

# MUNICIPAL YEAR 2016/2017 REPORT NO. 151

## MEETING TITLE AND DATE:

Cabinet  
14 December 2016

Agenda – Part: 1

Item: 6

## REPORT OF:

Ian Davis  
Director - Regeneration  
and Environment

**Subject: Approval of Cycle Enfield  
Proposals for Enfield Town**

**Wards: Grange, Highlands, Southbury and  
Town**

**Key Decision No: KD4112**

Contact officer and telephone number:

Bob Griffiths: 020 8379 3676

E mail: [bob.griffiths@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:bob.griffiths@enfield.gov.uk)

**Cabinet Members consulted:**

**Cllr. Daniel Anderson and Cllr. Krystle  
Fonyonga**

**Associate Cabinet Member: Cllr. Vicki Pite**

## 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report seeks approval to undertake detailed design and statutory consultation for segregated cycling facilities and public realm improvements at Enfield Town. 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 note the results of the public consultation on options 1 and 6A and the resulting changes made to the design.
- 2.2 To note the air quality assessment, the economic impact assessment, the parking assessment, the traffic modelling, the equalities impact assessment and the comments of critical friends. These assessments were made in respect of the emerging design following public consultation.
- 2.3 That approval be granted to undertake detailed design and statutory consultation for lightly segregated cycling facilities and public realm improvements at Enfield town centre
- 2.4 That approval be granted for capital expenditure of £288,000 for detailed design and statutory consultation.
- 2.5 That delegated authority be granted to the Cabinet Member for Environment to approve and implement the final design of the scheme subject to further traffic modelling, consultation and completion of all necessary statutory procedures and make any additional changes as appropriate.

### 3. INTRODUCTION

3.1 In March 2013 the Mayor of London published his Vision for Cycling with the overarching aim to double the number of people cycling by 2023. The Vision, which is supported by funding of £913m over 10 years, set out four key elements:

- A Tube Network for the Bike – providing a network of cycle route across London
- Safer Streets for the Bike – a range of measures to improve cycle safety at junctions and to improve lorry safety
- More People Travelling by Bike – making cycling a mainstream and popular mode of transport
- Better Places for Everyone – more cycling will benefit everyone, not just people that cycle.

3.2 One of the key elements of the vision was the ‘Mini-Hollands’ programme, which allocated £100m to help boroughs deliver a step change in cycling and emulate some of the best practice seen in Holland and elsewhere. The programme was open to all outer London boroughs with funding awarded following a competitive bidding process.

3.3 Enfield’s bid, which had cross-party support, was based on the following elements:

- Providing segregated cycle lanes along the length of the A105 (Enfield Town to Palmers Green), A110 (Enfield Town to Lee Valley Road) and A1010 (Waltham Cross to Angel Edmonton);
- Revitalising Enfield Town and Edmonton Green town centres by improving the public realm and rebalancing space for traffic, pedestrians and cyclists (see para. 5.7 on Public Realm Improvements);
- Introducing ‘Quieter Neighbourhoods’ to address traffic rat-running through residential streets;
- Extending the Greenway network to promote leisure cycling;
- Addressing severance caused by the A10 and A406 North Circular Road;
- Introducing ‘Cycle Hubs’ at Enfield Town and Edmonton Green; and
- A range of supporting measures to encourage more people of all ages to take up cycling.

3.4 Enfield, Waltham Forest and Kingston were announced as the three successful bids in March 2014, each receiving in the region of £30m from the Mayor’s Mini-Hollands fund. Enfield has allocated further external funding to the project (principally significant elements of its annual LIP allocation from TfL), taking the total funding available for the project (locally branded as ‘Cycle Enfield’) to £42m.

3.5 In July 2014 the then Cabinet Member for Environment and Community Safety agreed to expenditure of £700,000 to commence the design and

consultation process. In September 2014 Cabinet agreed to the governance arrangements for the project, including the establishment of three Partnership Boards to allow a wide range of stakeholders to participate in the project. In April 2015 Cabinet agreed to the expenditure of an additional £1.9m to support the design and consultation process. In 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. In June 2016, Cabinet approved the Cycle Enfield Spending Plans for 2016/17. In July 2016, Cabinet granted approval to undertake detailed design and statutory consultation on the A1010 South. In August 2016, the Cabinet Member for Environment granted approval to implement the A105 scheme and make the associated Traffic Management Orders (TMOs).

- 3.6 Cycle Enfield represents a significant investment in the borough that can help transform our high streets and town centres; deliver long-term health benefits; and enable people to travel safely by cycle.
- 3.7 This report sets out the consultation undertaken to date on the Enfield Town scheme and how this has helped shape the design. However, there will be further opportunities for public engagement as part of the detailed design process. In particular, many of the scheme elements, including the mandatory cycle lanes and amendments to waiting and loading arrangements etc. will require the making of traffic management orders. As part of the order making process there is a statutory requirement to consult a number of prescribed organisations and affected parties and to consider any objections or representations made.
- 3.8 Should the scheme proceed, there are also several aspects of the detailed design yet to be finalised, including the designs of the public realm improvements at Fountain Island, the area in front of Enfield Town station and the link between the Town park and the library. These will be developed in conjunction with the local community, with co-design workshops planned for Spring 2017. In addition, further detailed design will be undertaken covering issues such as bus mitigation measures; signing and lining; drainage; lighting and surfacing materials. This important stage also allows further consideration of a number of detailed concerns raised during the consultation process, including the need to minimise the risk of conflict with pedestrians at bus stop boarders and equalities.
- 3.9 The remainder of this report describes the Enfield Town consultation process; sets out the impact of the scheme on parking, town centre vitality, air quality, health and congestion; and highlights how the scheme has been amended to address other concerns raised during the consultation.

