

OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

1 March 2017

RESPONSE TO **REASONS FOR CALL IN** **[PART 1/PART 2]**

Relating to the Following Decision:

Decision: Approval of Cycle Enfield Proposals for the A1010 South

Decision Date: 6 February 2017

Decision of: Cabinet Member for Environment

Key Decision No: KD4390

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 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, 'Quieter Neighbourhoods', cycle hubs and a wide range of supportive measures to encourage more people to cycle and to improve the look and feel of our high streets and town centres.
- 1.2 On 7 July 2016 Cabinet granted approval to undertake detailed design and statutory consultation for lightly segregated cycling facilities and public realm improvements along the A1010 South between Lincoln Road and Fairfield Road. 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.
- 1.3 On 6 February the Cabinet Member for Environment considered report RE 16.123 (KD 4390) and approved the final design of the proposals for the A1010 South and, subject to detailed costs being agreed by Transport for London, to implement the scheme and make the associated traffic management orders.

2. REASONS FOR CALL-IN

2.1 The reasons why the decision was called in are as follows: -

See attached

3. RESPONSE TO REASONS FOR CALL-IN

a) London Ambulance Service

As noted in report RE 16.123, the London Ambulance Service did not object to the proposals for the A1010 South, offering support for schemes that reduce the potential for and severity of collisions. However, the LAS stressed the importance of direct and unhindered access across London's roads and highlighted that travelling at lower speeds across significant areas of the borough is likely to increase travelling times.

The impact of the scheme on journey times for general traffic at peak times was clearly summarised in the report. However, the impact on journey times for emergency service vehicles will be less than stated in the report. The use of traffic separators to segregate cyclists from other traffic will help to minimise the impact on emergency service response times, allowing vehicles to pull into the cycle lane to get out of the way of an ambulance or fire appliance. In some situations, this may be better than the current arrangements where the parked vehicles restrict the width of the traffic lane.

b) Air Quality Monitoring

No representations or objections were made specifically about air quality monitoring so this was not addressed in report RE 16.123. The wider impact on air quality was raised and the report therefore refers to the fact that there is likely to be some increase in NO₂ concentrations at those junctions where there are some increases in queue length and delays. However, the report also 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 0.1 µg/m³ and 0.5 µg/m³) but have the potential to increase if a greater mode shift from private car to cycling is achieved in the future.

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. The Action Plan contains a wide range of local measures and notes that significant improvements in air quality depend on both national and London-wide initiatives, such as the proposed Ultra-Low Emission Zone.

Air quality monitoring and modelling are currently undertaken and this will continue in the future to help inform the Council's Action Plan.

c) Journey Times

Paragraphs 5.30-5.32 of RE 16.123 summarise the results of the extensive traffic modelling that was undertaken to assess the impact of the scheme. The models have been independently audited by Transport for London and confirmed as fit for purpose. The table following paragraph 5.31 sets out the delay per mile for the busiest AM and PM peak hours for both the northbound and southbound directions.

d) Parking

Paragraph 5.28 of RE 16.123 refers to a number of locations where short-stay bays will be provided to support local businesses. These will initially be introduced to allow free parking for up to two hours, with a restriction that motorists must wait for at least four hours if they want to return to the same bay. The use of these bays will be monitored to ensure that they are being used as intended and that there is a sufficient turnover of vehicles. If not, other options to be considered in consultation with affected residents and business, include reducing the maximum length of stay (to ensure a greater turnover of spaces); changing the method of control (e.g. to pay and display); or introducing additional bays in side roads, where feasible.

e) Regeneration of the area

No representations or objections were made on the basis of additional traffic that may be generated from future development in the area and this was therefore not addressed in the report. In any event, it is clear that the highway network cannot continue to absorb demand for car use given the scale of growth forecast for the borough and across London. The scheme for the A1010 South and the wider Cycle Enfield programme supports the approach set out in the London Plan, the Mayor's Transport Strategy and his recently published 'Healthy Streets for London' document, which is about encouraging more people to walk, cycle and use public transport.

f) Bus Boarders

No representations or objections were made on the basis that there was insufficient information regarding the Council's plans to communicate with residents about use of the new bus boarders. This issue was therefore not addressed in the report.

However, explanations of how new types of infrastructure will be used will be disseminated via a range of channels including the Cycle Enfield website and newsletter. Visits can also be arranged for local groups (such as sheltered housing along the route) where officers can provide further explanations of how bus-stop boarders are designed to operate. As part of the communication with Enfield Disability Action, we have also offered the opportunity for a site visit with a selection of their members who we can then work with to help cascade the relevant information.

g) Driveway Crossovers

No representations or objections were made regarding the provision of footway crossovers and this was not therefore addressed in the report.

The opportunity for footway crossovers will be considered in advance of work commencing, taking into account relevant planning criteria. Where crossovers are feasible and can be provided as part of the works they will be provided free of charge, with residents only having to fund any necessary the works with the curtilage of their properties.

h) Consultation and Value for Money

The original consultation on the A1010 South was carried out between 20 November 2015 and 20 March 2016 and generated 377 responses. A further 872 views were obtained from face to face interviews. All responses were reported to Cabinet in July 2016 and, taking the various views into account, the decision was made to proceed to detailed design and statutory consultation.

The statutory consultation, referred to here, was principally about inviting objections to the traffic management orders required to enable traffic and parking to be regulated once the scheme has been implemented. The number of responses therefore gives no indication of the level of support for the scheme itself, which as you are aware is in alignment with the cross-party Mini Holland bid as submitted to and awarded by the Mayor of London.