

MUNICIPAL YEAR 2018/2019 REPORT NO. **KD 4701**

Delegated Authority Report

REPORT OF:

Sarah Cary
Executive Director – Place

In consultation with

James Rolfe
Executive Director - Finance,
Resources and Customer Services

Contact officer and telephone number

Nick Martin

Head of Service – TA Procurement

Tel: 020 8379 4550

Email: nick.martin@enfield.gov.uk

Agenda – Part 1	Item: N/A
Subject: A decision to award a management contract and lease to the successful bidder to manage a portfolio of vacant decant properties.	
Wards: All	
Cabinet Members consulted: Cllr Lemonides Cllr Maguire	

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. There are increasing pressures on housing supply in Enfield, in particular the pressure on temporary accommodation has increased significantly. At the end of March 2018 Enfield was ranked 2nd highest nationally for the number of families in temporary accommodation (MHCLG published data), equating to 3350, most of which are housed in nightly paid accommodation.
2. The demand for temporary accommodation and private rented sector properties in order to discharge the Council's homelessness duty continues to increase. Hence a need to increase the number of expensive emergency units, posing significant budget pressures for the Council, unless action is taken to provide a more cost-effective alternative.
3. There is an opportunity of utilising the decant blocks which are subject to demolition in the short to medium term by leasing out vacant units to landlords who will in turn sub-let the properties to tenants. This will allow the Council to better use its housing assets, discharge its homelessness duty and generate additional rental income, to help reduce the current budget pressures.
4. Based on this, the Council invited bids from providers that could refurbish and manage a portfolio of circa 150 vacant decant units for a minimum of two years and a maximum of seven years. The tender process concluded on 21st June 2018.
5. A lease structure and management agreement have been drafted to enable the Council to lease out the vacant properties to the successful bidder who will be the landlord. The landlord will in turn sub-let the properties to tenants and take on the responsibility for managing the properties.
6. This report seeks authority to award a contract to the successful bidder following a competitive procurement process as detailed in Part 2 of this report.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that:

- 2.1 A management agreement and accompanying lease is awarded to the successful bidder specified in Part 2 of this report for a period of a minimum of two to a maximum of seven years dependent on each regeneration scheme's timescale.
- 2.2 The structure described at paragraph 3.7 to 3.9 is used to grant the head lease.
- 2.3 The Council replicates the use of this structure and competitive process to invite bids and grant future head leases of properties which become vacant on estates earmarked for redevelopment (subject to further authority/approval being obtained in each case, and following the Key Decision process where required under the Council's Constitution).
- 2.4 The final contract documents are in a form approved by the Director of Law and Governance.

3. BACKGROUND

- 3.1 There are increasing pressures on housing supply in Enfield, in particular pressure on temporary accommodation the need for which has increased significantly. At the end of March 2018 Enfield was ranked 2nd highest nationally for the number of families in temporary accommodation (MHCLG published data), equating to 3,350, most of which are housed in nightly paid accommodation.
- 3.2 While there are a number of interventions, the demand for temporary accommodation and private rented sector properties to discharge of duty continues to rise. Hence increasing the number of expensive emergency units required and posing significant budget pressures for the Council, unless action is taken to provide a more cost-effective alternative.
- 3.3 There are several Estate Regeneration schemes around the borough containing a number of empty council properties where leaseholder's properties have been purchased back at an optimum price/time (lower market value), or where tenants voluntarily have moved on to alternative council accommodation following consultation in relation to the proposed regeneration plans.
- 3.4 The Council can better utilise its housing assets by leasing out vacant decant units to landlords who will in turn sub-let the properties to tenants. This will allow the Council to discharge its homeless duty and generate income, therefore reducing the current budget pressures.
- 3.5 This project was initiated in August 2014 when a delegated authority report was signed by Paul Davey authorising the use of vacant decant regeneration properties. The

properties were utilised for move-on accommodation for clients in emergency accommodation (discharge of duty). We currently have 68 properties in management with the current procured supplier.

BIDDING PROCESS AND GRANTING OF MANAGEMENT CONTRACT AND LEASE

- 3.5 On 11 May 2018, an Invitation to Tender (ITT) was sent to ten private property management providers that could refurbish and act as a landlord to take on day to day management responsibilities which include collection of rents, maintenance and management of the void properties. The prospective providers were required to respond by Friday 1 June 2018.
- 3.6 Prior to the award evaluation process, the tenders were reviewed by the Evaluation Panel to ensure that the providers met the requirements outlined in the ITT.
- 3.7 A lease structure and management agreement have been drafted to enable the Council to lease out c150 vacant properties to a landlord. The landlord may then sub-let the properties using Assured Shorthold Tenancy agreements to private tenants. The lease mitigates the creation of secure tenancies which is the greatest financial risk from the Council's perspective. The appointed landlord will be responsible for management, rent collection, maintenance internally and ensuring vacant possession when the Council requires the units back for demolition.
- 3.8 The head lease includes a nominations clause which gives the Council 100% nomination rights to nominate tenants to the appointed landlord. Once the lease is granted, and the units are available for letting, colleagues in temporary accommodation will be able to transfer tenants to the landlord.
- 3.9 The head lease structure will comprise of a portfolio of circa 150 vacant units on the Alma Estate, New Avenue Estate and Ladderswood Estate. The first phase will cover 83 units and their keys will be handed over to the successful bidder when the contract is awarded. The remaining units which would be available between 12 and 24 months' time would be handed over either in another one or two phases.

4. ALTERNATIVE SCENARIO

The Council could consider the following options for the use of its vacant properties on renewal estates:

4.1 Do nothing

Doing nothing would not present an opportunity to reduce the number of people in TA and place more households within the borough, nor would it reduce the Council's own liability for Council tax from vacant properties on the renewal estates. By doing nothing, the Council will continue to incur costs by placing households in expensive nightly paid accommodation. As properties are decanted they are left empty and unfurnished until demolished. As a result, there are often issues with vandalism, ASB, squatting and crime on such estates. This option has no financial benefits because there will be no income for the HRA

4.2 Work in partnership with Housing Gateway Ltd

The Council could transfer circa 150 vacant units to Housing Gateway to refurbish and manage the units. While this option will achieve the aim of placing people in a less costly

accommodation within the borough, Housing Gateway may not generate the level of income that the proposed option will yield for the HRA. The turnaround period for refurbishing the units may be longer than that proposed by the successful bidder. However, Housing Gateway have chosen a number of void units for refurbishment and continue to identify further decant units outside of the portfolio identified within this tender.

4.3 "Guardians"

These live-in property guardians will only occupy units in the imminent phases of estate renewal projects because guardians sign up to short term periods, which is considered more appropriate and it is perceived that vacant possession is therefore less of a risk. However, there is significant financial incentive for using the head lease structure to grant a lease to a management & lettings company charging at LHA rents.

4.4 Council Managed Nightly Paid Accommodation

The Council could refurbish and manage the properties on a license tenure (nightly paid accommodation) as the Council are not legally able to award an Assured Shorthold Tenancy. However, this may cause additional pressure on the Council's void works team and would require additional resource within property management team. Although there would be cost saving in comparison to other procured nightly paid accommodation, the Council would be unable to discharge its housing duty to private sector and the outcome would not lead to any reduction of families in temporary accommodation.

5 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 See part 2 of this report

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

6.2 Financial Implications

See part 2 of this report.

