

Annex 5

Bowes Primary Area Quieter Neighbourhood – Response to Objections

1 Objections raised

Objections have been taken from all communications throughout the consultation periods; from implementation through to 2 May 2021, and between 1 to 21 November 2021. This annex is in addition to the main report and other supporting documents that form part of the report, which should also be considered as they also provide an indirect response to many of the themes raised. Objections raised broadly fell into the groupings below. Some may fall across more than one category but have only been listed once.

- Motor traffic, traffic related impacts, mobility and access
- Physical and mental health and / or safety
- Equalities
- Process and decision making of the project
- Communications and engagement
- Design and infrastructure
- Miscellaneous
- Impacts outside of the scope of the traffic order

They are listed in each category in no specific order.

2 Motor traffic, traffic related impacts, mobility and access		
Ref	Nature of objection	LBE response
2.1	Objection that traffic is being displaced or worsened	<p>Traffic volumes have been monitored in a number of locations in the area. Detailed analysis of the pre and post implementation traffic volumes are included in Appendix 2 of the main report and discussed in paragraphs 32-45 of the main report.</p> <p>Acknowledging the limitations in the data, the unprecedented impacts of the pandemic and that Haringey are exploring further mitigation measures, the impacts associated with traffic volume do not, in isolation, suggest that the trial should not be made permanent.</p>
2.2	<p>Objection that there has been an increase in journey times, including specific objections about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase in fuel bills or higher taxis fares. • Impact on work / working fewer hours • Impact on providing or receiving care, due to the carer having less time after / before travelling • Students and children's education is being affected by increased journey times 	<p>The Council accept that some individual journeys that continue to be taken by private car may be longer than the same journey prior to the trial.</p> <p>It is proposed that a subsequent report is to be produced as soon as possible which explores mitigation measures to improve access for residents with disabilities through potential exemptions and includes consideration of those with caring responsibilities.</p> <p>The School Street on Highworth Road is intended to help increase the number of young people who walk and cycle to school.</p>
2.3	Objection that vehicles are speeding on roads	Vehicle speeds have been assessed as part of the monitoring of the trial. The change in vehicle speeds before and after implementation are not considered to be significant enough to not make the scheme permanent.

2.4	Objection that noise pollution had increased	<p>Noise has been assessed as part of the monitoring of the trial and the assessment is that any negative impacts are not considered to be significant enough to not make the scheme permanent.</p> <p>Further detail can be seen by referring to the 'Noise' section in Table 1 of the main report.</p>
2.5	Objection that there has been an increase in air pollution	<p>Air quality has been assessed as part of the monitoring of the trial and the assessment is that any negative impacts are not considered to be significant enough to not make the scheme permanent.</p> <p>Further detail can be seen by referring to 'Air quality' section in Table 1 of the main report.</p>
2.6	Objection that the scheme has had little/no impact on traffic/pollution	<p>Traffic volumes have been monitored on boundary and several surrounding roads.</p> <p>The impacts associated with traffic volume and air quality do not suggest that the trial should not be made permanent.</p> <p>Further detail can be seen by referring to 'Traffic volumes' in Table 1 of the main report.</p>
2.7	Objection that traffic would become worse after lockdown (from responses received during the COVID-19 lockdowns that occurred while the survey was live)	<p>Traffic volumes have been monitored on boundary and several surrounding roads, and the analysis included in the report is based on post implementation surveys collected in September 2021, after restrictions due to Covid-19 had been eased.</p>

2.8	<p>Objection that there has been an increase in congestion as a result of the QN is negatively affecting public transport</p>	<p>Bus journey times in the area have been analysed and details of this is included in Appendix 2, and discussed in paragraphs 52-61 of the main report.</p> <p>The impacts on bus journey times identified, when considered in isolation, are not considered to be significant enough to not make the scheme permanent. The Council will continue to work with TfL to identify ways in which bus journey times can be improved across the Borough.</p>
2.9	<p>Objection that there has been an increase in congestion as a result of the QN is negatively affecting active travel</p>	<p>Pedestrian and cycling volumes have been monitored in the area. Details are included in Appendix 2 and discussed in paragraphs 62-65 for pedestrians, and 66-76 for cycling.</p> <p>Whilst the pedestrian data is limited to particular locations, the overall increase in pedestrian activity observed appears to be a positive trend. One of the aims of projects such as this is to create a network of streets that when connected together will enable the development of safe routes for walking and cycling on quiet streets. Where space allows, and as part of the development of a wider network, this approach can be complemented by segregated cycling facilities on primary roads. It should be acknowledged that changing travel behaviours is part of a longer-term programme that the Council is pursuing. The data suggests that the project has enabled the start of increase in active travel levels which can continue to be built upon.</p>

2.10	<p>Objection that there has been an impact on work/local businesses or deliveries</p>	<p>All properties, including businesses within the QN remain accessible by private motor vehicle, whilst the route taken to access a property or business may be different than before the trial was implemented.</p> <p>As part of the implementation of the project, the Council have invested in technological solutions to ensure that updates are effectively made to commercially available navigation solutions such as google, TomTom and Bing.</p>
2.11	<p>Objection that tradespeople and taxis struggle to access properties</p>	<p>All properties within the QN remain accessible by private motor vehicle, whilst the route taken to access a property may be different than before the trial was implemented.</p> <p>Council met with the Secretary of the National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers (RMT) to discuss the Quieter Neighbourhood project. At this meeting, it was explained to project team members that there was a perception among some taxi drivers that some roads were closed and unable to be accessed. The project team members clarified that the roads remain open, and every address remains accessible by private motor vehicle.</p>
2.12	<p>Objection that delivery vehicles have been hampered as a result of the QN</p>	<p>It was anticipated that there would be a period of time for drivers to adjust to the changes.</p> <p>For those who continue to visit the area by motor vehicle, all properties within the QN remain accessible by private motor vehicle, whilst the route taken to access a property may be different than before the trial was implemented.</p> <p>As part of the implementation of the project, the Council have invested in technological solutions to ensure that updates are effectively made to commercially available navigation solutions such as google, TomTom and Bing.</p>