#### **4. CONSULTATION PROCESS**

- 4.1 Enfield Town is the fourth of five main road cycling schemes to be delivered as part of the Cycle Enfield programme. The A110 Southbury Road

scheme is later in the programme and will be the subject of a separate report to Cabinet.

- 4.2 The purpose of the Enfield Town consultation exercise was to inform decision making and help shape the proposed scheme aimed at providing high quality, segregated facilities to encourage more people to cycle. The consultation process included a series of awareness raising campaigns to encourage both debate and participation in the consultation.
- 4.3 On 17 February 2015, the Council held a public engagement event at the Dugdale Centre to enable local residents and businesses to find out about the alignment and scope of the Enfield Town scheme and make comments using post-it notes. This event was attended by more than 200 people.
- 4.4 On 26 June 2015, the original proposals for Enfield Town underwent a TfL sponsor review. This meeting was attended by Jacobs (the Council's designers), LBE officers and representatives from different parts of TfL. As a result of this review, various amendments were made to the designs to improve alignment with the London Cycle Design Standards.

### **12-week Consultation**

- 4.5 In early September 2015, we wrote to approximately 53,000 properties within a 1 Km radius of the centre of Enfield Town, inviting local residents and business owners/managers to attend an exhibition and participate in the 12 weeks consultation. We also consulted residents associations, disability groups, cycling groups, the Police and the other emergency services, transport user groups and bus operators. Detailed information on the proposals was published at <http://cycleenfield.co.uk/major-projects/enfield-town-road-scheme-consultation/>. We also provided copies of the consultation documents to those people that requested them in hard copy.
- 4.6 On 24 September 2015, the Council held a business event at the Dugdale Centre Centre for business owners/managers to find out about the proposals and to let us know how and when goods are delivered and where their customers park etc. This event was attended by 40 people.
- 4.7 On 25 & 26 September July 2015, the Council held a public exhibition at the Dugdale Centre to launch the public consultation. This event provided an opportunity for local residents to peruse the detailed proposals and discuss any concerns with officers and the designers. Over the two days, a total of 367 people attended the exhibition.
- 4.8 Towards the end of November 2015, booklets were delivered to approximately 53,000 properties within a 1 Km radius of Enfield Town to remind people to have their say.
- 4.9 The public consultation started on 25 September 2015 and ran until 18 December 2015.

- 4.10 Enfield Council received a total of 2,707 responses to the online consultation. Option 1 was fully supported by 29.8% (806) of respondents and partially supported by 3.8% (103) of respondents. 64.6% (1749) of respondents did not support this option, whilst 1.8% (49) either had no opinion or were unsure. Option 6A was fully supported by 13.7% (370) of respondents and partially supported by 14.7% (398) of respondents. 69.2% (1872) of respondents did not support this option, whilst 2.4% (67) either had no opinion or were unsure. The results of the consultation and resulting changes to design can be found at Appendix B1.
- 4.11 Throughout 2016, the Council's designers have continued to amend the initial proposals to take account of the extensive consultation feedback, which favoured the Cecil Road remaining one-way with two-way cycle lanes, and Church Street remaining open for all vehicular access, and the new Mayoral priority of "walking and cycling". The amended proposal may be less transformational than that shown in the bid, but still delivers significant cycling and town centre improvements. It also enables future enhancements to be delivered in the longer-term as part of the ongoing Master Plan for Enfield Town.
- 4.12 On 12 October 2016, the amended proposals were reviewed at a design surgery by Urban Design London. The notes/ recommendations from that meeting can be found in Appendix F.
- 4.13 In accordance with the Cycle Enfield governance arrangements agreed by Cabinet on 17 September 2014, presentations were made to the Enfield Town Partnership Board on 15 November 2016 and Project Board on 24 November 2016. A pack containing comments received from both boards was provided to Members in advance of the meeting to enable Cabinet to consider them as part of the decision-making process.

## **Youth Engagement**

- 4.14 Over the summer of 2016, Council Officers delivered a programme of engagement to better understand the views of younger people on the Cycle Enfield programme. This group has consistently been under represented in previous consultations. The combined number of responses to the A105, Enfield Town, Southbury Road and A1010 South consultation totalled 5065 responses. Of these, 32% (1622 responses) were from people aged over 60 and just 3% from people aged under 20.
- 4.15 During August and September 2016, 16 mini exhibitions were held across the borough (at leisure centres, festivals and other young people community events), displaying details of the Cycle Enfield programme. Young people at these events (aged between 8 – 24 years old) were surveyed about how they would like to travel around the Borough and whether they support Enfield Council's proposals to invest in cycle lanes across the Borough. There were 1,112 responses to the survey, which found that 79% (884) supported the investment in cycle lanes, 7% (82) did

not support and 13% (146) were not sure. Further details about youth engagement can be found at Appendix B2.