6.3 Legal Implications

- 6.3.1 The Council has a statutory duty to provide suitable temporary accommodation to homeless people who are eligible and have a priority need for accommodation under Part VII of the Housing Act 1996 (as amended). Section 111 of the Local Government Act 1972 permits local authorities to do anything which is calculated to facilitate, or is conducive or incidental to, the discharge of their functions. The Council also has a general power of competence under section 1(1) of the Localism Act 2011 to do anything that individuals may do, provided it is not prohibited by legislation and subject to Public Law principles.
- 6.3.2 As the head lease will be for a maximum of seven years it is classed as a short term tenancy and the arrangement is not strictly governed by the duty under section 123 of the Local Government Act 1972 to obtain "best value". Nevertheless, the Council has invited competitive bids, thus demonstrating value.
- 6.3.3 The TA team has liaised with the Council's Procurement and Commissioning Board in procuring the management contract and accompanying lease as a services concession contract. Although the value is below the EU threshold for service concessions and the Council does not need to comply with the full rigours of the

Concessions Contracts Regulations 2016, the Council must comply with the general EU Treaty principles of equality, transparency, proportionality and non-discrimination.

6.3.4 The final contract documents must be in a form approved by the Director of Law and Governance.

6.3.5 The Council must ensure value for money in accordance with the overriding Best Value Principles under the Local Government Act 1999.

6.4 Procurement Implications

The procurement process was carried out in accordance with the Council's Contract Procedure Rules, The Public Contracts Regulations 2015 and The Concession Contracts Regulations 2016, following approval by the Procurement and Commissioning Board on 1 March 2018.

7 KEY RISKS

See part 2 of this report.

8 IMPACT ON COUNCIL PRIORITIES

8.1 Fairness for All

The principle of bringing currently vacant properties into short term use promotes fairness given the conditions of the current housing rental market. Leasing out vacant properties on renewal estates for sub-letting by a management & lettings company, for nominated temporary accommodation will save the tax payer money.

8.2 Growth and Sustainability

8.3 Strong Communities

The Council will work with the successful bidder to ensure that all refurbished units are a safe and healthy place to live before offering them to tenants.

9 EQUALITIES IMPACT IMPLICATIONS

9.1 The provision of additional accommodation through the successful bidder will benefit families currently in temporary accommodation, those waiting for discharge of duty including the vulnerable ones such as those who are pregnant, young and in priority need.

10 PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

10.1 The service of the successful bidder will contribute to cost avoidance and demand management. As a result, performance of the bidder will be managed through a robust contract management.

MUNICIPAL YEAR 2018/2019 REPORT NO.

ACTION TO BE TAKEN UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY

PORTFOLIO DECISION OF:
Deputy Leader

REPORT OF:
Director of Environment &
Operational Services

Agenda – Part:	KD Num: N/A
Subject: Fernleigh Road Area Quieter Neighbourhood	
Wards: Winchmore Hill	

Contact officer and telephone number: Andy Ruffell x3632

E mail: Andrew.ruffell@enfield.gov.uk

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1 This report summarises the outcome of the statutory consultation relating to the proposals for the Fernleigh Road Area Quieter Neighbourhood and recommends that the scheme be implemented with some modifications to take into account the various comments received.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 That the Quieter Neighbourhood scheme for the Fernleigh Road Area as illustrated in Appendix A be implemented, including:
- Introduction of a 20mph zone;
 - Installation of speed humps and speed cushions in Fernleigh Road, Woodberry Avenue and Compton Road; and
 - Trialling of a point no-entry feature in Stonard Road to allow for further feedback from residents.
- 2.2 That it is noted, the following are not progressed following objections to the proposals;
- One-way traffic in Eaton Park Road and Meadowcroft Way;
 - Area wide road narrowings (wider parking bays); and
 - Banned turns into Radcliffe Road and Ringwood Way.
- 2.3 That the necessary traffic management orders be made to bring the scheme into operation, including an experimental traffic management order relating to the point no-entry in Stonard Road.

3. BACKGROUND

- 3.1 Quieter Neighbourhoods form an integral part of the Council's Cycle Enfield Project, aimed at creating a 'Better Enfield' involving 'Healthy Streets' where walking and cycling takes precedence over through traffic.
- 3.2 Work on the Fernleigh Road Quieter Neighbourhood began back in 2015 with a perception survey and a series of workshops with residents to explore possible structural interventions. Building on this initial engagement with residents there has been two further stages of consultation, allowing residents to contribute at a formative stage in the development of the scheme.

INFORMAL CONSULTATION

- 3.3 Informal consultation was carried out in October 2017 by means of a leaflet, which directed residents to an online questionnaire with a plan showing the measures in detail. The leaflet was delivered to approximately 2,500 local residents, Palmers Green High School and other interested parties. In addition, there was press and online publicity.
- 3.4 The draft proposals consulted upon were informed by previous engagement with residents and comprised five key elements:
- A potential point no-entry for westbound traffic on Stonard Road;
 - One-way streets in Meadow Croft Road and Eaton Park Road;
 - Widened parking bays in Haslemere Road and Orpington Road;
 - Peak time banned left turns from Station Road into Radcliffe Road and Ringwood Way; and
 - A 20mph zone, including physical traffic calming measures in both Fernleigh Road and Woodberry Avenue.
- 3.5 Fernleigh Road and Woodberry Avenue both recorded higher speeds than other roads in the area and need to include physical traffic calming features to comply with the relevant guidance¹ and, in particular, to ensure that any measures aimed at reducing speed will necessarily be self-enforcing as the cost of speed cameras would be prohibitive. Two options were therefore put forward for residents to consider:
- Option 1 – Speed humps and speed cushions²; and
 - Option 2 – Road narrowings using planters.

¹ The Department for Transport recommend that physical traffic calming features are provided where the 85th percentile speed is more than 24mph.

² Speed humps typically stretch across the full width of the road. There are instances where the appropriate locations for the placement of speed humps correspond with dropped kerbs. Rather than create potential access difficulties for residents, in these instances, speed cushions placed in the centre of the road are proposed instead.

- 3.6 In total 464 consultation responses were received, many of which (134 or 29%) were general comments and suggestions, mainly relating to the major A105 scheme. However, the key concerns raised at the informal stage were:
- Loss of parking spaces;
 - The roads are already quiet and the scheme is not therefore necessary;
 - Congestion caused by the proposed point no-entry;
 - Speed of vehicles in roads inside and outside of the proposed Quieter Neighbourhood Area;
 - That the proposals would make life more difficult for residents living within the area; and
 - Issues caused by introduction of the cycle lanes along the A105
- 3.7 The results of the consultation for the two traffic calming options for Fernleigh Road and Woodberry Avenue clearly indicated that the majority of respondents from these roads were against the introduction of planters due to the associated loss of parking.
- 3.8 A petition was also received from residents of Woodberry Avenue regarding the proposed planters and speed humps in that road. A number of residents had completed both the petition and the Council consultation. A comparison of these responses indicated that in a number of cases, individual residents had indicated one preference in the petition but a different preference in the consultation. Although this created some ambiguity around the information provided, it was evident that there was a lack of support for the planters as a potential traffic calming measures.
- 3.9 The consultation also indicated that some residents felt that traffic calming measures needed to be extended to include roads such as Compton Road and Radcliffe Road
- 3.10 Overall, whilst there was clear support for the principle of slowing vehicle speeds in the area, there was no consensus about how this should be achieved. Although it was clear that some features were not supported, such as the use of planters to create pinch points, no clear consensus emerged from the analysis of the consultation responses regarding most of the other measures. It was therefore decided to amend the scheme to take on board feedback from the informal consultation, where there was a clear consensus, and re-consult on specific detailed proposals.

STATUTORY CONSULTATION

- 3.11 The scheme requires the making of traffic management orders to bring some aspects of the scheme into operation. In line with the requirements of the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996. Notice of the Council's proposals was published in the London Gazette, the Enfield

Independent and by way of street notices erected in every affected road within the area. Notices were also sent to the various prescribed statutory consultees, including the emergency services, bus operators and road-user groups. The statutory consultation ran for 3 weeks from 21 February until the 18 March 2018.