2.13	Objection based on friends/family finding it harder to visit.	<p>Whilst the project does not impact journeys by public transport and/or walking/cycling, it was anticipated that there would be a period of time for residents and their visitors who travel by private car to adjust to the changes.</p> <p>For those who continue to visit the area by motor vehicle, all properties within the QN remain accessible by private motor vehicle, whilst the route taken to access a property may be different than before the trial was implemented.</p> <p>As part of the implementation of the project, the Council have invested in technological solutions to ensure that updates are effectively made to commercially available navigation solutions such as google, TomTom and Bing.</p>
2.14	Objection that it is harder to access healthcare, or for careers to gain access to patients, childcare/school	<p>It is proposed that a subsequent report is to be produced as soon as possible which explores mitigation measures to improve access for residents with disabilities through potential exemptions and includes consideration of those with caring responsibilities.</p> <p>The School Street on Highworth Road is intended to help increase the number of young people who walk and cycle to school.</p>
2.15	Objection that it is harder to access Bounds Green Industrial Estate	<p>Bounds Green Industrial Estate remains accessible by private motor vehicle, whilst the route taken to access the estate may be different than before the trial was implemented.</p>
2.16	Objection that there has been a reduction in mobility, including for disabled, general population and older people	<p>It is proposed that a subsequent report is to be produced as soon as possible which explores mitigation measures to improve access for residents with disabilities through potential exemptions and includes consideration of those with caring responsibilities.</p>

2.17	Objection that there has been an obstruction to emergency services	Communication has taken place prior and post implementation of the project. Any impact on the emergency services has been carefully considered and is set out in para 77 – 83 of the main report. None of the emergency services have objected to the traffic orders being made permanent.
2.18	Objection that emergency services do not have access to all filters	The MPS and LAS have each made their own operational decision not to carry keys to the removable bollards that have been implemented as part of the project. The LFB carry the appropriate keys for the locks installed on the bollards. None of the emergency services have objected to the traffic orders being made permanent.
2.19	Objection that non-residential traffic cutting through the area had increased/not been stopped by the LTN	The design of the QN limits the ability for non-residential traffic cutting through the area. The design of the QN at present continues to enable through trips on some roads. These roads are controlled by Haringey Council. Haringey Council is investigating implementing an LTN in the area. If they proceed, it is anticipated the volumes on these roads would significantly reduce.
2.20	Objection that the narrowing of streets for bike lanes has caused congestion	There are no cycle lanes deployed in this scheme. By significantly reducing motor vehicle volume, the roads within the QN area become suitable for cycling without dedicated cycling lanes, effectively creating a network of safe cycling streets.
2.21	Objection that emergency services delays because the bollard key does not work	The Council work closely with the London Fire Brigade and have received no reports of any delays as a result of this. The bollards have remained under review throughout the trial and improvements made to the locking mechanism to reduce the number of incidents from the public who have at times interfered with the locks.

2.22	Objection that the number of journeys being made by car have increased due to the inability to car share as a result of the QN	<p>Detailed analysis of the pre and post implementation traffic volumes are included in Appendix 2 of the main report and discussed in paragraphs 30-42 of the main report.</p> <p>Acknowledging the limitations in the data, the unprecedented impacts of the pandemic and that Haringey are exploring further mitigation measures, the impacts associated with traffic volume do not, in isolation, suggest that the trial should not be made permanent.</p>
------	--	--

3 Physical and mental health and / or safety

Ref	Nature of objection	LBE response
3.1	Objection regarding damaging their own or other's physical health, such as by aggravating breathing conditions due to a perceived increase in pollution	<p>Air quality has been assessed in the area. The air quality modelling report concluded that the scale of the changes in concentrations of nitrogen dioxide area associated with negligible impacts at all locations reviewed, with the exception of one at the junction of Truro Road and the A105 High Road in Haringey and one location at the intersection of the A105 Green Lanes and the A406 North Circular Road with a moderate adverse impact. The predicted changes in PM10 and PM2.5 concentrations are associated with negligible impacts at all locations in the study area.</p> <p>The air quality modelling report was informed by data collected in November 2020. Reasonable assumptions were made in adjusting the data for the air quality assessment, including for impacts of Covid-19 on the traffic data. Sensitivity testing, which tested the boundaries of the Covid-19 assumptions, predicted negligible impacts for all PM10 and PM2.5 concentrations, and for all nitrogen dioxide concentrations with the exception of one location on the A105 Green Lanes near its junction with the A406 North Circular Road, where a moderate adverse impact is predicted, and one location on York Road, where a slight beneficial impact is predicted.</p> <p>Data from the automatic monitoring station at Bowes Primary shows that the nitrogen dioxide concentrations have been below the annual mean objective.</p> <p>The project is set within the context of a wider programme of work and takes a long-term view of improving air quality. The assessment does not indicate that the project is having a broad negative impact on air quality.</p>