### **Impact Assessments**

- 4.16 On 28 October 2015, we commissioned Cambridge Environmental Research Consultants to undertake an air quality assessment for five main road cycling schemes, including Enfield Town.
- 4.17 On 19 November 2015, we commissioned Regeneris Consultants to assess the economic impacts of the Enfield Town scheme on Enfield town centre.
- 4.18 In November 2016 a predictive equalities impact assessment was undertaken. This assessment confirms that the scheme will have a generally positive effect in tackling inequality and can be found at Appendix E.

### **Impact on Blue Light Services**

- 4.19 The Metropolitan Police Neighbourhood Partnerships Support & Operations Unit stated:

“In principle, the Metropolitan Police support and encourage greener forms of transportation such as cycling and this must fit into a modern world with all other forms of vehicular traffic. Our own officers on cycles will also benefit from the introduction of designated cycle lanes.

We would be keen to be given more time in advance of the design workshops to consult with colleagues within boroughs such as Westminster, where cycle schemes not dissimilar to this one are already in place. This will enable us to benefit from lessons learned and feed these into the designs for Enfield.

We have considered the risks associated with the scheme as it currently stands, and our initial points are summarised below:

- Communication strategy for project to link in with TFL to prevent congestion with buses timetable
- Cecil Road blind spots for two-way traffic for cycle lane but one way vehicular traffic.
- Cecil Road - potential collisions with large scale deliveries to rear of shopping chains
- Cecil Road is a poorly lit area design should incorporate this factor to make the cycle lanes safe.
- Emergency vehicles travelling at speed to be aware of blind spots and two way cycle lane traffic conflicting one way vehicular access.
- To ensure Safer Transport police are invited to the co-design workshops in 2017 to provide safety advice.”

4.20 The Metropolitan Police Traffic Management Unit stated:

“It's a little difficult for me to give a detailed response from the limited contact I've had with the scheme. In addition, the Traffic Management Unit would tend to only comment/object on a safety and casualty reduction basis. That said, the scheme itself has merit. The plan is to rejuvenate the area and create a more welcoming and safer place for all road users. Your design proposal lists a couple of additions I am supportive of (countdown timers, better designed crossings, traffic calming) as these look to improve collision and casualty rates. And taken as a whole, upon initial examination, the proposals look to fairly balance the needs of all roads users, whilst still offering additional safeguards for the more vulnerable road user.”

4.21 The London Fire Brigade Station Manager for Southgate fire station stated:

“London Fire Brigade in Enfield have reviewed the proposed cycle route revision for Enfield Town and supports the change with the following observations.

The ‘Moritz 1996 study’ into cycle lanes provides strong evidence that cars pass closer to cyclists on roads without cycle lanes due to the absence of a physical barrier. Further analysis of the impact of cycle lanes introduced in European towns and cities also indicate a reduction in the number of accidents taking place involving cyclists.

London Fire Brigade welcomes programmes which enhance the safety of all road users which in turn reduce incidents attended by fire crews. This being said, it has also been identified that significant changes to road layouts have occasionally resulted in road traffic collisions due mostly to individual drivers failing to either understand the change or apply sufficient attention.

We welcome steps that are taken which provide extensive information to drivers and pedestrians regarding road changes via a variety of methods prior to and during the initial stage of the implementation.

#### Operational response

Our review of the planned physical changes have not identified that they will have a negative impact to the response times of fire appliances in Enfield. Whilst this is our position presently, fire crews are required to report their observations of their actual experiences travelling under emergency conditions and whilst performing their general duties.

#### Traffic separators

I have noted the proposed introduction of traffic separators and further note the physical makeup of these separators will allow fire appliances and other emergency vehicles to drive over them in emergency situations without hindrance.

### Raised tables

A particular observation made by emergency crews centre on the impact to response time following the introduction of speed humps and raised tables. The Mercedes fire appliance used in London carries 3000 litres of water. When full the impact to the physical attributes of the appliance when travelling at speed over uneven or raised surfaces is a factor taken into account by our drivers.

Our assessment of the proposed raised tables would be that their design incorporates a gentle incline at either end thus reducing the impact to the appliance when travelling at speed. It is also preferable that the length of the tables are consistent with the length of the Mercedes fire appliance and are of greater length whenever possible.

### Widened crossings

It is felt that the widened controlled crossings will increase the number of pedestrians able to cross roads safely in what is predominantly a busy commercial area. However, to eliminate any concerns over the increased number of pedestrians being physically on the road at the approach of a fire appliance responding to an emergency. Local planning must ensure authorised parking sites, street furniture and other structures that are placed near crossings do not affect the line of sight of an approaching emergency service vehicle thus hindering the drivers entire view of the crossing.

### Traffic/congestion

We are unable to provide a fact based position regarding the impact of the introduction of the proposed changes and will once, and if introduced, comment further upon receipt of reports from fire crews.

Needless to say in our last safety plan London Fire Brigade stated that we will endeavour to provide a fire appliance anywhere in London within 6 minutes of being called and the second in 8 minutes.”

#### 4.22 The Stakeholder Engagement Manager for London Ambulance Service stated:

“My concerns remain the same as detailed in other correspondence around such schemes. Such as:

- The LAS has unhindered 24/7 access to all road networks.
- Traffic should be able to move out of the path of LAS vehicles engaged on emergency calls safely.
- Producing bottlenecks in flow should be avoided.
- The manufacture of such a scheme shouldn't produce increased traffic flow or rat runs/heavy traffic in surrounding streets.”