3.12 In addition to the minimum legal requirement, further leaflets were again delivered to approximately 2,500 local residents in the area, Palmers Green High School and other interested parties, directing them to the consultation website to view the detailed proposals for each street. This asked residents to consider five specific separate questions:

- Do you support the area-wide 20mph zone (including the associated traffic calming)?
- Do you support the point no-entry in Stonard Road?
- Do you support the one-way streets?
- Do you support the banned turns on Station Road into Ringwood Way and Radcliffe Road?
- Do you support the area-wide road narrowing?

3.13 No responses were received from the various statutory consultees (including the emergency services). One ward councillor responded and this has been included within the other responses to the consultation. A total of 227 responses were received from individuals or groups, including the Winchmore Hill Residents Association, representing a response rate of 9%. The breakdown of responses including by road can be seen in the tables shown in Appendix B to this report.

3.14 Consultations are designed so that people living both within and outside of the area can provide their views on the proposals should they wish. However, when considering which measures to take forward, the views of residents more directly impacted are prioritised. Consultations are widely promoted, however relatively low return rates are not untypical (an issue for all local authorities rather than specifically Enfield Council). Recommendations are based upon the views of those residents who engage in the consultation process. Of the 227 responses, a total of 59 (26%) were received from residents who live outside the area. For information, Appendix B also shows the total results with responses from residents outside the area omitted. However, all responses were considered regardless of whether they came from people either inside or outside the area.

3.15 The responses to each of the five key questions are considered below.

Question 1 – Do you support the area-wide 20mph zone (including the associated traffic calming)?

3.16 A 20 mph zone is proposed across the Fernleigh Road area, adjoining the existing 20mph zone in Hoppers Road, which was introduced in 2013.

- 3.17 Due to vehicle speeds being higher than 24mph in Fernleigh Road, Woodberry Avenue and Radcliffe Road, a combination of speed cushions and sinusoidal speed humps are proposed to help make the speed limit self-enforcing.
- 3.18 Overall, 59% of all of the consultation responses supported the introduction of the 20 mph zone. Of the responses from Fernleigh Road, 65% were in favour of the 20mph zone, with 83% of the responses from Woodberry Avenue also in favour.
- 3.19 However, a number of objections to the 20mph zone were received and these are considered in the table below, together with the officer response:

Comment / Objection	Officer Response
<p>Speed Humps do not work – A number of comments and objections related to the ineffectiveness of speed humps and speed cushions.</p>	<p>Speed humps and cushions used in isolation are not as effective as when used, as in this instance, in series with the correct spacing to achieve the desired speed limit. In these circumstances they are very effective and studies show that they can have a reduction in speed of up to 10mph.</p>
<p>Speed humps increase pollution – Comments and objections in this category related to a concern that speed humps can increase emissions if drivers accelerate after a hump and brake hard before the next hump.</p>	<p>Research has shown that some traffic calming measures can cause some increase in harmful emissions, particular old-style speed humps. However, as speed humps are generally used in residential roads with low vehicle numbers, speed humps do not significantly contribute to the total amount of vehicle pollutants. In this case, any potential risk is mitigated by the use of sinusoidal humps³ & speed cushions spaced to ensure that a smooth and constant rate of speed can be maintained.</p>

³ A sinusoidal hump is a development of the traditional speed hump in that the hump starts relatively flat and then become progressively steeper in the direction of travel. It then curves over the top and then the gradient reduces gradually on the other side. This profile has the same effect, but is much more comfortable to cycle over.

<p>Noise and vibration – Comments and objections in this category related to the increase in noise and vibrations that speed humps can cause and the associated disturbance to residents.</p>	<p>There is the possibility that the introduction of speed humps and cushions could marginally increase the level of background noise and vibration. It is likely that any increase in noise and vibration will be due to large or empty goods vehicles rather than from cars. Consequently, wherever speed humps have been proposed we are using a new 'sinusoidal' speed hump profile which provides a smoother transition and should reduce the level of noise and vibration caused by any vehicles travelling over them. Where speed cushions have been proposed they have been positioned so that the wheel tracks of, large vehicles (i.e. ambulances) will be able to straddle them, which again will help to reduce the level of noise and vibration experienced.</p>
<p>Speed humps damage cars and cause collisions – comments and suggestions in this category related to the concern that speed humps and speed cushions cause damage to the suspension and steering of cars.</p>	<p>The current guidance on the design of speed humps and speed cushions is based on thorough research in to what is the most appropriate profile for each type of measure. This has been done to reduce the level of discomfort and damage to the suspension and steering components of a car. It is also not possible to say that speed humps are the sole cause of any damage as other factors in daily driving, could also contribute to wear and tear on the components. However, long-term damage is only likely if, for instance, people regularly drive over speed humps/cushions without slowing down sufficiently.</p>
<p>20mph limit not needed – comments and objections in this category suggested that in many roads vehicles could not achieve 20mph due to existing parking narrowing the road.</p>	<p>In some roads within the area, the vehicle speeds are lower than the current speed limit of 30mph. The idea of creating an area-wide 20mph speed limit is that we can address concerns over a large area as well as keeping sign clutter to a minimum. Where roads already have low vehicle speeds we are following existing guidance and only introducing road markings to remind drivers of the speed limit.</p>

<p>Additional measures necessary on Hoppers Road – comments in this category included requests for additional traffic calming measures in Hoppers Road which is already a existing 20 mph road.</p>	<p>Post any scheme implementation, monitoring will take place to help determine how introducing an area-wide 20mph zone has impacted on traffic speeds on Hoppers Road. Further measures can then be considered if appropriate or necessary.</p>
--	--

3.20 Having considered all of the comments and objections received, it is recommended that the proposal to introduce a 20mph zone, including the traffic calming measures shown on the plan attached in Appendix A, be implemented.

Question 2 – Do you support the point no-entry in Stonard Road?

3.21 Earlier engagement highlighted concerns about the level of through traffic in Stonard Road, compounded by high levels of parking generated by users of both Saint Monica’s Church and the Intimate Theatre.

3.22 Much of the through traffic utilises Stonard Road to avoid being delayed when turning right at the traffic signals, from Green Lanes into Bourne Hill. The proposed point no-entry at the northern end of Stonard Road would prevent this movement whilst still allowing southbound traffic.

3.23 Overall, 25% of all respondents supported this element of the scheme, with 47% opposing it and 28% having no preference. However, 60% of responses from residents living on Stonard Road, supported the proposed point no-entry.

3.24 The table below summarises the objections to the point no-entry in Stonard Road:

Comment / Objection	Officer Response
<p>Congestion / Displacement – Comments and objections in this category suggested concerns with the potential likelihood of displaced traffic on to neighbouring roads such as Fernleigh Road and Woodberry Avenue.</p>	<p>Any engineering measure, which restricts the flow of traffic in one direction, is likely to cause some displacement, as drivers using through routes tend to be doing this as it is a more direct route to their destination and/or it saves time. The proposals consulted upon provide a balance between the needs of residents in Stonard Road, residents in adjoining streets and other road users.</p>

<p>Longer Journeys / Additional journeys – Comments and objections in this category related to not being able to access Hoppers Road directly, due to the location of the proposals.</p>	<p>The point no-entry will reduce the level of through traffic but may also cause some inconvenience to local residents living in the wider area. Again, a trial of the scheme will allow the impact of the scheme to be monitored before a decision is made whether to make the scheme permanent</p>
<p>Wrong Orientation – Comments and objections in this category related to the proposals restricting the wrong direction of traffic flow and that it should be changed.</p>	<p>Earlier design workshops with residents recommended this direction (Green Lanes to Hoppers Road). The scheme will initially be constructed using temporary materials so that its impact can be assessed and adjustments made in the light of this and further consultation.</p>

3.25 Having considered all of the comments and objections received, it is recommended that the point-no entry in Stonard Road be implemented on a trial basis (using an experimental traffic management order and temporary materials) to test the impact of the scheme. Further consultation will be undertaken to help determine whether or not this aspect of the scheme should be made permanent.