3.2	Objection regarding damaging their own or other's mental health, including feeling 'trapped' or isolated	Whilst it is acknowledged that some people may feel this way, the project aims to increase the sense of community within the area and to encourage more interaction between neighbours in an environment that is not dominated by motor traffic.
3.3	Objection based on feeling unsafe due to traffic	Road collisions before and after implementation have been reviewed and is discussed in paragraphs 102-107 of the main report. Whilst a trend cannot be established based on just 10 months of data, the current information does not suggest the Bowes Primary Area QN has had a significant impact on personal injury collisions.
3.4	Objection based on feeling unsafe due to crime, or that crime has increased, including that women feel unsafe walking in the QN, elderly and vulnerable people along with feeling unsafe due to moped/scooter/motorbike related crime.	The Council acknowledges that some people have reported feeling less safe in the area due to crime. Crime data has been reviewed to see if there are any underlying trends in the data which may indicate negative changes in the crime landscape. Public mappable Police data has been reviewed before and after implementation. The data is included in Appendix 3 and discussed in paragraphs 82-83. There has been a 2% decline overall in offence numbers since implementation of the QN. Offences across the Bowes and Southgate Green wards, which the QN falls within, have increased by an average of 7% within the same time period. An increase in more walking and cycling can create more 'natural surveillance' out on the streets.
3.5	Objection based on the perception that the QN poses a potential risk to life.	Based on the available information set out in Table 1 of the main report, the Council does not consider the QN poses a higher risk to life than before the QN was implemented.
3.6	Objection based on the view that the health of children at Bowes Primary School has been negatively affected.	The air quality monitoring station at Bowes Primary School does not indicate that the QN has resulted in a negative impact at this location. The proposed School Street will further improve conditions.

3.7	Objection based on a perception that cycling is not a suitable alternative to car journeys for children as they cannot cycle longer distances and/or over tougher terrain	The QN encourages mode shift by making active travel more attractive within the QN area. It is acknowledged not all trips are able to be made by modes other than private car, however many are. The 2016 TfL's Analysis of Cycling Potential confirmed that Enfield is within the top five London boroughs in terms of cycling potential. The analysis suggested that an additional 315,000 trips could be cycled daily – with over 250,000 trips made currently by private vehicles.
3.8	Objection that cycle lanes are dangerous.	There are no cycle lanes deployed in this scheme. By significantly reducing motor vehicle volume, the roads within the QN area become suitable for cycling without dedicated cycling lanes, effectively creating a network of safe cycling streets.
3.9	Objection that the junctions to enter / exit the area are unsafe, eg the Warwick Road / A406 junction	A Road Safety Audit was completed for the scheme which included a review of this junction and did not identify any areas of concern. The collision history does not indicate significant safety concerns at these junctions.
3.10	Objection that drivers ignore the restrictions leading to safety concerns	Enforcement is in place for camera operated filters. Traffic remains on all roads as no road has been closed to traffic so the risk of vehicles on the road cannot be eliminated. Efforts have been made to restrict the width of filters so drivers do not circumvent the physical filters.

4 Equalities		
Ref	Nature of objection	LBE response
4.1	Objection based on the quality of the equalities impact assessment.	The equality impact assessment is attached as an appendix to the report. It has been updated from a number of sources including census data, ward profiles, TfL research, academic research, focus groups, questionnaires and email feedback.
4.2	Objection based on the Equalities Duty not fully considered	The decision report contains the equality impact assessment for consideration by the decision maker when they make the decision.
4.3	Objection based on the view that the scheme breaches the Equality Act 2010 and that the Council has not met legal requirements.	The equality impact assessment does not consider that there has been a breach of the equality act. The Council will in making its decision comply with all legal duties.
4.4	Objection based on the view that the QN has negatively affected BAME groups	The decision report contains the equality impact assessment where the impact on Race is considered.
4.5	Objection based on the view that women are affected more negatively by the QN as they are perceived to be more likely to act as caregivers	In responses to consultation, females viewed the scheme slightly more negatively. The responses and comments of carers have been considered and are captured in the equalities section of the report.
4.6	Objection based on a perception from members of the BAME community that they are being placed at a greater risk of COVID-19 by being encouraged to use public transport by the QN	Medical evidence suggests that Covid affects people from certain BAME communities. Concern about using public transport was expressed in the survey responses. The project encourages more sustainable transport choices as part of a green recovery from the pandemic. However it is recognised that individuals will make personal choices about how they travel which may be influenced by Covid precautions that may be personal to their circumstances.
4.7	Objections based on the view that the streets in the QN are not fit for the disabled	Roads across the Borough are reviewed for their condition and upgrade works prioritised based. Site visits have taken place to gain a greater perspective on the condition of the footways and some areas for improvements identified. The Council does not consider this a reason to not make the trial permanent.

5 Process and decision making of the project		
Ref	Nature of objection	LBE response
5.1	Objection based on the view that the scheme is unfair on residents	The Council does not hold the view that the scheme is unfair on residents and considers that the benefits outweigh any disbenefits / disadvantages.
5.2	Objection based on the view that traffic in the area wasn't a problem	<p>Enfield Council has heard concerns from residents in the Bowes area for many years about the impact of motor traffic passing through the area. In November 2018 a number of Bowes area residents petitioned the local MP¹. He took this petition to parliament. In his speech he talked about speeding, road danger and high levels of air pollution affecting children at Bowes Primary School.</p> <p>In October and November 2019 a perception survey was conducted with residents in the area to gather perceptions on traffic speeds and volumes in response to ongoing traffic concerns raised by residents and Councillors.</p> <p>The project objectives are not solely focussed on reducing traffic in the area. Improving provision for modes of active travel strongly aligns with national, regional and local guidance as set out in paragraphs 18 -28.</p>
5.3	Objections based on the view that the project has created a social or community divide, or a class divide	There is no evidence at this time of the scheme creating a social or class divide. In fact, transport ² and sociological ³ research has shown that high levels of motor traffic on residential streets are associated with poor health and weakened social cohesion among residents.