## **5. SCHEME DESIGN PROPOSALS**

- 5.1 The Enfield Town scheme helps address three key themes: transforming our high streets and town centres; delivering long-term health benefits; and enabling people to travel safely by cycle.
- 5.2 This scheme involves the installation of lightly segregated cycle lanes on both sides of Cecil Road; additional traffic signals to reduce conflicts and enable cyclists to pass safely through junctions; widened pedestrian crossings on Church Street; public realm improvements at Fountain Island and the plaza in front of Enfield Town station; a new link between the Town Park and the library; the installation of bus stop boarders, side road entry treatments and raised tables; remodelling of key junctions. The scheme drawings can be found at Appendix A.
- 5.3 Light segregation is defined in the London Cycle Design Standards (2014) as “the use of physical objects intermittently placed alongside a cycle lane marking to give additional protection from motorised traffic”.
- 5.4 To accommodate the new cycle lanes, it will be necessary to make changes to parking and loading as outlined in section 5.8 below.
- 5.5 Subject to Cabinet approval, the detailed design and statutory consultation will be undertaken by Ringway Jacobs via the London Highways Alliance Contract (LoHAC).

### **5.6 Bus Lanes and Bus Stops**

- 5.6.1 Detailed discussions have taken place with TfL about the impact of the scheme on bus services and their views have been taken into account in developing the current designs and mitigation measures.
- 5.6.2 In the proposed design, the bus stops on Church Street will remain in their current locations. On Cecil Road, Bus Stop S, east of Raleigh Road, will be merged with bus stops W and X to the east. The Bus stand located west of Raleigh Road will be relocated to the Little Park Gardens bus station. The northbound stop on London Road (Stop V) has been relocated south and the Genotin Road stop has remained in its current location.
- 5.6.3 Bus stop by-passes are proposed on Cecil Road, with shared bus boarders at the stops on London Road and Genotin Road, with a 0.5m ‘buffer’ strip between the kerb and the cycle lane.

5.6.4 To accommodate the cycle lane on London Road south of Genotin Road, it will be necessary to remove the northbound bus lane. This section of bus lane was originally due to be removed as part of the A105 scheme, but was left in place for logistical reasons.

## 5.7 Public Realm Improvements

5.7.1 Public realm improvements will be incorporated through the town centre area with key locations being:

- Fountain Island at the eastern end of Church Street
- Improved crossings on Church Street
- The plaza in front of Enfield Town station
- New link created between the Town Park and the library

5.7.2 To inform the detailed plans for Enfield Town and ensure community buy-in, a co-design event will be organised where local resident and business owners can help shape the final design of some of the key public spaces. This is expected to take place in early Spring 2017 and will provide further opportunity for engagement.

## 5.8 Parking Implications

5.8.1 The proposed changes to parking and loading in the town centre are summarised below.

Location/Type of facility	Existing Spaces	Proposed Spaces
<b>Church Street West</b>		
Disabled Parking	0	2
Pay and Display bay	14	0
Loading	11	8
<b>The Town</b>		
Disabled Parking	1	1
Loading	8	6
Motorcycles	12 metre bay	Relocated to New River Loop Car Park
Taxi	0	3
<b>London Road</b>		
Loading	6	5
<b>Cecil Road</b>		
Pay & Display Bay	5	0

5.8.2 Furthermore, two additional disabled bays also introduced on Little Park Gardens, replacing existing pay and display bays.

## 5.9 Economic Impact Assessment

5.9.1 Regeneris Consulting were commissioned to undertake an economic impact assessment of the Cycle Enfield Scheme on the economic vitality of Enfield Town centre. The assessment focuses on the current turnover of the town centre and assesses how this may be affected by Cycle Enfield both during the construction phase and the operational phase, once the scheme has been implemented. It also recognises that the potential transformational effect of the proposals could, if achieved, lead to a 10-15% uplift in spend. Indeed, in section 3.134 of their report they document 3 case studies, which show increased footfall of up to 30% after public realm improvements. However, this potential uplift has not been factored into the assessment as it is not guaranteed.

5.9.2 The Economic Impact Assessment is attached as Appendix D, but the overall conclusions are summarised in the table below:

	Construction Phase			Operational Phase		
	Better Case	Base Case	Worst Case	Better Case	Base Case	Worst Case
Enfield Town	Negligible	Minor Negative	Medium Negative	Medium Positive	Negligible	Medium Negative

5.9.3 The following measures have been identified by the consultants and will be implemented to ensure that impact of construction and operation is minimised and to enable the operational phase to reach either a neutral or positive level:

### Construction Phase Mitigation

5.9.4 The ongoing design and planning process provides an opportunity to develop and refine a number of important pre-construction mitigation approaches.

- **Design of construction works** – engineers should bear town centre vitality in mind and do as much as possible to limit disruption to businesses and users;
- **Traffic management plan** – could help to scope out congestion issues and ensure that alternative provisions are put in place where possible; and
- **Publicity and business liaison** – widely publish delivery plans to ensure that town centre businesses and users are aware of what the work entails, how they might be impacted and when.

5.9.5 Once the construction work is underway, a range of additional mitigation measures can be developed to help reduce disruption:

- **Approach to construction** – ensure that construction is undertaken in a way which is considerate to local businesses and town centre users;
- **Ongoing business liaison** – explore the potential for the contractors to employ a specific business liaison officer for the duration of the construction period; and
- **Proactive efforts to maintain footfall flows** to local shops during construction e.g. develop a coherent town centre parking strategy for both the construction and operational phases of Cycle Enfield and local way-finding to guide pedestrians if necessary.