3.26 This recommendation is based on acknowledgement that the majority of respondents living on Stonard Road supported the proposal and we have prioritised their views over the views of the wider area.

Question 3 – Do you support the one-way streets (Eaton Park Road & Meadowcroft Road)?

3.27 In an effort to reduce the volume of traffic, which may use alternative routes to avoid the Hedge Lane traffic signal junction, it was proposed to introduce one-way working in Eaton Park Road (westbound) and Meadowcroft Road (eastbound). This would have the effect of re-routing through traffic back onto Green Lanes in a position that is further away than where they left the main route.

3.28 Overall, 33% of responses supported the one-way working proposals. However, in Eaton Park Road and Meadowcroft Road, 79% and 100% respectively, of residents on those streets who responded, opposed the one-way working.

3.29 The table below sets out the objections to the proposed one-way working:

Comment / Objection	Officer Response
<p>Vehicle speeds will increase – Comments and objections in this category related to concerns that one-way streets would lead to vehicle speeds increasing as there would be no oncoming traffic.</p>	<p>In certain circumstances, speeds can increase in one-way streets without physical traffic measures. However, in this instance, after reviewing vehicle speeds it was felt that the road conditions (parked vehicles) along with 20mph roundels would help to keep vehicle speeds low.</p>
<p>Not needed as no increase in level of traffic – Comments and objections in this category suggested that there had been no increase in traffic since the completion of the major scheme.</p>	<p>This proposal was based on previous engagement with residents who had complained about through traffic and congestion. While traffic may not have increased, in the short term the likelihood is that the proposed point no-entry will displace some traffic onto both Eaton Park Road and Meadowcroft. However, the one-way streets are not essential at this stage and could be reviewed once the wider scheme has been implemented.</p>
<p>Inconvenience to residents / deliveries – Comments and objections in this category suggest that there would be an increase in inconvenience to residents having to make longer detours to access their road or when attempting to find suitable parking.</p>	<p>Any engineering measure that restricts the flow of traffic in one direction is likely to cause some displacement and inconvenience. In particular, one-way systems tend to force drivers on to less direct routes to their destination, making these roads less desirable to through traffic. One-way streets can therefore be an effective traffic management tool and the inconvenience caused to residents in this instance is likely to be minimal.</p>
<p>Congestion – Comments and objections in this category suggest that there would be increased congestion for vehicles looking to turn right onto Green Lanes.</p> <p>Additional concerns were raised over congestion when refuse vehicles are in the road necessitating vehicles having to wait behind.</p>	<p>The proposal to introduce the one-way system supported the point no-entry in Stonard Road. In combination, they would work to reduce the level of vehicles travelling through the area to access Hoppers Road/Bourne Hill, thereby reducing overall congestion.</p> <p>It is accepted that delivery or service vehicles may occasionally hold up residents, but this is not regarded as having a significant impact as it is an occasional, not a regular occurrence.</p>

3.30 Having considered all of the comments and objections received, it is recommended that the proposal to introduce the one-way working in Eaton Park Road and Meadowcroft Road is not implemented at this stage, but that traffic volumes are monitored during the introduction of the Stonard Road point no-entry trial.

3.31 This recommendation is based on acknowledgement that the majority of respondents living in Meadowcroft Road and Eaton Park Road did not support the proposal, along with the majority of the wider area. However, one-way streets remain an appropriate practical solution to traffic issues in these streets and could be implemented at a later date should the wishes of residents change.

Question 4 – Do you support the banned turns on Station Road into Ringwood Way and Radcliffe Road?

3.32 Officers received a request to propose measures for Radcliffe Road to address resident's complaints that traffic levels had increased in their road.

3.33 In response, proposals to ban the left turn from Station Road into both Radcliffe Road and Ringwood Way were developed, applicable during peak hours only (7:30am - 9:30am and 5pm - 7pm).

3.34 The restriction would also help reduce the volume of traffic passing St Paul's C of E Primary School on Ringwood Way, at least when children are on the way to school in the morning. The school supported the proposal at the informal stage, but suggested that restrictions should be put in place between 8.30am - 9.30am and 3pm - 5pm, and for Ringwood Way to become 'residents only'.

3.35 The proposed am peak times for the banned turns were very similar to those requested by the school (7.30am – 9.30am). The proposed pm restriction (5pm - 7pm) was designed to prevent peak commuter traffic rather than just school-related traffic, although the hours could be reviewed if necessary. Restricting Ringwood Way to residents only would make the public highway effectively a private road; therefore, this option was not pursued further.

3.36 Overall, the banned turns were supported by only 23% of responses, with 60% opposing the proposal and 16% having no preference. However, 100% of residents who responded from Ringwood Way supported the proposals, but only 29% of responses from Radcliffe Road showed support.

3.37 The table below sets out the objections to the banned turns:

Comment / Objection	Officer Response
---------------------	------------------

<p>Displacement – Comments and objections in this category suggested that traffic would use adjacent side roads to avoid the left turn ban.</p>	<p>There may be some displacement of traffic onto adjacent roads if the scheme was implemented. However, there are few obvious alternative routes and most traffic is likely to either stay on Station Road or dissipate across a wide area.</p>
<p>Restrict access to leisure facility – Comments and objections in this category mainly related to how members of the bowls club would be inconvenienced accessing the club.</p>	<p>During the restricted hours eastbound traffic on Station Road would no longer be able to turn left into Radcliffe Road. Instead traffic would need to continue on Station Road, turn left onto Green Lanes and then left on to Radcliffe Road. Access to the bowling club would therefore be maintained at all times, with only a minor increase in journey times.</p>
<p>Increased congestion at school times – Comments and objections in this category suggested that the banned turns would lead to more congestion at peak-school times as drivers would use alternative roads to reach the school or for parking.</p>	<p>The proposal is designed to restrict through traffic avoiding the traffic signal junction at Station Road / Green Lanes. It is acknowledged that an effect of this would be that some school traffic during the AM peak would need to use alternative routes. However, this could be mitigated if parents and the school engage with the TfL STARS Accreditation Scheme and take steps to reduce the number of children travelling to and from school by car.</p>
<p>Re-instate the previous Station Road / Green Lanes junction layout – Comments and objections in this category suggested that the cause of vehicles using Ringwood Way and Radcliffe Road was because of the changes to the Station Road / Green Lane junction and there was no problem when the previous roundabout layout was there.</p>	<p>The junction was changed as part of the A105 Major Cycle programme works to improve safety. The operation of the junction is being monitored and queuing is limited at most times. The signal timings are currently being reviewed as part of the post-implementation monitoring to see if any further adjustments should be made.</p>
<p>Timed Restrictions – Comments and objections in this category suggested that having a timed restriction as opposed to a permanent restriction would cause confusion.</p>	<p>Restrictions that operate at specific times during a day are not a new concept and have been demonstrated to work elsewhere. Appropriate signage would minimise the risk of any confusion.</p>

3.38 None of the comments and objections received are of sufficient weight in themselves to prevent the part-time ban being implemented. However, on the basis of the lack of support for this aspect of the scheme, particularly from Radcliffe Road, it is recommended that banned turns are not implemented at the current time. Introducing a banned turn on Ringwood

Way could displace traffic onto Radcliffe Road, possibly increasing the volume of traffic in this road.