¹ <http://betterstreets.co.uk/bowes-ward-petitions-for-a-low-traffic-neighbourhood/>

² Hart, J., & Parkhurst, G. (2011). Driven to excess: Impacts of motor vehicles on the quality of life of residents of three streets in Bristol UK. *World Transport Policy and Practice*, 17(2), 12-30

³ APPLEYARD, D., 1981. *Livable Streets*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

5.4	Objections based on a perceived lack of data provision and/or collection	<p>Traffic data was collection prior to the implementation of the trial, and several times post implementation. Analysis of the most recent data collection in September 2021, and comparisons to the pre implementation data is presented in Appendix 2, and discussed in 30-73.</p> <p>Other monitoring data, such as air quality and crime, is presented in the main report.</p>
5.5	Objections based on a lack of evidence being used to support decisions or impacts of the QN - some refer to this as a lack of 'KPIs'	<p>The project published a monitoring plan which set out the areas of focus for the monitoring and assessment of the trial. A webinar was also held to help explain each of these areas to the community, with a view to increasing the understanding of how the project would be assessed. Each of those areas of focus have been reported against in this project report so that the decision maker can consider each of these pre-defined aspects when considering a decision.</p>
5.6	Objections based on a perception that there was a lack of project objectives	<p>The project published a project rationale document to help explain the rationale for the project, this included a set of project objectives which were also reinforced in the project monitoring plan. These objectives and how the trial has met them has been discussed in the main body of the report.</p>
5.7	Objections based on misuse of funds/a waste of money / exploited the pandemic as a reason to implement	<p>This project was implemented using funds from the Department for Transport specifically for schemes to help increase levels of active travel. The funding could not have been used for any other purpose and had Enfield Council not used it for this type of project is would likely have been allocated to a different local authority for the same purpose. Letters provided as an appendix to this report set out the use of the funds within the context of the ongoing pandemic.</p>
5.8	Objection based on the perception that the disbenefits of the QN outweigh the benefits – a view that there is a lack of beneficial outcomes	<p>The Council have considered the impacts of the project and are of the view that the benefits the scheme brings outweighs</p>

		any dis-benefits, the rationale for this is set out in the project report.
5.9	Objection based on the perception that the QN is a revenue-generating scheme	The use of ANPR cameras in this project have been at the request of the emergency services to enable their continued access to the area. Enforcement revenue is only generated where motorists fail to comply with the traffic signs that are in place. Accounts from enforcement activity must be kept and any surplus can only be used for prescribed purposes, including supporting public transport and other highway and transport improvements. In previous years surpluses have been used to pay towards the contribution the Council has to make to pay for concessionary travel for qualifying older and disabled residents.
	Objection based on the perception that the QN is undemocratic	The decision to make the trial permanent or not lies with elected members. Consultation has been undertaken to seek feedback on the trial. Outcomes of the consultation and Council's responses are presented in the report.
5.10	Objections based on a perception that levels of air pollution will be reduced by a transition to electric vehicles and / or ULEZ and that, therefore, there is no need to reduce the number of vehicles on the roads	<p>Transition to electric vehicles, and / or ULEZ, is expected to reduce emissions. It is however not expected that on its own would result in meeting the project objectives of the Bowes Primary Area QN.</p> <p>Electric vehicles are an important part of Enfield's plan to be a carbon neutral borough by 2040, and efforts are being made in accordance with the Enfield Climate Action Plan 2020 to increase electric vehicle charging provision. They however are not a solution on their own.</p> <p>As much as 50% of particle pollution comes from brake wear, tyre wear and road surface wear⁴. These particles contribute to what is known as 'non-exhaust emissions' particulate</p>

⁴ https://uk-air.defra.gov.uk/assets/documents/reports/cat09/1907101151_20190709_Non_Exhaust_Emissions_typeset_Final.pdf

		<p>matter. Non-exhaust emissions increase with vehicle mass and electric vehicles tend to be heavier than their petrol/diesel counterparts due to the battery mass. An effective way to reduce these emissions is to reduce traffic volumes.</p> <p>Further, other problems associated with motor vehicle use, for example collisions, congestion and parking availability, will not be solved by a transition to electric vehicles.</p>
5.11	Objection based on a perception that the number of cars is greater than the number of pedestrians and cyclists on most roads and therefore should be prioritise	The Bowes QN is delivered in the context of local, regional and national policies and strategies that seek to respond to the climate emergency, reduce traffic congestion and increase levels of physical activity, and post-pandemic response to enable a green recovery. Improving on the current ratio of cars to pedestrians and cyclists, ie 'mode share' is key to these policies. An example of this is the Mayor's Transport Strategy which aims for 80% of all trips to be made on foot, by bicycle or by public transport by 2041.
5.12	Objection based on the view that the ULEZ will force more traffic onto the A406 which will increase pollution and congestion on this road	Transport for London will continue to monitor the volume of traffic on the A406 and the Enfield Council permanent air quality monitoring station will continue to provide air quality data. As set out in this report, neither excessive congestion or pollution on this road is identified as a reason to not make the trial permanent at this time.
5.13	Objection based on the view that conducting the QN trial during a period of multiple COVID-19 lockdowns does not give a representative reflection of the effect that the QN will have on traffic flow in the future	A decision was made, as presented in the interim report presented to decision makers in June 2021, to continue the trial to enable collection of traffic data following the removal of restrictions due to Covid-19. Further traffic data was collected in September once lockdown was lifted and at a time when TfL are reporting that traffic has returned to 96% of pre-pandemic levels.