### **Operational Phase Mitigation**

5.9.6 Once the scheme is operational, there is potential to deploy additional measures to mitigate negative impacts or maximise positive impacts of the scheme on town centre vitality as follows:

- **Traffic flow** – introduce traffic management measures and add new junctions to SCOOT cells to minimise congestion delays;
- **Loading/unloading** - offer to work with individual businesses to explore alternative loading and unloading solutions to minimise cost impacts for businesses;
- **Town centre management** – e.g. through town teams to enhance overall economic vitality, helping to develop stakeholder relationships, identify and respond to issues and offer opportunities for proactive work to enhance town centre vitality; and
- **Employment and training** – explore the potential to engage local residents, particularly young people in the delivery process.

## **5.10 Air Quality Impact and Health**

5.10.1 Without any of the Cycle Enfield proposals, the air quality objective for annual average NO<sub>2</sub> is predicted to be exceeded in Enfield town centre.

5.10.2 With the introduction of the proposals and assuming a 2.5% reduction in traffic, there are predicted to be both increases and decreases in NO<sub>2</sub> concentrations near junctions. At the junction of Church Street with Windmill Hill, concentrations are predicted to increase by more than 1 µg/m<sup>3</sup> where queuing traffic is introduced. At the other junctions the NO<sub>2</sub> concentrations show both increases and decreases, for instance, where the road is proposed to be narrowed from two lanes to one lane, concentrations decrease at the start of the queue, but increase where the queue extends further from the junction. An example of this is the junction of Cecil Road with Sydney Road where the average delay per vehicle is predicted to increase from 9 seconds per vehicle to 19 seconds per vehicle whilst the queue length increases from 4 vehicles long to 22 vehicles long. Away from the junctions, the reduction in traffic results in small decreases in NO<sub>2</sub>

concentrations close to the major roads. It is, however, important to note that increases in NO<sub>2</sub> will also be found in the vicinity of traffic lights and pedestrian crossings caused by queuing traffic.

- 5.10.3 With greater reductions in traffic flows, the increases in concentrations at queues become smaller and the decreases in concentrations along the rest of the road become greater.
- 5.10.4 The changes to the traffic flows are predicted to bring about only small decreases in particulate matter PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>.
- 5.10.5 The scenarios were run through an air pollution computer simulation modelling programme to make predictions of their effects on air pollution levels. The results of this work showed that none of the scenarios tested made a significant reduction in the distance from the edge of the road that air pollution levels exceed air quality standards for nitrogen dioxide and particulates. The Air Quality Standards Regulations set emissions standards levels for various pollutants, these include nitrogen dioxide and particulates which are emitted from road traffic. If these standards are breached it is referred to as an 'exceedance' of the standard.
- 5.10.6 On balance, taking into account both air quality impacts and the potential for more people to engage in active travel, the proposed scheme can play a significant part in supporting the council's objective to improve the health of residents in the borough and to address health inequality.
- 5.10.7 The National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) consultation on air quality (Air Pollution – outdoor air quality and health) recognises its profound impact on both health and health inequalities. This includes the 52,630 life-years lost per year due to PM<sub>2.5</sub> particulates and the further loss of 88,113 life-years from NO<sub>2</sub> exposure in London alone. Implementing many of their recommendations will lead to improved health and quality of life. These include those aimed towards input into Supplementary Planning Documents, urban planning, providing infrastructure to support low and zero emission travel, travel planning, vehicle idling and congestion zones.
- 5.10.8 The Council is working with its NHS colleagues to improve health in the borough. The Chair of Enfield CCG is very supportive of our Cycle Enfield programme both because it will make Enfield better and more pleasant but also because of the huge costs of physical inactivity to the NHS. This includes an increased risk of 20 – 30% in conditions such as diabetes, cancer, obesity and dementia. Diabetes alone costs the NHS some £25,000 per minute. It is unfortunate therefore that some of the draft recommendations that contradict NICE's own guidance and are likely to actually increase pollution. For example, NICE guidance Physical Activity and the Environment recommends that 'pedestrians, cyclists and users of other modes of transport that involve physical activity are given the highest priority when developing or maintaining streets and roads'. Recommending off-road or quiet streets for cycle routes will inevitably take a circuitous route to destinations thereby encouraging car-use and pollution. Similarly,

Enfield has followed NICE guidance to introduce traffic calming schemes to make streets more attractive for walking, cycling and children to play thereby increasing health and stopping pollution at source.

5.10.9 The Council is also disappointed that NICE’s draft guidance does not seem to recognise recent evidence from Cambridge University that the health benefits of physical activity through cycling far outweigh any dis-benefits of air pollution<sup>1</sup> or that trees and the natural environment encourage people to walk and cycle.

1. *Tainio et al. [Can air pollution negate the health benefits of cycling and walking?](#) Preventive Medicine; 5 May 2016; DOI: 10.1016/j.ypmed.2016.02.002*

## 5.11 Congestion and Journey Times

5.11.1 Modelling has been undertaken to understand the impact of scheme on congestion for buses and general traffic. Modelling has been undertaken to understand the impact of scheme on congestion for buses and general traffic. Modelling shows that the proposed network can accommodate existing traffic levels in the AM and PM peak but in the Saturday Peak 10% of through trips will need to reassign to alternative routes. Further details of the results of the modelling can be found in Appendix G.

