and carriageway are of the same level with no kerb upstand. There may also be on uncontrolled pedestrian crossings.

*The shared space concept has only been applied to two lightly trafficked service roads along the A105. These will be carefully designed to mitigate the concerns of people with impaired vision and mobility.*

Key concerns:

- You have to make eye contact

Pedestrians, motorists and cyclists have to make 'eye contact' to decide who moves first. This obviously compromises the safety, independence and confidence of blind and partially sighted people. Blind and partially sighted people face a similar problem when crossing a standard road. *However, bringing the road up to footway level will lead to drivers being more cautious and improve safety for all road users.*

- People rely on the kerb

Blind and partially sighted people, particularly guide dog owners and long cane users, use the kerb as a navigation clue to know where they are in a street.

*A low kerb will be incorporated at the detailed design stage to provide a navigation clue.*

Tactile paving

Tactile paving should be provided at signal controlled crossings; dropped kerbs; or where the footway and carriageway are level at a junction; top and bottom of steps; at station platforms; and shared cycle and pedestrian routes. It is important that the appropriate tactile paving surface is used and the correct specification followed. All the different types and the recommended layout are provided in the Department for Transport 'Guidance on the use of tactile paving surfaces'.

*We will follow best practice where applying tactile paving to the A105 scheme at the detailed design stage.*

Pedestrian crossings

Controlled crossings should be provided and must have visual, audible and tactile signals. In addition they must have tactile paving as recommended in the 'Guidance on the use to tactile paving surfaces'.

*A number of new controlled pedestrian crossings are proposed in the A105 scheme and these will be of great benefit to the visually and mobility impaired. These will all be constructed with the relevant visual, audible and tactile signals and paving.*

Street furniture

Street furniture should be provided in a consistent pattern and not create obstructions on the footway. They should have good contrasting features and at the same time not cause glare as can be the case with stainless steel.

*The A105 proposals provide an excellent opportunity to declutter the high streets and provide a consistent pattern of street furniture.*

#### Visual contrast

Material, features and street furniture should have good tonal and colour contrast to enhance visibility for blind and partially sighted people with some residual vision. In addition, they should retain their contrasting features in wet and dull weather conditions. Uniform lighting is also essential and should enhance the street environment at night.

*These principles will be applied at the design stage.*

#### Bus Stop By-passes

We understand that from a cycle safety point of view, this is a positive design, to segregate them from the traffic, and allow an easy approach to the bus stop for buses. However, Transport for London/Enfield Borough Council has a duty of care to pedestrians, especially, in this case blind and partially sighted pedestrians - in its current form, we don't believe that has happened.

*We believe that the current design for bus boarders does make it clear that pedestrians have right of way. However we will carefully consider all the points made by Guide Dogs for the Blind at the detailed design stage and make amendments where necessary.*

#### **Royal National Institute for the Blind**

The RNIB do not support the Cycle Enfield proposals and provided some general comments. Concerns were expressed about inaccessible crossings, a negative impact on public transport and the disruptive impact arising from proposed changes to the locations of crossings.

*These comments will be addressed during the detailed design phase, building on the more detailed comments provided by Guide Dogs for the Blind.*

#### **Age UK**

*No comments or suggestions were received from Age UK*

#### **Enfield Disability Action**

*No comments or suggestions were received from Enfield Disability Action*

#### **Enfield Vision**

*No comments or suggestions were received from Enfield Vision*

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

The 'service' in this instance relates to users of the A105 corridor, including residents, businesses and community uses located along the route. However, there is limited specific information about the characteristics of the range of service users, which includes private vehicle users; taxis/minicab users; bus users; dial-a-ride users; pedestrians and cyclists. This is partly due to the range of organisations involved in providing services and partly due to the difficulty in collecting relevant equalities monitoring data.

Some context about the areas served by the A105 corridor is provided in the 2011 Census and the analysis included in the ward profiles for Bush Hill Park, Grange, Palmers Green and Winchmore Hill wards. The table below summarises some of the relevant characteristics of the key indicators and compares these to the borough average:

	<b>Aged 65+</b>	<b>Health/Disability<sup>1</sup></b>
<b>Borough</b>	<b>12.8%</b>	<b>7.3%</b>
Bush Hill Park	18.0%	7.1%
Grange	19.7%	6.2%
Palmers Green	13.8%	7.4%
Winchmore Hill	15.3%	6.3%

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

This suggests that a higher than average proportion of people living in the four wards are 65 or over (particularly in Grange and Bush Hill Park wards). It is also clear that a significant number of residents have a long term health problem or disability that is significantly limiting, albeit the proportion are either around or below the borough average..

The section below summarises the equalities monitoring carried out in relation to the A105 consultation itself. This highlights the support/partial support for the scheme falls below 50% for those aged 60 and above; that men are more positive about the proposals than women; and that the majority of disabled people did not support the proposal. To address these concerns there will need to be continuing engagement with all affected parties, both to help inform the detailed designs and to address identified issues and concerns post-implementation.