5.14	Objection based on a perception that introducing the trial during the COVID-19 pandemic was poor timing	The Department for Transport released funding under the Emergency Active Travel Fund for authorities to create an environment that is safe for both walking and cycling. This was to enable people to get around whilst maintaining social distance and helping to avoid overcrowding on public transport. It was also an opportunity to embed walking and cycling as part of new long-term commuting habits and reap the associated health, air quality and congestion benefits.
5.15	Objection based on a perception that results from the perceptions survey should not have been used to justify the QN	The perception survey helped inform the Council of how residents perceived various issues in the area and identified that traffic volume and speed was considered a problem in the area.
5.16	Objection on concerns over how the success of the QN will be measured	The Council responded to these concerns by publishing two documents to provide information on this; the Project Rationale sets out the rationale for the project and its objectives, and the Monitoring and Evaluation Plan sets out the various area of monitoring to consider the outcomes of the trial. The report provides an assessment against each of those monitoring areas of focus.
5.17	Objection on the grounds that the QN objectives fail due to the impossibility to prove the scheme's success	The main report sets out several areas of measured data to inform the extent of success of the trial. The provision of the data, acknowledging that the pandemic has created some limitations, is considered sufficient to inform a decision. The data is presented alongside other aspects of the report, such as the policy direction and context around climate and public health.
5.18	Objection that QN supporters have been receiving threats	Any concerns around personal threats are a matter for the Police and individuals are encouraged to report issues of threat or abuse, which is clearly unacceptable, irrespective of whether individuals support or do not support this scheme. It is recognised that different people will have different views and this should be respected.

5.19	Objection that others outside the QN area have been unfairly treated and discriminated against	People outside of the QN area have been able to participate in the consultation and people have done so. It is acknowledged that some people who have previously travelled through this area to get to somewhere else may now have to take alternative routes. A key objective of the trial was to reduce this through traffic for the reasons set out in the main report.
5.20	Objection that LTN schemes should be used rarely and only when absolutely necessary; and restricted to a "micro area/road"; and not whole estate/geographical area.	The Council is of the view that area wide schemes can be appropriate to prevent the displacement of motor traffic from one unclassified road in an area to another unclassified road within the same area. Schemes are designed to reassign traffic to the primary network. Where a scheme does create impacts on other unclassified roads then further measures should be consider to mitigate this.

6 Communications and engagement		
Ref	Nature of objection	LBE response
6.1	Objections based on lack of and/or poor communication and consultation	<p>Following the release of funding for active travel in response to the Covid-19 pandemic, communications with the community regarding the project included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A project flyer detailing the project background, a plan of the project, and information on the consultation delivered in July 2020 • A notification letter with details of the construction delivered in August 2020 • Launch of Let's Talk project page in October 2019, hosting information on the project, FAQs, documents, the electronic consultation survey, and project updates posted to the page • A letter inviting residents to participate in the consultation and providing details of how to do so, delivered in September 2020 • A letter inviting residents to join an online public webinar and the subsequent webinar in March 2021 • A letter advising residents of the closing date of the consultation, delivered in April 2021. This letter was delivered to a larger distribution area in response to feedback provided <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Deputy Leader and Healthy Streets Programme Director answered questions from the community at the Bowes Ward Forum on 17 June 2021. • A letter detailing information on plans by the London Borough of Haringey to introduce a Low Traffic Neighbourhood adjacent to the Bowes Primary Area QN, delivered in August 2021 • A letter advising residents of a further period to provide feedback delivered in November 2021 • Social media posts on Enfield Council's Facebook and Twitter pages throughout the consultation period.

		Notice of the making of the ETO was published in the London Gazette and Enfield Independent newspapers on 22 July 2020.
6.2	Objections over lack of transparency	The Council reflected on feedback received and provided more information during the trial, for example the Monitoring Plan was published in March 2021. Information was hosted on the project page on the Let's Talk Enfield site. The link for this was provided in all communications. The report and all associated data collected during the trial has been published online.
6.3	Objections based on the perceptions that the Council only contacted those within the QN / a small group of people	The Council reflected on feedback received at the start of the trial and significantly increased the distribution area for letters during the trial.
6.4	Objections based on views that the trial and consultation was conducted undemocratically	The Council adhered to the process and all that is required when implementing a project using an Experimental Traffic Order, including the conduct of the statutory consultation. In addition to the Council's statutory obligations, the Council provided additional communications as outlined above, extended the period of consultation and responded to many enquiries about the trial. The approach of an ETO is that consultation follows implementation, in able for feedback to be received in light of experience of the trial.
6.5	Objections regarding Councillors	Residents with concerns regarding Councillors were often in direct contact with the Councillor in question who responded to their concerns. There is a process in place to handle complaints against Councillors which can be found on the Council webpage.
6.6	Objections based on the perceptions that residents felt they were being ignored or not listened to by the Council	The statutory consultation was the formal process by which residents could provide their comments on the trial. Further, the Council received and responded to a high volume of correspondence throughout the trial period.
6.7	Objections based on issues with the online survey	There were no significant issues with the operation of the online survey. Any individual issues that were raised were promptly dealt with and comments were collected by email and letter for those who did not have the means or want to complete the online survey.

6.8	Objections based on the perception that the consultation was biased	The Council is committed to delivering Quieter Neighbourhood projects across the borough to enable more people to walk and cycle safely in their local areas. Given the Council's commitment to this initiative and at this stage of implementation, rather than asking residents a closed question of whether they want the Quieter Neighbourhoods project to be made permanent or not, the statutory consultation gathered feedback on how the scheme is working in practice, suggestions for amendments and other information on what is and isn't working. We engage residents, businesses and other stakeholders on issues that they can have influence over, and then work to incorporate their ideas and feedback into future iterations of projects such as the Bowes Primary and Surrounding Streets Quieter Neighbourhood.
6.9	Objections based on the view that lack of technology ability/access excluded some from being consulted	Non-electronic means of participating in the consultation were available including paper copies of the survey or submitting comments by email or letter. Letters delivered to the area provided details of these means.
6.10	Objections based on the views that some respondents reported that they felt unhappy with the reasons provided for a lack of advance notice regarding the project.	The project was implemented following the successful funding bid to the DfT. The requirements of the funding meant that there were short timelines for implementation. The Council gave residents as much notice as possible ahead of the trial being implemented.
6.11	Objections based on views of insufficient consultation of disabled people	In addition to the communications detailed above, further engagement with disabled people and carers took place in March 2021 following an early review of consultation responses provided by this group. The consultation findings report outlines the views of people with disabilities.
6.12	Objection on the grounds of having to sign up to the Council's website to participate in the consultation survey	All consultations run through the Let's Talk Enfield site require sign in or registration. This enables the Council to better understand and communicate with the people who take part in these processes.
6.13	Objection that letters about the QN were hard to read for non-English speakers	This feedback was responded to early on during the consultation. Subsequently, text in Greek, Polish and Turkish was added to all