- 3.39 This recommendation is based on acknowledgement that the majority of respondents living in Radcliffe Road did not support the proposal, along with the majority of the wider area. However, banned turns remain an appropriate practical solution to traffic issues in these streets and could be implemented at a later date.

Question 5 – Do you support the area-wide road narrowing?

- 3.40 Although speeds in most of the roads were less than 24mph (and do not therefore require measures such as speed humps or cushions), widening the parking bays was proposed to visually reduce the width of the available carriageway to help reinforce the need for low speeds.

- 3.41 Of the total responses, received 27% of people supported the measure, 56% opposed it and 17% stated no preference.

- 3.42 The table below sets out the objections to this aspect of the scheme:

Comment / Objection	Officer Response
Loss of parking spaces – Comments and objections in this category related mainly to the belief that the proposal to narrow the road meant the loss of parking places.	The proposal to narrow the road was based on 'psychological traffic calming' rather than physical engineering measures. The proposal was to widen the existing parking bay in many of the roads to create the illusion that the road had narrowed, but without removing any parking spaces.
No speeding problem – Comments and objections in this category were highlighting that there was not a speed problem in these roads and that the narrowing was not required.	Roads where wider parking bays were proposed fall within the larger 20mph zone where speeds were already relatively low. The wider-bay markings could help maintain lower speeds, but are not an essential part of the scheme.

- 3.43 It is likely that the wider bays would result in only marginal reduction in vehicle speeds and therefore are not an essential element of the scheme. Considering the lack of support for the wider bays it is recommended that this aspect of the scheme is not progressed at this stage.

Additional comments to the consultation.

- 3.44 In addition, to the specific comments made about each of the five key elements of the scheme, a number of general objections and representations were made. These are considered further in the table below:

Comment / Objection	Officer Response
<p>Proposals not necessary – Comments and objections in this category related to the statutory consultation not being necessary due to the feedback received during the informal consultation.</p>	<p>Quieter Neighbourhoods are a key part of the Cycle Enfield strategy, ensuring that the adverse effect of through traffic in residential areas is addressed.</p> <p>It was not clear following the informal consultation that the scheme was not wanted, although it was evident that some of the suggested measures were not supported. These views and other feedback from the informal consultation were used to help shape the final scheme.</p>
<p>Consequence of Cycle Enfield – Comments in this category blamed the changes in traffic and the reason behind the Quieter Neighbourhood programme on the construction of the A105 Cycle Scheme and asking for the A105 to be returned to its previous layout.</p>	<p>The Quieter Neighbourhood programme is Borough-wide and aims to reduce traffic in our residential roads and neighbourhoods.</p> <p>Indeed, through traffic in the Fernleigh Road area pre-dates the introduction of cycle lanes along A105, which were introduced following extensive consultation and engagement. However, we do acknowledge that during the construction period there may have been some impact on traffic flow through the Fernleigh Road area.</p> <p>The proposals for this area are aimed at tackling historical issues as well as responding to any change in traffic behaviour possibly as a result of the introduction of the major scheme, but also because of changes in driver behaviour with the increasing use of sat-navs and various apps, such as WAZE, which seek to encourage drivers to find more direct routes to destinations. The net result being more traffic on our residential roads.</p> <p>Whilst we will continue to monitor the wider impact of the A105 Cycle Scheme, there are no plans to make any significant adjustments.</p>

<p>Congestions / Displacement – Comments in this category were concerned that in combination with the A105 Cycle Scheme, that the proposals would just cause additional congestion or equally just displace traffic on to adjacent roads, simply furthering the problem.</p>	<p>The Quieter Neighbourhood proposals are aimed at slowing traffic and are not likely to cause additional congestion. However, any engineering measure that restricts the flow of traffic could cause some displacement. The proposals seek to balance the need for vehicles to safely move through the area whilst minimising the likelihood of displacement onto adjoining residential streets.</p>
<p>Additional Measures – Comments in this category were asking for either complete changes to the proposals or to introduce additional traffic calming in roads which would be affected as a result of the consultation being supported or because of the A105 Cycle Scheme.</p>	<p>The Council has a limited budget for Quieter Neighbourhoods and we are looking to maximise the benefits of the programme across the whole Borough. As a result, interventions need to be carefully targeted to maximise the benefits. The proposed scheme is not anticipated to divert traffic into other residential streets, but the situation can be monitored post-implementation and adjustments made to the scheme if necessary.</p>
<p>Flawed Consultation – Comments and objections in this category were all similarly structured and listed a number of different reasons why the consultation should be postponed and revisited after the local elections once the opportunity has been taken to improve the process. These comments and objections also called for traffic calming options to be introduced on Green Lanes which was outside of the scope of the Quieter Neighbourhood proposals.</p>	<p>The consultation process has been extensive, enabling residents to engage at a formative stage in the development of the scheme, with sufficient time and information to be able proper consideration of the proposals.</p>

4. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 4.1 **Do nothing** – This is not recommended as Quieter Neighbourhoods form an essential part of the strategy to promote walking and cycling in the Borough.
- 4.2 **Implement the scheme as consulted on** – This is not recommended as several comments made in response to the consultation raised legitimate issues that have been addressed as part of the development of the final scheme.

5. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

The proposed recommendations will enable a scheme to be implemented that promotes walking and cycling by reducing the impact of traffic in the Fernleigh Road area. In view of the mixed response to the proposed point no-entry in Stonard Road, it is also recommended that this be installed on a trial basis, with further consultation undertaken before a final decision is made whether it should be retained, removed or modified. As regards the proposals for one-way traffic in Eaton Park Road and Meadowcroft Way; area-wide road narrowings (wider parking bays); and banned turns into Radcliffe Road and Ringwood Way, for the reasons stated above we will not proceed with these measures.

6. COMMENTS OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR RESOURCES AND OTHER DEPARTMENTS

6.1 Financial Implications

- 6.1.1 The estimated cost for implementing the scheme is up to £116,000. The funding of the scheme will be met from the 2018/2019 Local Implementation Plan TfL Quieter Neighbourhood allocation previously agreed by the Lead Member.
- 6.1.2 Expenditure once approved by Transport for London, will be fully funded by means of direct grant from TfL; hence no costs fall on the Council.
- 6.1.3 The release of funds by TfL is based on a process that records the progress of works against approved spending profiles. TfL make payments against certified claims that can be submitted as soon as expenditure is incurred, ensuring that the Council benefits from prompt reimbursement of any expenditure

6.2 Legal Implications

- 6.2.1 The Highways Act 1980 provides a general power for the Council to improve highways as well as specific powers to introduce road humps (including speed cushions). The Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and supporting regulations enable the Council to make traffic management orders to restrict traffic in a variety of ways, including the introduction of a 20mph speed limit, banned turns and prescribed routes.
- 6.2.1 As part of the traffic management order making process, there is a statutory requirement to consult a number of prescribed bodies and others likely to be affected by the scheme. The final decision to implement the scheme needs to take into the various representations and objections received, as outlined in the report.

6.2.3 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.

6.3 Property Implications

None Identified.