5.11.2 The modelling results show the following estimated impact on buses as a result of the proposed scheme. The results are shown in minutes for both directions of each route.

Route	Estimated Change in Journey Time Per Route (Mins)		
	AM	PM	Sat
W9 Eastbound	0.5 to 1.5	-1 to 0	0.5 to 1.5
W9 Westbound	2.5 to 3.5	1 to 2	0.5 to 1.5
231/121/191/307 Eastbound	-0.5 to 0.5	-1.5 to -0.5	0 to 1
231/121/191/307 Westbound	3 to 4	2 to 3	0.5 to 1.5
192/317 Eastbound	-1 to 0	-1.5 to -0.5	1 to 2
192/317 Westbound	3.5 to 4.5	3 to 4	1 to 2
377 Southbound	0.5 to 1.5	-0.5 to 0.5	-0.5 to 0.5
377 Westbound	1 to 2	2 to 3	1 to 2
329 Southbound	0 to 1	0.5 to 1.5	0 to 1
329 Northbound	1.5 to 2.5	2 to 3	1.5 to 2.5
W8 Southbound	0.5 to 1.5	-1 to 0	-1 to 0
W8 Northbound	-0.5 to 0.5	0.5 to 1.5	0 to 1

5.11.3 The above estimated journey times equate to an average delay per bus of approximately 1 to 2 mins in the AM, and 0.5 to 1.5 mins in the PM and

Saturday peak. To mitigate the impact of these delays, LB Enfield are investigating bus priority measures on sections of the routes outside the Enfield Town study area, to improve the impact on overall bus journey times.

5.11.4 The table below shows the impact on vehicle journey times as a result of the scheme based on no reduction in traffic volumes in the AM and PM Peak hours and 10% of through-traffic in the Saturday Peak. The table compares through-routes and also key routes into the town centre from the west to the Palace Gardens car park and from the south to Palace Exchange car park.

Route		Additional Delay Per Movement (Secs)		
		AM	PM	Sat
Through Trips	West to East	0 to 1	0.5 to 1.5	0.5 to 1.5
	East to West	3.5 to 4.5	2.5 to 3.5	1 to 2
	South to North	0 to 1	0.5 to 1.5	0.5 to 1.5
	North to South	0.5 to 1.5	-1 to 0	-1 to 0
Car Park Trips	West to Palace Gdns	0.5 to 1.5	0 to 1	0.5 to 1.5
	Palace Gdns to West	0 to 1	1 to 2	0.5 to 1.5
	South to Palace Exchange	0.5 to 1.5	0.5 to 1.5	0 to 1
	Palace Exchange to South	0.5 to 1.5	2.5 to 3.5	2 to 3

5.11.5 The results show that the east to west route is most heavily affected by the scheme for through-routes and the two-way trip between the South and Palace Exchange, for the key routes into the town centre.

5.11.6 Based on the number of vehicles travelling along the through-routes shown in the above table, the average increase in journey per through- movement is approximately 0.5 to 1.5 mins.

5.11.7 When considering the wider impact of the traffic reduction in the Saturday Peak, a worst case scenario has been assumed, with no reduction related to cycling mode shift and all traffic re-assigns onto local alternative routes. The results of these calculations are based on origin and destination survey calculations and are summarised in the table below, indicating that the most significant reassignment is assumed to occur on the Willow Road, with 91 Passenger Car Units (PCUs) in total (approximately 45 each way) transferring to the alternative route in the peak hour.

<b>Local Diversion Route</b>	<b>Two-way Hourly Increase (PCUs)</b>
Chase Side/Parsonage Lane	45
Willow Road	91
A10/ Trinity Avenue/Park Avenue	75
Green Dragon Lane/ Old Park Ridings	29

5.11.8 These journey times are based on the proposed junctions and bus stops. More details of the impact of the scheme on congestion and journey times are set out in Appendix G.

5.11.9 In considering these additional delays, it should be noted that congestion is likely to increase at Enfield Town (and on other routes) in the light of forecast population and employment growth. Providing the infrastructure to enable more people to cycle forms part of the strategy to maintain accessibility and reduce congestion in the medium to long term.

## **5.12 Enfield Town Masterplan**

5.12.1 The Council is advancing a regeneration strategy for Enfield Town, through an Enfield Town Centre Master Plan. This will unlock identified development sites and guide new investment. The Master Plan will progress as a Supplementary Planning Document and will form part of Enfield's Local Plan in due course.

5.12.2 With highway capacity in the town centre constrained, public transport, walking and cycling will need to play a critical role in supporting future growth. The significant improvement in cycle facilities delivered by Cycle Enfield is therefore consistent with aims of the emerging Master Plan.

5.12.3 The Master Plan will focus on opportunities at the eastern end of the town centre, adjacent to Enfield Town station and the key adjoining sites. At this stage the form of development for the various sites is not known. However, the Council is aware that there has been interest to develop this area, including Genotin Road Car Park, which has been identified as a key opportunity site. Consequently, some sensitivity testing has been carried out to look at the implications of a more efficient use of Genotin road Car Park. One test therefore considers the possibility of an intensified use of Genotin Road Car Park, with an assumed employment use and a reconfigured car park. This test highlights that the network can continue to perform at an acceptable level, but emphasises the need for the Master Plan to promote highly sustainable forms of development.