### **Protected characteristic: Age**

Of the 1,646 people who responded to the consultation 3.2% (53) are aged 0-24, 77.2% (1,271) are aged 25-64, 18.3% (302) are 65 and above and 1.2% (20) preferred not to say.

Below is a table showing how the level of support for the proposals varies with age. The table excludes the responses of 20 people who preferred not to tell us their age.

Level of support	Age Group																	
	0-4	5-9	10-14	15-19	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-64	65-69	70-74	75-79	80-84	85+
Support	2	9	5	6	16	51	101	128	111	104	108	73	50	43	13	6	2	0
Don't support	0	0	0	4	10	19	19	29	48	63	79	77	84	86	57	22	17	10
Partially support	0	0	0	0	1	4	14	10	15	14	18	17	18	16	7	3	5	4
Not sure	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	1	4	6	5	2	1	1	1
No opinion	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0
Total	2	9	5	10	27	74	136	167	174	183	206	171	160	151	79	32	25	15

From the above table it is apparent that:

- Respondents aged 50-54 submitted more responses than any other group
- 100% of respondents aged 14 and under support the proposals.
- The level of support (full + partial) decreases with age and dips below 50% at 60 years of age

**Protected characteristic: gender**

Of the 1,646 people who responded to the consultation 56.3% (927) are male, 42.0% (691) are female, 0.4% (6) are transgender and 1.3% (22) preferred not to say.

Below is a breakdown showing how the level of support for the proposals varies by gender.



Level of Support	Gender			
	Female	Male	Prefer not to say	Transgender
Support	308	518	5	4
Don't support	308	315	15	2
Partially support	62	79	0	0
Not sure	13	12	2	0
No opinion	0	3	0	0
Total	691	927	22	6

From the above table it is apparent that:

- 53.5% of women who responded to the consultation support the proposals (full + partial)
- 64.4% of men who responded to the consultation support the proposals (full + partial)
- 66.7% of transgender people who responded to the consultation support the proposals (full + partial)

**Protected characteristic: disability**

Of the 1,646 people who responded to the consultation 2.9% (48) are limited a lot by a health problem or disability, 6.6% (109) are limited a little by a health problem or disability, 86.8% (1,428) are not affected by a health problem or disability and 3.7% (61) preferred not to say.

Below is a breakdown showing the level of support for the proposals from respondents who have a health problem or disability.

<b>Level of Support</b>	<b>Number of respondents with a health problem/ disability</b>
Support	48
Don't support	88
Partially support	18
Not sure	3
No opinion	0
Total	157

From the above table it is apparent that 42.0% of respondents with a health problem or disability support the proposals (full + partial), 56.1% don't support the proposals and 1.9% are not sure. Some of their concerns, such as those relating to bus stop boarders, have already begun to be addressed and any remaining concerns will be addressed during the detailed design phase and statutory consultation.

<b>3. Equalities Impact</b> Indicate Yes, No or Not Known for each group	Disability	Gender	Age	Race	Religion & Belief	Sexual Orientation	Gender reassignment	Pregnancy & Maternity	Marriage & Civil Partnerships
Does equalities monitoring of your service show people from the following groups benefit from your service? (recipients of the service, policy or budget, and the proposed change) <sup>1</sup>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Does the service or policy contribute to eliminating discrimination, promote equality of opportunity, and foster good relations between different groups in the community?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
*Could the proposal discriminate, directly or indirectly these groups?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Could this proposal affect access to your service by different groups in the community?	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No
Could this proposal affect access <u>to information</u> about your service by different groups in the community?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Could the proposal have an adverse impact on relations between different groups?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
<p><sup>1</sup> Although not directly supported by primary data, it is likely that all of the protected groups are users of the A105 corridor</p> <p>If Yes answered above – please describe the impact of the change (including any positive impact on equalities) and what the service will be doing to reduce the negative impact it will have.</p> <p>*If you have ticked yes to discrimination, please state how this is justifiable under legislation.</p> <p>The two protected groups impacted by the A105 proposals are Age and Disability. The preliminary designs have been amended to take account of comments, concerns and suggestions received and thereby prevent, reduce or mitigate any negative impacts as follows. Further changes will be made during the detailed design phase following input from specialist consultants and/or representatives of relevant organisations.</p>									

**Protected characteristic: Age**

**Positive Impacts**

- Providing segregated facilities will have a positive impact by enabling people of all ages to cycle.
- Replacing informal crossings with zebra crossings will have a positive impact by making it safer for people of all ages to cross the A105
- Supporting measures such as the Bush Hill Park inclusive cycling scheme and cycle training for older adults may encourage more to take up cycling and remain physically active.

**Negative Impacts**

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

**Protected characteristic: Disability**

**Positive Impacts**

- Replacing informal crossings with zebra crossings will have a positive impact by making it safer and easier for people with disabilities to cross the A105.
- Side road entry treatments in Palmers Green town centre will make it easier for wheelchair users and people with restricted mobility to cross the side roads
- Supporting measures such as the Bush Hill Park inclusive cycling scheme and cycle training for older adults may encourage more to take up cycling and remain physically active.