7. KEY RISKS

The key risks relating to the scheme are summarised below together, where relevant, with steps taken to mitigate the level of risk:

Risk Category	Comments/Mitigation
Strategic	The scheme will support the Council's aims to encourage more people to walk and cycle as a safe and healthy means of travel.
Operational	<p>Risk: Disruption during construction. Mitigation: Traffic management arrangements will be designed to minimise disruption for local residents. Roadworks will also be co-ordinated to take account of other work in the area.</p> <p>Risk: Sub-standard construction. Mitigation: Scheme being designed and supervised by experienced designers and built by experienced professional contractors, with a proven track record in Enfield.</p>
Financial	<p>Risk: Insufficient funds/cost escalation. Mitigation: Funding from TfL has been allocated to the scheme and the estimated implementation cost falls within the available budget. Controls are in place to ensure that order is not placed until price is known and budget confirmed.</p>
Reputational	<p>Risk: Opposition to scheme from some local residents/organisations. Mitigation: Consultation has been undertaken to take into account the views of local residents and other interested parties.</p>
Regulatory	<p>Risk: Failure to comply with statutory requirements. Mitigation: Scheme being delivered by experienced designers, with support from experts in the various statutory procedures.</p>

8. IMPACT ON COUNCIL PRIORITIES

8.1 The scheme supports the Council's vision to make Enfield a better place to live and work, delivering fairness for all, growth and sustainability and

strong communities. In particular, the scheme supports the following Council priority:

- Neighbourhoods that are clean, safe, well regulated, welcoming, cohesive and resilient.

9. EQUALITY IMPACT IMPLICATIONS

Local authorities have a responsibility to meet the Public Sector Duty of the Equality Act 2010. The Act gives people the right not to be treated less favourably because of any of the protected characteristics. We need to consider the needs of these diverse groups when designing and changing services or budgets So that our decisions it do not unduly or disproportionately affect access by some groups more than others.

In recommending this proposal we have considered the needs of all highway users including those from the protected characteristic groups. All members of the community have full access to the highways however it is recognised that some protected groups may have practical problems in using the service. We are confident that these proposals will ensure that everyone will continue to benefit from this service.

The Council are looking to introduce a 20mph zone with traffic calming on roads within what we have defined as the Fernleigh Road Quieter Neighbourhood Area to reduce vehicle speeds through the neighbourhood. The aim is that reduced vehicle speeds may improve safety for pedestrians, cyclists as well as for motorists and will also encourage and facilitate the use of more sustainable modes of transport. It's possible that the scheme could result in some displaced traffic transferring on to adjacent roads, but mitigation measures are being considered.

The proposal will restrict vehicles to 20mph within the area, with two roads in particular (Fernleigh Road and Woodberry Avenue) having traditional traffic calming measures installed (speed humps / speed cushions). It is understood that certain protected groups can experience some discomfort when traversing the types of measures proposed. However, where possible the Council is using a new type of profile for the speed humps called 'sinusoidal'. This type of ramp profile aims to provide a smoother transition and reduce the jolting effects, which can be felt within a vehicle.

We will undertake monitoring through the use of static speed surveys to determine how effective the measures have been.

Any impact on social economic inequality is likely to be low, as those on low incomes are less likely to own cars, meaning they are more likely to walk or cycle and this proposal promotes active travel and associated health benefits, by providing a safer area for this to occur.

Therefore, we believe there will be no negative impact on residents or users from the protected characteristic groups in taking this decision.

10. PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

The scheme will have limited impact on performance when considered in isolation. However, the scheme will contribute to a number of key targets, including those relating to improving the health of adults and children in the Borough, reducing the number of vulnerable road users injured on our roads, and increasing the use of sustainable means of travel.

11. PUBLIC HEALTH IMPLICATIONS

The scheme directly improves conditions for people to walk and cycle in the Fernleigh Road area. This will make walking and cycling more attractive, encouraging more people to take part in active travel. The scheme therefore supports the Council's wider strategy to improve public health by increasing levels of physical activity.

Meeting physical activity guidelines is associated with reducing long-term conditions by 20-40%. Long-term conditions account for 70% of the NHS budget. This scheme will therefore contribute to both supporting the NHS and improving health in the Borough.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

None

Appendix A – Fernleigh Road Area Quieter Neighbourhood

Road Name	Q1			Q2			Q3			Q4			Q5		
	Yes	No	NP*	Yes	No	NP*	Yes	No	NP*	Yes	No	NP*	Yes	No	NP*
Arlow Road	1	3	0	1	3	0	2	2	0	1	3	0	0	4	0
Arundel Gardens	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
Arundel Road	1	1	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1
Avondale Road	1	1	0	0	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	2	0	1	1
College Road	0	1	1	0	2	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1
Compton Road	11	5	0	4	6	6	7	4	5	4	10	2	8	5	3
Eaton Park Road	9	4	1	5	9	0	2	11	1	0	7	7	2	10	2
Fernleigh Road	26	12	2	7	17	16	10	21	9	8	25	7	7	27	6
Hoppers Road	7	2	0	3	3	3	3	4	2	2	5	2	3	6	0
Hurst Road	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	2	0
Live outside of this Quieter Neighbourhood area	29	26	4	14	35	10	18	37	4	10	47	2	14	39	6
Lytton Avenue	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	1	1	0	1	1	0
Meadowcroft Road	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	2	0
Orpington Road	9	7	0	4	9	3	6	4	6	4	10	2	8	8	0
Radcliffe Road	9	7	1	2	1	14	2	3	12	5	12	0	0	5	12
Ringwood Way	4	0	0	0	0	4	4	0	0	4	0	0	4	0	0
Shrubbery Gardens	0	3	1	0	3	1	0	4	0	0	4	0	0	3	1
Station Road	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	2	0	1	1	0
Stonard Road	8	2	0	6	4	0	8	1	1	5	1	4	4	3	3
Woodberry Avenue	15	2	1	7	7	4	8	6	4	8	5	5	10	7	1

NP* = No Preference

Totals - All Responses

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5
Yes	134	56	75	53	62
No	80	107	105	137	127
No Preference	13	64	47	37	38
Totals	227	227	227	227	227

Totals - Responses from within area only

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5
Yes	105	42	57	43	48
No	54	72	68	90	88
No Preference	9	54	43	35	32
Totals	168	168	168	168	168

Road Name | **Number of Responses Received**

Arlow Road	4
Arundel Gardens	1
Arundel Road	2
Avondale Road	2
College Road	2
Compton Road	16
Eaton Park Road	14
Ferleigh Road	40
Hoppers Road	9
Hurst Road	2
Live outside of this Quieter Neighbourhood area	59
Lytton Avenue	2
Meadowcroft Road	2
Orpington Road	16
Radcliffe Road	17
Ringwood Way	4
Shrubbery Gardens	4
Station Road	2
Stonard Road	10
Woodberry Avenue	18
No address given	1
Totals	227

MUNICIPAL YEAR 2017/2018 REPORT NO.

**ACTION TO BE TAKEN UNDER
DELEGATED AUTHORITY**

PORTFOLIO DECISION OF:

Deputy Leader

REPORT OF:

Director - Environment &
Operational Services

Agenda – Part: 1

KD Num:

Subject: Approval of Quietway 18 Proposals
for Church Street to Salmons Brook

Wards: Bush Hill Park

Contact officer and telephone number:

Matthew Davies: 07855761934

E mail: matthew.davies@enfield.gov.uk

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report seeks approval to undertake Section A of Quietway 18 which will link the A105 cycling network to the cycle track along Salmons Brook which has recently been completed. This scheme forms part of the Quietway 18 route between Enfield and Edmonton Green. These proposals form part of the Mayor of London's Transport Strategy to increase cycling in London and will be fully funded by Transport for London (TfL). Forming part of the wider network, the proposals contained in this report are expected to deliver health and transport benefits for both local residents and visitors to Enfield.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 To note the issues raised in response to the statutory consultation and the officer responses set out in Section 6 of this report.
- 2.2 To approve expenditure of £100,000 to enable the scheme illustrated on drawings. Q18-2017-196-100-01 and 02 to be implemented, including modifying the layout of the junction of Bury Street West and Church Street by constructing two central islands to create a cycle crossing and informal pedestrian crossing.