5.12.4 Regeneris were asked to assess the impact of such development and loss of parking to Enfield Town Centre. They conclude that there is sufficient capacity at other car parks parking during the daytime on weekdays, with

the occupancy rate only reaching 95% at peak times of the year. Loss of parking would have no additional impact on Enfield Town. However, retention of 75% of existing capacity at Genotin Road Car Park during evenings and weekends would be required to ensure limited impact on the overall number of spaces available in Enfield Town. This report is attached at appendix D2

## **6. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

The Council could decline the Mini Holland funding. However, this would mean forgoing £4.7million of investment in the borough on this scheme, £37.6million of investment on other Mini Holland schemes and the associated economic, health and transport benefits.

## **7. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

- To create better, healthier communities;
- To make cycling a safe & enjoyable choice for local travel;
- To make places cycle-friendly and provide better streets and places for everyone;
- 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 enable transformational change to 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 detailed design and statutory consultation is £288,000, which will be fully funded by Transport for London. This is all Mini Holland funding, which can only be spent on delivering the Mayor's Cycle Vision.

8.1.2 Expenditure once approved by TfL 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.

8.1.3 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 Under the Greater London Authority (GLA) Act 1999, the Mayor is empowered, through TfL, to provide grants to London Boroughs to assist with the implementation of the Transport Strategy. TfL is charged with responsibility of ensuring that the key rationale for allocating grants is the delivery of the Mayor's Transport Strategy.

8.2.2 The generic matters to which TfL will have regard in allocating financial assistance and the generic conditions that will apply to any such assistance are:

- Under section 159 of the GLA Act, financial assistance provided by TfL must be for a purpose which in TfL's opinion is conducive to the provision of safe, integrated, efficient and economic transport facilities or services to, from or within Greater London.
- In order to ensure this purpose is met, TfL may have regard to the following matters when exercising its functions under section 159:
  - Any financial assistance previously given
  - The use made by the authority of such assistance
- Conditions – section 159(6) of the GLA Act also allows TfL to impose conditions on any financial assistance it provides and in specified circumstances to require repayment. Other more detailed conditions may be imposed that relate to particular projects.

8.2.3 Under section 65 of the Highways Act 1980, a highway authority may, in or by the side of a highway maintainable at public expense, construct a cycle track as part of the highway; and they may light any cycle track constructed by them under this section.

8.2.4 Under the Localism Act 2011, local authorities have a general power of competence.

8.2.5 In exercising powers under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, section 122 of the Act imposes a duty on the Council to have regard (so far as practicable) to securing the 'expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians) and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway'. The Council must also have regard to such matters as the desirability of securing and maintaining reasonable access to premises and the effect on

the amenities of any locality affected. Any final decision to implement any scheme needs to take account of the considerations set out above and the outcome of public consultation. Any changes to parking restrictions and the introduction of cycle lanes will be subject to the making of a Traffic Management Order pursuant to powers contained within the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and the Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996.

- 8.2.6 Before making any decision with respect to this matter, the Cabinet must conscientiously consider the consultation responses.

### **8.3 Property Implications**

There are no corporate property implications arising from this report.

## **9. KEY RISKS**

- 9.1 The Cycle Enfield Project Delivery Team monitors and considers risk management issues at its regular meetings, and directs remedial action as necessary.
- 9.2 If the Council proceeds with these proposals there is a risk of delays due to traffic order objections, delays due to traffic signal approvals and delays due to Statutory Undertaker consents and works. If the Council does not proceed with these proposals there is a risk of increased congestion and increased pollution as the population grows and a modal shift in transport is not effected and no economic, health and transport benefits. However, the economic benefits are not guaranteed, see paragraph 5.9 above.

## **10. IMPACT ON COUNCIL PRIORITIES**

### **10.1 Fairness for All**

Enfield Town is part of a safe, convenient and extensive cycle route network that will make cycling a viable transport choice for all. 32.5% of households in the borough do not have access to a car or van. This scheme will improve transport for all and increase cycling amongst all age groups.

### **10.2 Growth and Sustainability**

- 10.2.1 With forecast growth in population in the borough, the Enfield Town Scheme will help to provide a safe and efficient means of accessing Enfield town centre and contributing to its 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**

The Enfield Town scheme will have a positive impact on people living in deprived wards/areas by improving personal health and fitness. 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. EQUALITIES 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 Enfield Town, 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. The Cabinet should review the EQIA when exercising their duty under section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 in considering whether to approve the proposals.
- 11.3 In accordance with the Cycle Enfield governance arrangements agreed by Cabinet on 17 September 2014, we held four Partnership Board meetings for the Enfield Town scheme on 5 January 2015, 12 May 2015, 23 July 2015 and 15 November 2016. Meeting invitations were sent to Members of Parliament; ward councillors; residents' associations; cycling groups; disabilities groups, including Enfield Disability Action, Enfield Vision, RNIB, Age UK and Enfield Over 50s Forum and interest groups. These meetings were an excellent opportunity for representatives to influence the designs and to feed information back to the groups and organisations that they represent.
- 11.4 The EQIA includes comments from the Centre for Accessible Environments, who were commissioned to undertake a design appraisal to ensure that the proposals take account of everyone in the community,

including those with protected characteristics e.g. age and disability. The concerns raised will be addressed as part of the detailed design process.

## **12. PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS**

12.1 The Enfield Town scheme directly contributes to the Council Business Plan as follows:

### Fairness for All

- The new infrastructure delivered as part of the Enfield Town scheme will make walking and cycling safer and enable older people and people with disabilities to maintain their independence.