		letters. The project page can also be translated into languages other than English.
6.14	Objection that maps given to residents were too small	The map of the project was available to download via the project page, and residents were provided with information on how to request alternative formats of the information provided.
6.15	Objection that the tone of all communications was designed to make car-users feel guilty	The project team planned communications to be informative, transparent, clear and respectful. The aims of the project include reducing the number of short journeys by private motor vehicles through the area. This was recognised throughout the project communications, however it was also stated that the Council recognise that there are reasons as to why car use is necessary for some people, for example for use by people with limited mobility.
6.16	Objection that emergency services were not fully consulted (objection raised by resident(s))	Emergency services were consulted prior to the implementation of the trial, and the project team remained in regular communication throughout the trial period.
6.17	Objection that schools have not been consulted (objection raised by resident(s))	A series of conversations have been held with Bowes Primary School with discussions now focused on the potential introduction of a School Street on Highworth Road.
6.18	Objection that the scheme is only supported by a vocal minority	The consultation findings report sets out the feedback received. Anyone is able to respond to the consultation survey. The response rate of the population of the Bowes QN area was approximately 4% of the local population who live within the area of the QN.
6.19	Objection that a petition to remove the trial has been ignored	The purpose of the consultation and experimental phase is to allow people to give their view prior to a decision being made. A petition was received by the Council and was debated in accordance with the governance process of the Council.
6.20	Objection that an impact assessment for businesses wasn't carried out	The consultation period has allowed businesses to provide their responses to the scheme.
6.21	Objection that there was no information available to the public to advise on where the filters were located	The location of filters was detailed in the traffic order. A map of the filters was delivered to residents ahead of the scheme being implemented. This map was also available online on the project page.

7 Design and infrastructure		
Ref	Nature of objection	LBE response
7.1	<p>Objection that public transport or active travel are not suitable alternatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in general • due to disability • due to age • for children as they cannot cycle longer distances and/or over tougher terrain • for families • due to covid-19 • due to family commitments • due to work commitments • due to longer journey times • due to safety 	<p>The QN encourages mode shift by making active travel more attractive within the QN area. It is acknowledged not all trips are able to be made by modes other than private car. The Mayor's Transport Strategy 2018 estimates that 74% of car trips could be made by a more sustainable mode. It is Enfield's portion of these trips being targeted by the QN project.</p>
7.2	<p>Objection that there is not enough infrastructure inside / outside of the QN for safe active travel routes</p>	<p>Over time the Council will continue to deliver projects to support active travel which will continue to develop a borough wide network of safe walking and cycle routes and infrastructure. The Bowes QN connects directly to Cycleway 20 via the recently upgraded walking and cycling across the A406 by Palmerston Road.</p>
7.3	<p>Objection based on the view that the removal of street furniture and landscaping suggests the Council had already decided to make the trial permanent</p>	<p>In the implementation of the trial the Council has used temporary materials, including movable planters, secured with rubber bolt down kerbs. A series of bollards have also been used, which can be readily removed. Some posts and the historic width restriction gate on Warwick Road has also been removed. All of these items can be returned should a decision be reached not to make the ETO permanent.</p>
7.4	<p>Objection that there are not enough amenities to sustain a LTN</p>	<p>It is not only amenities that generate a journey to be made. In addition to shops and other amenities located in places such as a high street, journeys can be made for a number of reasons on foot or cycle within</p>

		<p>walking / cycling distance, by those who are able to. Some examples are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To access other modes of transport, for example a bus stop or train / tube station • To visit friends or family • To access educational facilities, healthcare, recreational facilities, or the journey itself may be for recreation. <p>In addition, the longer-term intention is to connect one QN project to another, creating a 'bridge' where necessary across dividing strategic roads. This approach will enable people to reach amenities in nearby communities.</p>
7.5	Objection that the A406 must be travelled on to access some roads / unwilling or reluctant to use A406	<p>The A406 is an important road in the area and it carries significant volumes of traffic across a 24 hour period. However where the access roads meet the A406 (Ollerton, Highworth Warwick, Natal and Brownlow Roads), they are either signal controlled, or where not signal controlled, the priority junctions are left in left out. The Council does not consider the A406 is an 'inappropriate' road to access the area, however acknowledges that some drivers have expressed a preference for a different access road (eg Bounds Green Road). This option has been discussed in more detail in Table 7 of the main report. On balance, it was considered that the current layout offers the best solution at this time.</p>
7.6	Objection based on a perceived lack of understanding of the different residential 'cells' within the area	<p>The Council recognises that adopting a Low Traffic Neighbourhood approach creates individual 'cells' that may not be able to be readily traversed by a motor vehicle. Preventing these th</p>
7.7	Objection that drivers ignoring Palmerston/Kelvin no-right turn / u-turning around the island / unsafe manoeuvre	<p>The Council installed an enforcement camera during the trial to encourage drivers not to bypass the traffic island on Palmerston Road. The Council has observed drivers making u-turns around the island. Should Haringey proceed with implementing the Bounds Green LTN, it is expected that, by removing through traffic from the area, the 'demand' for this manoeuvre will be minimised.</p>
7.8	Objection that parking issues have been created	<p>The issue of parking in the area has been raised with the Council prior to the implementation of the trial and the QN scheme is not likely</p>