**Negative Impacts**

<b>Impact</b>	<b>Mitigation</b>
Possible conflict with cyclists at bus stop boarders	Installation of buffer strips, ramps, signage and distinctive paving to inform cyclists that they are entering an area used by pedestrians and must give priority to pedestrians. Publicity campaign to be launched prior to and following opening of route to inform pedestrians and cyclists how to use the new facilities.
Possible conflict with other roads users in 'shared space' areas.	Shared surface treatments are only proposed in two lightly traffic service roads on the A105. The detailed designs will be developed in conjunction with local groups and or specialist advisers, but will involve the use of contrasting materials, tactile surfaces, low kerbs and other measures to help blind and partially sighted pedestrians navigate safely.
Loss of parking for blue badge holders	Blue badge holders will continue to be able to park in marked bays on-street and in off-street car parks for free. Dedicated blue badge bays could be included in the final design or post-implementation if necessary.  Footway crossovers will be provided on the residential sections of the A105 (subject to obtaining planning permission) to enable people, including blue badge holders to park off-street where practicable.
Reduced opportunity for dial-a-ride,	The traffic orders will be drafted to enable Dial-a-Ride vehicles and taxis and minicabs

taxis/minicabs to pick up and set down	transporting Taxicard holders to set down and pick in the cycle lane. The maximum period that such a vehicle can stop will be determined in consultation with relevant disability groups.
Change in road layout could result in short term uncertainty and confusion whilst all road users adapt to the new road layout	Prior to completion, targeted engagement with a wide range of local disability groups to raise awareness of the scheme and its possible impacts. Post completion, provision of advice and/or training in use of new facilities.

<b>4. Tackling Socio-economic inequality</b> Indicate Yes, No or Not Known for each group	Communities living in deprived wards/areas	People not in employment, education or training	People with low academic qualifications	People living in social housing	Lone parents	People on low incomes	People in poor health	Any other socio-economic factor Please state:
Will the proposal specifically impact on communities disadvantaged through the following socio-economic factors?	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	
Does the service or policy contribute to eliminating discrimination, promote equality of opportunity, and foster good relations between different groups in the community?	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	
Could this proposal affect access to your service by different groups in the community?	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	
<p>If Yes answered above – please describe the impact (including any positive impact on social economic inequality) and any mitigation if applicable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The A105 scheme will have a positive impact on people living in deprived wards/areas by improving air quality and personal health and fitness. Any shift from public transport or car use to cycling has the potential to increase financial resilience by reducing spend on travel costs.</li> </ul>								

- The A105 scheme will have a positive impact on people who are currently unemployed by making it easier for them to attend training courses and job interviews.
- The A105 scheme will have a positive impact on people with low incomes as travelling by bike is a cheaper alternative than travelling by car or public transport.
- The A105 scheme will have a positive impact on people in poor health by improving air quality, increasing physical activity and helping to tackle obesity. Physical activity has been shown to reduce long-term conditions (heart disease, diabetes, musculo-skeletal problems, mental illness by 20 – 40% depending on the condition).

#### **5. Review**

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

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

Due to the difficulty in obtaining primary data about the characteristics of users of the A105 corridor, monitoring will take the form of continued engagement with key stakeholders representing the interests of older people and disabled people. One option would be the setting up of an equalities advisory group(s) to initially advise on the detailed design of the scheme, to provide feedback on its impact once implemented and to help identify further practical mitigation measures.

## Enfield Council Predictive Equality Impact Assessment/Analysis

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

Title of decision: Cycle Enfield proposals for the A105

Team: Traffic & Transportation

Department: Regeneration & Environment

Service manager: David B Taylor

Identified Issue	Action Required	Lead Officer	Timescale/ By When	Costs	Review Date/ Comments
Stakeholder engagement	Hold Partnership Board meetings at key points Improve dialogue with disability groups and others to help inform detailed designs and throughout construction period	Traffic & Transportation	Ongoing	Fully funded by Transport for London	
Continue to minimise equalities barriers throughout detailed design, statutory consultation and implementation	Review/benchmark with models of good practice and attend training and workshops if appropriate  Establish specialist advisory group or seek specialist consultancy support to assist with the detailed design of the scheme	Traffic & Transportation	Ongoing	Fully funded by Transport for London	
Scheme publicity	Develop campaign aimed at relevant protected	Traffic & Transportation	During construction and after opening of	Fully funded by Transport for London	



	groups to highlight the changes to the road layout		relevant sections of A105 route		
Monitoring	Establish local stakeholder group(s) to provide feedback on the impact of scheme on relevant protected groups	Traffic & Transportation	Ongoing	Fully funded by Transport for London	
Access to service for all	Continue to promote cycling to relevant protected groups to increase take up of cycling	Traffic & Transportation	Ongoing	Fully funded by Transport for London	
Retrospective EQIA	Arrange for a retrospective EQIA to be carried in conjunction with relevant stakeholders/special advisors.	Traffic & Transportation	01/11/2017	Fully funded by Transport for London	

**Date to be Reviewed:** .....

*R A Cragg*

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

.....

This form should be emailed to [joanne.stacey@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:joanne.stacey@enfield.gov.uk) and be appended to any decision report that follows.