3. INTRODUCTION

- 3.1 Quietway 18 (Section A) of the secondary route network forms part of the package of works aimed at improving the Borough's cycling infrastructure.
- 3.2 Secondary route links are intended to strengthen the network of cycle routes, following quieter streets, parks and waterways across Enfield. They'll connect with other cycling infrastructure, expanding the reach of cycling investment and linking residential areas to local services such as schools, town centres and green spaces. They help overcome barriers to cycling by providing safe and signed routes and where appropriate, creating 'feeder' routes to the major schemes.
- 3.3 Quietway 18 will connect the A105 cycle route with the new infrastructure on the A1010 (currently under construction). It will provide an east west link between Enfield Town and Edmonton Green thereby creating a safer and more attractive route for walking and cycling.
- 3.4 This report sets out the outcome of statutory consultation undertaken on the Church Street to Salmons Brook scheme, which provided the opportunity for residents and interested parties to comment on the design and layout of the proposed scheme.

4. SCHEME DESIGN PROPOSALS

- 4.1 A copy of the design for this scheme is at Appendix 1. Key design features of this scheme are:
 - 4.1.1 **Junction Improvements:** The revised measures now proposed at Bury Street West junction with Church Street include:
 - a) Two refuge islands to facilitate safer and shorter informal crossing points for both cyclists and pedestrians. Currently Bury Street West is 30m across at the junction with a 1.25m traffic island. The new layout has a 6.3m crossing width (with drivers asked to give way to cyclists) on the eastbound lane; 3.7m crossing width on the right turn lane and 4.1m across the left turn slip lane. These two lanes will now be separated by a refuge island as opposed to the current road markings.
 - b) Reduced corner radius by building out the existing northern kerbline to tie into the A105 scheme.
 - 4.1.2 **Cycle Track** - The continuation of the cycle track from the A105 major scheme. The cycle track will be set back from the junction to reduce the risk of left/right hook turn collisions. It will connect cyclists to Blakesware Gardens.
 - 4.1.3 **Loading bays** – Revisions to the existing loading/parking bay on Church Street to widen it along its full length to improve loading for local

businesses. This will require setting back part of the existing A105 cycle track on Church Street to accommodate these works. Additional 6m loading bay on Bury Street West (northern side) adjacent to rear access road. This will be carried out under an experimental traffic order so that the impact can be monitored and easily adjusted if necessary.

4.1.4 **Public Realm Improvements** – We intend to plant two trees (subject to public utility constraints) in the area, provide a new bench and add further cycle parking.

4.1.5 **Wayfinding Signage** - Due to the quiet nature of Blakesware Gardens and Little Bury Street, the only intervention on these streets will be installing wayfinding signage for the route.

5. CONSULTATION PROCESS

5.1 Following a TfL Sponsor Review of these proposals, an extended statutory consultation took place from October 18th 2017 to November 12th 2017. A total of 1209 leaflets were hand delivered to residents in the area shown in Appendix 2.

5.2 In line with the requirements of the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996, the various prescribed consultees were notified. In addition, ward councillors, local residents' associations and disability groups were informed about the consultation process and details were published in the Enfield Independent and London Gazette on 2nd August 2017. Public notices were erected on street and the consultation was also promoted in the Council's Cycle Enfield e-newsletter to over 4,000 interested stakeholders. Throughout the process, detailed information on the proposals was published at www.cycleenfield.co.uk/have-your-say

5.3 Paper copies of the consultation document were available and issued to those that made a request. Copies of the consultation document are at Appendix 3 including the original consultation drawings.

6. CONSULTATION RESPONSES

6.1 There were 89 separate submissions to the consultation, although none from any of the Emergency Services or other statutory consultees. The postcode split of the 89 responses is shown in the table below:

Postcode	No. of responses
EN1	28
EN2	15
EN3	1

N9	21*
N13	5
N14	1
N15	1
N21	17

Note: (* 8 of these responses were from one respondent)

6.2 The table below illustrates the key issues raised and provides a response:

Item	Issue Raised	Council Response
1	Objection based on the perception that removing the left turn slip lane will cause long traffic queues and lead to more pollution.	Following consultation feedback LB Enfield have amended the junction re-design so that the left turn slip lane will remain. However, we plan to build out the kerb to slow vehicle speeds turning left onto Church Street
2	Objection based on the perception that emergency vehicles and HGVs will not be able to negotiate the junction.	Swept path analysis of the original design showed that emergency vehicles and HGVs could negotiate the junction. London Cycling Design Standards (Section 5.1.4 Corner Radii) states that <i>"it is important not to design geometry solely based on occasional use by large vehicles such as refuse trucks or removal trucks. Provided drivers can make the turn within the overall road space available, it is rarely necessary to design so that they can do so while remaining entirely in a single nearside lane"</i> .
3	Objection based on the perception that the design will affect deliveries to local businesses	We are not planning on removing any loading/parking bays or implementing any waiting and loading restrictions. We plan to widen the existing parking/loading bay on Church Street along its full length to create a 17m long 2.4-2.5m wide loading bay. We also plan to install a 6m loading bay (under an experimental traffic order allowing any objections to be raised over a 6 month period) on Bury Street West just east of the access road. The proposal therefore improves the loading provision in the area.

4	Objection based on the perception that drivers will rat run along Little Bury Street and Blakesware Gardens as a result of the extra congestion caused by removing the left turn slip lane.	Amendments to the original design now retain the slip road which should address this issue. We have carried out a traffic survey on Blakesware Gardens so we have baseline traffic data for this road. Should we receive complaints of increased traffic on Blakesware Gardens after the junction improvements then we will be able to compare post-construction traffic figures and investigate measures to prevent rat running.
5	Objection based on the fact that the consultation drawings didn't contain dimensions to enable residents and businesses to make an informed decision on the proposals given for this junction.	The consultation drawings provided a clear indication of the Council's proposals. The supporting technical drawings were to scale, enabling more detailed consideration for those interested in the detailed design.
6	Objection based on the perception that Little Bury Street is unsuitable for two-way cycling without any cycling infrastructure.	The route utilises a short section of Bury Street between Blakesware Gardens and Salmons Brook and is currently suitable for use by cyclists. However, we will monitor the situation post-construction and introduce additional measures, if necessary.
7	Objection based on the location of the cycle crossing and that it should be located further along Bury Street West away from the junction which will negate the need for kerb buildouts.	We have taken on board consultation feedback and has decided to relocate the crossing points at least 5m away from the junction with Church Street. The northern kerbline will have a small build out to tie into the new kerbline on Church Street by the loading bay. The kerbline alongside the left turn slip lane will also be built out in order to calm traffic speeds as they exit Bury Street West. The original consultation drawing is included in Appendix 3.
8	Objection based on the perception that the changes to the junction layout will have a detrimental effect on the surrounding side roads by increasing traffic on them.	We have taken on board consultation feedback and has revised the design accordingly. We feel the revised design with the left turn slip lane remaining in place will not have any detrimental effect on the surrounding side roads. The original consultation drawing is included in Appendix 3.
9	Objections based on concerns that footway widths need to be a minimum of 2m.	No footway widths will be reduced below 2m

10	Objection based on the perception that Bury Street West would be better served with two central islands for the pedestrian and cycle crossings keeping the three lanes of traffic	LB Enfield has taken on board consultation feedback in particular the Bush Hill Park Residents Association and the proposed design has been amended to include two refuge islands so that the three traffic lanes on Bury Street West are kept.
11	Consideration should be given to providing an informal crossing with a central island on Church Street just south of Bury Street West to reduce the need for pedestrians to cross Bury Street West.	Installing an informal crossing at this location would only be possible if the left turn slip road is removed and the junction geometry is tightened up. However, the central island would then block access to the right turn pocket/right turn lane on Church Street thus having a detrimental effect on traffic flows. So although considered, this approach will not be taken forward.
12	Consideration should be given to altering the timings/phasing of the traffic signals at Ridge Avenue to give Church Street more green time.	Post construction monitoring of this junction is ongoing as part of the A105 project.
13	Consideration should be given to installing a yellow box marking on Church Street at the junction with Bury Street West to stop right turning blocking Church Street.	This potential issue will be monitored following implementation of the scheme. However, a yellow box marking could not be used to deter vehicles turning right from Bury Street West into Church Street.