		to have made the parking situation materially worse. The Council has investigated implementing a Controlled Parking Zone in the area in the past but there was insufficient public support at the time. This can be re-looked at in the future if there is sufficient support and funding available.
7.9	Objection on the basis that Haringey have not yet implemented their LTN.	Haringey have now published their intention to implement a LTN in the adjacent area and both Enfield and Haringey are committed to continuing to work together and conduct some joint monitoring.
7.10	Objection to the Brownlow Road bus gate	A bus gate on Brownlow Road is not within the scope of the experimental traffic orders. The report outlines how further data will be required post the implementation of the Haringey LTN to enable a further assessment to be made.
7.11	Objection on the grounds of road layout issues associated with the QN	We do not consider that there are any fundamental road layout issues associated with the QN.
7.12	Objection that signage regarding the QN is not clear enough	The signage at the camera enforced modal filters is fully compliant with relevant guidelines.
7.13	Objection that there is inadequate street lighting in the QN	The lighting levels have been set in accordance with national design standards and have been checked during the trial. The Council will continue to check any further queries that are raised about views of insufficient lighting at specific locations.
7.14	Objection that the Brownlow Road bus gate should have been introduced in Phase 1	The funding allocated, and time for implementation, was such that only the Phase 1 measures implemented were suitable. An initial review of the Bus Gate was included in the second phase of funding that was received and it was concluded that this could not be fully assessed until Haringey have delivered their intended LTN. Further engagement with Transport for London and Haringey Council will be required.
7.15	Objection that there is a lack of electric charging points	In the Council's Climate Action Plan there is a commitment to provide an additional 250 charging sockets for electric vehicles on public highways and public car parks by 2025. This will be a rolling programme with delivery reliant on funding, so the number provided each year will vary.

		<p>The aim is to provide charging points where there is the greatest need. This includes areas covered by the extended Ultra-Low Emission Zone, where there are more people living without off-street parking, and where they support other carbon reduction interventions such as low traffic neighbourhoods.</p> <p>See here for more information: https://new.enfield.gov.uk/services/roads-and-transport/electric-vehicle-charging/</p>
7.16	Objection that the QN was poorly designed and by non-highway specialists	The design that was brought forward was considered the best approach when considering the objectives and the other constraints in the area (i.e. a number of banned movements that are not set by Enfield Council). The original designs were developed by Traffic Engineers within Enfield Council and have since been considered by other design engineers. Other designs have been considered and are set out in the alternative options section of the main report.
7.17	Objection to parking restrictions	Some additional double yellow lines have been introduced at the filters. These are considered necessary to create turning points at these locations.
7.18	Objection that there are not enough roads to get on to the A406	The entry and exit points into the area were considered during the design process and the design allows movements in and out, albeit at fewer points, with the key entry / exit at the northern end of Warwick Road, where signalised infrastructure is in place to facilitate movements in and out of the area.
7.19	Objection that cycle lanes in the area are under-utilised	Cycle lanes in the area, such as those on the A406 are useful but do not yet form part of a coherent network. This is necessary to encourage mode shift. Enfield Council is working to develop a coherent cycle network which is anticipated to increase cycle journeys.
7.20	Objection that the camera-operated road filters are not effective	Camera enforced restrictions may not be as effective in reducing motor traffic as a physical closure, because some drivers will not comply. However, camera enforced filters allow emergency service vehicles to pass through key routes. We work with emergency

		services to understand their needs and may make amendments to designs as a result.
7.21	Objection that pedestrian infrastructure is of low quality/in poor condition	Programme staff have visited the area with a local disabled resident. Some areas for improvement of the footway have been identified and are being assessed.
7.22	Objection to no right-turns, for example the no right turn from Bounds Green Road onto the A406 Eastbound	The banned turns have been in place for a number of years. The no right turn at the A406 / Bounds Green Road junction was investigated. The study concluded no feasible physical changes to the junction could be identified and the right turn is not considered to be viable. The banned turns at either end of Brownlow Road in relation to the QN area are under the jurisdiction of TfL (A406 junction) and Haringey (Bounds Green Road junction).
7.23	Objection that infrastructure on the area is poorly maintained	The Council has a maintenance programme in place. The programme is borough wide and makes an assessment on the condition of current roads and footways and priorities a works schedule accordingly.
7.24	Objection on the grounds that a School Street should have been implemented	The Council is investigating a School Street on Highworth Road as part of a further Borough wide rollout of School Streets.
7.25	Objection that cycle storage in the area is an issue and has no cycle hangars.	The Council has a programme to increase cycle parking provision across the Borough to meet objectives of the Mayor of London's Transport Strategy. The Bowes QN area currently has the highest concentration of cycle hangars and more can be installed to match increasing demand as funding is identified.
7.26	Objection that the scheme should have been designed to provide access to and from the Bounds Green Rd side of the QN area.	The scheme was designed to provide access for most residents west of Brownlow Road to/from the A406. Respondents to the survey were asked about access to / from the area from different directions. The responses show only a slight preference for access to / from the south. Relocating the filters to the A406 to provide access to / from the south is discussed further in Table 7 of the main report.
7.27	Objection that traffic signal timings at specific junctions surrounding the area are poor or 'not right', for example at Brownlow Road / A406	The signals along the North Circular Road operates a system of Urban Traffic Control that enables signal timing to be adjusted to reflect live traffic conditions. However, it is acknowledged that some junctions operate at capacity at certain times and delays can occur.