### Growth and Sustainability

- The inward investment in Enfield Town centre will support sustainable regeneration and growth; and
- The public realm improvements delivered as part of the Enfield Town scheme will create an environment in which businesses and community groups can grow and thrive.

### Strong Communities

- The Enfield Town scheme will transform our borough and create a place where people want to live, work, learn and visit;
- The Enfield Town scheme will enable cycling to become an alternative means of transport for short journeys and enable people to live healthier lives; and
- The Enfield Town scheme will improve safety for all road users and make the area more welcoming.

## **13. HEALTH AND SAFETY IMPLICATIONS**

13.1 The preliminary design drawings were sent to TfL's Road Safety Team in November 2016 for a stage 1 Road safety Audit. This is part of an ongoing process to identify potential road safety problems that may affect any users of the highway and, where possible, to suggest measures to eliminate or mitigate those problems. Further road safety audits will be undertaken at the end of detailed design and after construction.

13.2 The Construction, Design and Management Regulations are being followed to ensure that risks are designed out/mitigated and the Enfield Town scheme can be constructed safely.

13.3 In the public consultation, some respondents raised concern about the safety of pedestrians at bus stop borders and bus stop by-passes. These

designs have been introduced successfully in other parts of London and the UK. There are a number of Councils who have implemented these designs e.g. Camden Council and Brighton & Hove Council and monitored their impact and have not reported any significant issues.

#### **14. PUBLIC HEALTH IMPLICATIONS**

- 14.1 The Enfield Town scheme is part of Cycle Enfield, which provides a unique opportunity to improve the health of the borough's residents and address health inequality.
- 14.2 The Chair of the Enfield Clinical Commissioning Group has issued a statement, fully supporting the aims and implementation of Cycle Enfield as it will enable people to take control of their own health, improve the health of the population and make the NHS more sustainable.
- 14.3 Compared to those who are least active sufficient physical activity reduces all-cause mortality and the risk of heart disease, cancer, metabolic ill-health (type 2 diabetes), mental health issues and musculo-skeletal disease by approximately 20 to 40%. These conditions account for 70% of the NHS budget.
- 14.4 There is substantial evidence to suggest that a) physical activity is essential for maximal health and b) that population levels of physical activity are far below those recommended by the Chief Medical Officer (CMO) who also recommends that levels of physical activity are most likely to be increased by activities that can be integrated into everyday life.
- 14.5 Guidelines on physical activity have been published by (amongst others) the World Health Organisation (WHO) and the Chief Medical Officers of the Four Home Countries and at least 20 other countries.
- 14.6 Health Survey (HSE) 2012 self-report data indicates that 33% males and 44% of females aged 16+ report not meeting the current Chief Medical Officer (CMO) guidelines of 150 minutes of physical activity per week. Objective data indicates that in actuality some 95% of the population may not be meeting physical activity guidelines.
- 14.7 HSE data (2012) also shows that that 79% of boys and 84% of girls aged 5 – 15 do not meet physical activity guidelines.
- 14.8 10.5% of reception year pupils in Enfield (aged 4-5) are obese, higher than in London or England as a whole (10.1% and 9.1% respectively). 23.3% are overweight or obese, higher than in London (22.2%) and England (21.9%).
- 14.9 25.4% of Year 6 pupils in Enfield (aged 10-11) are obese, higher than in London or England as a whole (22.6% and 19.1% respectively). 41% are either overweight or obese compared to 37.2% in London and 33.5% in England. This is the 6th highest in London.

- 14.10 Cycling can be a very effective means of integrating physical activity into everyday life. In the Netherlands cycling accounts for some 34% of journeys up to 7.5km (4.6 miles). The population attributable fraction of mortality due to inactivity in the Netherlands is 1/3 to 1/2 that of the UK. It is estimated that 57% of Copenhagen residents cycle (e.g. undertake physical activity) everyday.
- 14.11 Whilst paragraph 5.10 acknowledges the air quality impacts of the scheme, cycling is good for health; it does not impact on air quality and those who cycle for non-sporting purposes are four times more likely to meet physical activity recommendations than people who do not cycle. The health benefits of cycling far outweigh the risks associated with air pollution and it is estimated that in London a person would need to cycle 9.15 hours before the effects of air pollution negate the positive effects of physical activity.
- 14.12 Improving cycling facilities in the borough has the potential to significantly increase the disposable income all residents in the borough. Academic studies indicate that those in the least wealthy quintile spend approximately 30% of their income on transport.
- 14.13 Other benefits to the individual could include greater access to employment, education, shops, recreation, health facilities and the countryside.
- 14.14 The greatest gain in the health of the public will be from increased physical activity. However, other benefits may accrue to the wider Enfield community that could result from a long-term modal transport shift towards cycling.

### **Background papers**

None

### **List of Appendices:**

Appendix A: Post-consultation drawings [To be available at the Cabinet meeting and in the Group offices and the Members' Library]

Technical drawing for Enfield Town revised design:

<http://cycleenfield.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/Draft-Enfield-Town-Revised-Option-Design.pdf>

Appendix B1: Consultation report

Appendix B2: Youth engagement report

Appendix C: Air quality assessment

Appendix D: Economic impact assessment

Appendix D2: Cycle Enfield – Enfield Town Impacts

Appendix E: Predictive equalities impact assessment

Appendix F: Comments of critical friends

Appendix G: Preliminary traffic modelling assessment