7. Alternative Options Considered

The following alternative options have been considered:

Option	Comment
Not implementing scheme	This is not recommended as there would be no signed cycle route to safely bring cyclists to and from the A105 Major Scheme. This option would therefore reduce the anticipated benefits resulting from the new infrastructure and the desire to increase cycling in the borough. There would also be no benefit to pedestrians if the scheme were not implemented.

<p>Implementing scheme with the left turn slip lane kept in place.</p>	<p>Following strong objections from the consultation respondents against the removal of the left turn slip lane and analysis of traffic movements at this junction it is recommended that the design be changed to keep the left turn slip lane in place. Although it means a wider crossing point for cyclists and pedestrians, keeping the left turn filter should ensure that drivers don't use other quietway route roads (Blakesware Gardens and Little Bury Street) to make their journeys.</p>
--	---

8. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

8.1 The recommendations have been made to enable the scheme to be implemented so that a number of benefits can be realised, including:

- Ensuring a safe and convenient secondary cycle route connection to the A105 major cycling scheme.
- The changes to the Church Street junction with Bury Street West greatly improves pedestrian and cycle safety by providing informal crossing points across Bury Street West via two refuge islands. We have revised our design proposals (see Section 7 above) based on consultation feedback from local residents and businesses.
- Enabling increased levels of physical activity by providing the infrastructure to encourage more people to make short journeys by bike instead of by car.

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

9.1 Financial Implications

9.1.1 The total estimated cost implementing the scheme is £100,000, which will be fully funded via the 2018/19 Local Implementation Plan allocation provided by Transport for London to help deliver the Mayor's Transport Strategy.

9.1.2 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.

9.1.3 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.

9.2 Legal Implications

- 9.2.1 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.
- 9.2.2 Section 62 of the Highways Act 1980 provides a general power for the Council to improve highways. Section 65 of the same act provides a specific power that enables the Council to extend the cycle tracks.
- 9.2.3 The Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 provides powers to regulate use of the highway, including powers to designate parking and loading bays.
- 9.2.4 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.
- 9.2.5 Any final decision to implement any scheme needs to take account of the considerations set out above and the outcome of the statutory consultation. Any changes to parking restrictions and the introduction of contra-flow 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.

9.3 Property Implications

There are no corporate property implications arising from this report.

10. KEY RISKS

The key risks relating to the scheme are summarised below together, where relevant, with steps taken to mitigate the level of risk:

Risk Category	Comments/Mitigation
Strategic	<p>Risk: Not providing complementary cycle connections to main routes</p> <p>The scheme will support the Council's aims to encourage more people take up cycling as a safe and healthy means of travel.</p>
Operational	<p>Risk: Disruption during construction.</p> <p>Mitigation: Traffic management arrangements will be designed to minimise disruption for local residents. Roadworks will also be co-ordinated to take account of other work in the area.</p>
Financial	<p>Risk: Insufficient funds/cost escalation</p> <p>Mitigation: Funding from TfL has been allocated to the scheme and the estimated implementation cost falls within the available budget. Controls are in place to ensure that order is not placed until price is known and budget confirmed.</p>
Reputational	<p>Risk: Opposition to scheme from some local residents/organisations.</p> <p>Mitigation: Consultation has been undertaken to take into account views of local residents.</p>
Regulatory	<p>Risk: Failure to comply with statutory requirements.</p> <p>Mitigation: The scheme is being delivered by experienced designers, with support from TMO experts.</p>

11. IMPACT ON COUNCIL PRIORITIES

The scheme supports the Council's vision is to make Enfield a better place to live and work, delivering fairness for all, growth and sustainability and strong communities. In particular, the scheme supports the following Council priorities:

Council Priority	Comment
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• People make healthier choices.	Quietway 18 forms part of a network of safe cycle routes that will encourage more residents of all ages to engage in physical activity.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Diverse and attractive town centres and retail areas; and improving transport connectivity and capacity.	The scheme provides an efficient alternative to car use for short trips and so supports the long-term vitality of the town centre, as well as improving transport connectivity.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Neighbourhoods that are clean, safe, well regulated, welcoming, cohesive and resilient.	Quietway 18 also forms part of strategy to reduce the impact of traffic on local neighbourhoods and to provide a coherent and connected cycle network.

12. EQUALITIES IMPACT IMPLICATIONS

12.1 Local authorities have a responsibility to meet the Public Sector Duty of the Equality Act 2010. The Act gives people the right not to be treated less favourably because of any of the protected characteristics. We need to consider the needs of these diverse groups when designing and changing services or budgets So that our decisions it do not unduly or disproportionately affect access by some groups more than others.

12.2 In recommending this proposal we have considered the needs of all highway users including those from the protected characteristic groups. All members of the community have full access to the highways however it is recognised that some protected groups may have practical problems in using the service. We are confident that these proposals will ensure that everyone will continue to benefit from this service.

12.3 The Council are looking to connect Quietway 18 to the A105 cycle route. This will be achieved by installing two refuge islands to facilitate safer and shorter informal crossing points for both pedestrians and cyclists. Currently Bury Street West is 30m across at the junction with a 1.25m

traffic island on the pedestrian desire line. A cycle track will be set back from the junction to reduce the risk of left/right hook turn collisions and will connect cyclists to Blakesware Gardens which leads to the Salmons Brook path

We will undertake monitoring through post-implementation site visits to monitor how pedestrians and cyclists are crossing Bury Street West with the new facilities in place.

Any impact on social economic inequality is likely to be low, as those on low incomes are less likely to own cars, meaning they are more likely to walk or cycle and this proposal promotes active health and provides a safer area for this to occur.

The potential negative impact of any shared pedestrian/cycle areas and footway level cycle tracks could have on those with impaired vision is far outweighed by the benefit of the improved crossing facilities which will allow more residents on foot access to shops, the local library and the 329 bus route. However, this risk has been mitigated by the careful design of both features, including the use of tactile paving, buffers strips and signage.

Therefore, we believe there will be no negative impact on residents or users from the protected characteristic groups in taking this decision.

13. PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

The scheme for Quietway 18 (Section A) will have limited impact on performance when considered in isolation. However, the scheme will contribute to a number of key targets, including those relating to improving the health of adults and children in the Borough, reducing the number of vulnerable road users injured on our roads, and increasing the use of sustainable means of travel.

14. PUBLIC HEALTH IMPLICATIONS

- 14.1 The scheme is part of the Council's plans to improve the Borough's cycling infrastructure, which provides a unique opportunity to improve the health of the Borough's residents and address health inequality.
- 14.2 Compared to those who are least active, sufficient physical activity reduces all-cause mortality and the risk of heart disease, cancer, mental health issues and musculo-skeletal disease by approximately 20 to 40%. These conditions account for 70% of the NHS budget.
- 14.3 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.

- 14.4 Cycling can be a very effective means of integrating physical activity into everyday life. Improving cycling facilities in the Borough also has the potential to significantly increase the disposable income all residents in the Borough. Other benefits to the individual could include greater access to employment, education, shops, recreation, health facilities and the countryside.

Background papers

None