		Transport for London are responsible for setting the signal timings and seek to balance the competing demands of traffic and pedestrians on all arms.
7.28	Objection that Highworth Rd is not wide enough to be one of the major access roads to the QN area, causing obstructions.	Highworth Road, and other access roads, are in line with many other similar roads across the borough.
7.29	Objection that motorbikes pass through the bollard filters	Bollard spacing is designed to allow pedestrians and cyclists to pass through depending on their location. It is not feasible to physically prevent motorbikes from passing through the bollard filters, without obstructing other users, including those on larger cycles, such as cargo bikes used by families / deliveries.
7.30	Objection that the streets are shady due to overgrown and uncared trees	This objection is not directly related to the QN scheme. However, the Council has a programme in place to maintain trees and plants in the area. In addition, the owner or occupier of a property has a legal responsibility (Highway Act 1980 s154) to ensure that the public highway adjacent to a property is not obstructed by vegetation from their property.
7.31	Objection based on the perception that there has been no consideration of the alternatives.	A number of alternatives have been considered and these are set out in the main body of the report – ‘Options Considered’. A range of alternatives have been considered with further commentary on reasons why these may not have been pursued.
7.32	Objection that the public transport system/infrastructure to support public transport (eg bus network) was insufficient	The area’s Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) ranges from 3 to 6, reflecting the fact that it is well served by several bus routes and is close to both Underground and overground rail services.

8 Miscellaneous		
Ref	Nature of objection	LBE response
8.1	Objection that the QN had impacted house sales/values or made people move from the area	Evidence from Waltham Forest suggests the opposite is true. Savills ⁵ report property within LTN areas rose by 4% more than property outside of the LTN from 2016 to 2020.
8.2	Objection that those who cannot afford to live close enough to their place of work to be able to use active travel or public transport conveniently to commutes are being punished	It is acknowledged that different people will make different transport choices and that this will be influenced by the distance required to travel.
8.3	Objection that vibrations from heavy goods vehicles being redirected as a result of the QN are causing structural damage to houses	There is no evidence of any structural damage. All roads are constructed to the appropriate standards.
8.4	Objection that damage to parked cars has increased since the start of the QN	There is no evidence that damage to parked cars has increased.
8.5	Objection that the QN has had a negative effect on children's education	Council does not consider there is an overall negative effect on children's education as a direct result of the QN.
8.6	Objection that disruptions from accidents are magnified by the QN	Accidents cannot unfortunately be avoided. In the rare event of the A406 being closed to traffic at the Warwick Road junction, the Council will suspend enforcement with the aim to avoid issuing PCNs during the period of the closure. Residents will then be able to use the camera filter point at the southern end of Warwick Road. This situation has not occurred during the trial.
8.7	Objection that the enforcement of measures is not strong enough	Council considers the enforcement of measures to be adequate.
8.8	Objection that cyclists still travel on Brownlow Road and on pavements	There is no restriction on the use of Brownlow Road by cycles. Cycling on footways is still unlawful and a matter for the local police.
8.9	Objection that wildlife is being harmed by a perceived increase in traffic as a result of the QN	There is no evidence of wildlife being adversely affected.

⁵ <https://www.savills.co.uk/blog/article/311069/residential-property/low-traffic-neighbourhoods-see-housing-values-rise.aspx>

8.10	Objection based on the view that assessment has not been made in consideration of the Fox Lane Quieter Neighbourhood and how that project is impacting traffic and bus journey times	The traffic data collected in September 2021 and contained in detail within the report, including the impact on bus journey times, was collected with the Fox Lane Quieter Neighbourhood trial currently in place. This project will be subject to its own report and analysis.
8.11	Objection that those paying 'road tax' over not being able to use all roads in the QN	All roads within the QN are able to be accessed by motor vehicle.
8.12	Objection that increased exercise is not as important as diet in tackling obesity	Increased physical activity has numerous benefits other than tackling obesity. Both are relevant to a healthy lifestyle.
8.13	Objection based on the view that there must be a clear majority buy-in to the project.	The Council has set out in the monitoring plan a range of factors that would be considered when assessing the project. The views of the community are an important factor to consider, but not necessarily a deciding factor. The Council has a responsibility to consider the wider context when reaching a balanced decision.
8.13	Objection based on the uncertainty around TfL finances.	The outcome of financial discussions between TfL and the Government are not yet announced. However, both organisations remain committed to future measures which promote active and sustainable travel, the Bowes QN project has already received funding to enable delivery.

9 Impacts outside the scope of the traffic order		
Ref	Nature of objection	LBE response
9.1	Objection to the Haringey QN	Haringey Council is conducting their own consultations in relation to their schemes.
9.2	Objection that those who want to live in an area with low traffic levels should not live in a busy city	The Council view is that the Borough can improve the living environment, contribute to the climate crisis and improve public health by reducing the volume of car trips and increasing levels of sustainable travel. In a place with a growing population, this will enable the transport network to continue to function.
9.3	Objection that Haringey proposals will increase the difficulty to access some roads in the area.	Haringey Council is conducting their own consultations in relation to their schemes and Enfield residents will have the opportunity to continue to feedback into this process.
9.4	Objection that there is no lift in Palmers Green nor Bowes Park stations	We would support any improvements to accessibility across the public transport network.
9.5	Objection to the no left turn from Bounds Green Road (north) onto Brownlow Road	This junction is under the jurisdiction of Haringey. Haringey Council is aware of some resident's suggestions to remove the no left turn at this junction.
9.6	Objection that the Government only subsidises domestic chargers for people that live in houses with driveways or private parking	This is outside of the scope of the QN and not something that Council controls.
9.7	Objection that there is reduced bus service in the area	There have been no reductions in bus services.
9.8	Objection to the Shrewsbury Road barrier.	There is no filter on Shrewsbury Road under the Traffic Orders.
9.9	Objection that there is/has been a lack of investment/improvement of A406 junctions on the perimeter of the QN	The A406 and its junctions are controlled by Transport for London. Transport for London have recently invested in an upgrade of walking and cycling facilities across the A406 at Palmerston Road.