



Report to the Secretary of State for Transport

By Mr A L Roberts, CB CBE AFC FRAES

An Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport

The Planning Inspectorate

4/11 Eagle Wing

Temple Quay House

2 The Square

Temple Quay

Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372

Date: 17/04/2008

HIGHWAYS ACT 1980

ACQUISITION OF LAND ACT 1981

THE TRANSPORT FOR LONDON (A406 – BOUNDS GREEN ROAD TO GREEN LANES SAFETY AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENTS) (SIDE ROADS) ORDER 2007

AND

THE TRANSPORT FOR LONDON (A406 – BOUNDS GREEN ROAD TO GREEN LANES SAFETY AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENTS) COMPULSORY PURCHASE ORDER 2007

Dates of Inquiry: 11 to 13 March 2008

References: DN5011/55/7/5 & 60/1/6

CONTENTS

	Page No
1. PREAMBLE	1
2. DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS	2
3. THE CASE FOR TRANSPORT FOR LONDON	3
3.1 Need for the Scheme	3
3.2 Earlier Schemes	4
3.3 Aims of the Current Scheme	5
3.4 Description of the Scheme	5
<i>Properties to be Demolished</i>	7
3.5 Traffic	7
<i>Existing Conditions</i>	7
<i>Impact of the Scheme on Flows</i>	8
<i>Impact on Queues and Journey Times</i>	9
3.6 Public Transport	9
<i>Existing Situation</i>	9
<i>Impact of the Scheme</i>	10
3.7 Pedestrians and Cyclists	10
<i>Existing Conditions</i>	10
<i>Impact on Pedestrians and Cyclists</i>	10
3.8 Road Safety	11
<i>Accident Analysis</i>	11
<i>Economic Benefit in Accident Savings</i>	12
3.9 Environmental Impact	12
<i>Noise and Vibration</i>	12
<i>Construction Noise</i>	13
<i>Operation Noise</i>	13
<i>Vibration</i>	14
<i>Air Quality</i>	14
<i>Existing Air Quality</i>	14
<i>Operational Air Quality</i>	14
<i>Construction Air Quality</i>	15
<i>Townscape and Visual Amenity</i>	15
<i>Cultural Heritage</i>	16
<i>Ecology and Nature Conservation</i>	16
<i>Drainage</i>	16
3.10 Planning Considerations	16
<i>Planning Policy</i>	16
<i>Removal of Blight and Area Regeneration</i>	17
3.11 Planning Permission for the Scheme	17
3.12 The CPO	17
<i>Land Use</i>	17
<i>Order Land in the Ownership of TfL</i>	18
<i>Order Land to be Acquired</i>	18
<i>Land to be Acquired Permanently</i>	18
<i>Residential Property</i>	18
<i>Commercial Property</i>	19
<i>Network Rail Land</i>	20
<i>Land at Bowes School</i>	20
<i>Preparation for Acquisition</i>	20
<i>Exchange Land</i>	20
<i>ODPM Circular 06/2004</i>	21

3.13	The Side Roads Order	21
	<i>Vehicular Accesses to Properties</i>	21
	<i>Access to Side Roads</i>	21
3.14	Consultation	23
3.15	Funding and Cost-Benefit	24
3.16	Implementation of the Scheme	24
3.17	Modifications	24
3.18	TfL's Conclusions	25
4.	THE CASE FOR THE SUPPORTERS	26
	The Governors of Bowes Primary School	26
	<i>Coach Bays</i>	26
	<i>Closure of Stanley Road Junction with the A406</i>	26
	<i>Pedestrian crossings</i>	26
	<i>Footbridge</i>	26
5.	THE CASE FOR THE OBJECTORS	27
5.1	Mrs Adamczyk (statutory objection to the CPO)	27
	<i>Right Turn into Wilmer Way</i>	27
	<i>Cycleway and Footway</i>	27
	<i>Visual Amenity</i>	28
	<i>Noise and Air Pollution</i>	28
	<i>Congestion</i>	28
	<i>Demolition of Residential Properties</i>	28
	<i>Community Severance</i>	28
	<i>Blight</i>	29
	<i>Consultation</i>	29
	<i>Independent Assessment of the Scheme</i>	29
	<i>TfL's Response to Mrs Adamczyk's Objection</i>	29
	<i>Right Turn into Wilmer Way</i>	29
	<i>Cycleway and Footway</i>	30
	<i>Visual Amenity</i>	30
	<i>Noise and Air Pollution</i>	30
	<i>Congestion</i>	31
	<i>Heavy Lorries</i>	31
	<i>Community Severance</i>	31
	<i>Blight</i>	32
5.2	Sunstar Estates Limited (statutory objection to the CPO)	32
	<i>TfL's Response to Sunstar's Objection</i>	32
5.3	Mr P A J Brown (non-statutory objection to the CPO)	32
	<i>TfL's Response to Mr Brown's Objection</i>	32
6.	CONCLUSIONS	34
	Criteria	34
	Need for the Scheme	35
	Scope and Timing of the Scheme	36
	Impacts of the Scheme	36
	<i>Properties to be Demolished</i>	36
	<i>Traffic</i>	37
	<i>Public Transport</i>	37
	<i>Pedestrians and Cyclists</i>	37
	<i>Road Safety</i>	38
	<i>Environmental Impact</i>	38
	<i>Noise and Vibration</i>	38
	<i>Air Quality</i>	39
	<i>Townscape and Visual Amenity</i>	39

<i>Cultural Heritage</i>	40
<i>Ecology, Nature Conservation and Drainage</i>	40
<i>Open Space</i>	41
Policy and Planning Considerations	41
<i>Central Government Policy Guidance</i>	41
<i>Regional and Local Plans</i>	41
<i>Planning and Commercial Blight</i>	41
<i>Planning Permission</i>	42
Availability of Funding and Cost-Benefit	42
Matters Raised in the Objections	42
<i>Objections by Mrs Adamczyk</i>	42
<i>Right Turn into Wilmer Way</i>	42
<i>Cycleway and Footway</i>	42
<i>Visual Amenity</i>	43
<i>Noise and Air Pollution</i>	43
<i>Congestion</i>	44
<i>Demolition of Residential Properties</i>	44
<i>Community Severance</i>	44
<i>Blight</i>	44
<i>Consultation</i>	44
<i>Need for Independent Assessment</i>	45
<i>Objection by Sunstar Estates Limited</i>	45
<i>Objection by Mr Brown</i>	45
The Orders	45
<i>The Compulsory Purchase Order</i>	45
<i>The Side Roads Order</i>	46
Overall Conclusions	46
RECOMMENDATIONS	46
Appendices:	
A. List of Appearances	48
B. List of Deposit Documents	49
C. List of Inquiry Documents	51
D. List of Proofs of Evidence	53

CASE DETAILS

- **THE TRANSPORT FOR LONDON (A406 – BOUNDS GREEN ROAD TO GREEN LANES SAFETY AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENTS) (SIDE ROADS) ORDER 2007** was made under sections 14 and 125 of the Highways Act 1980 and is dated 7 September 2007. It would authorise Transport for London to improve lengths of highway, stop up lengths of highway, construct new highways, stop up private means of access to premises and provide new means of access to premises.
- **THE TRANSPORT FOR LONDON (A406 – BOUNDS GREEN ROAD TO GREEN LANES SAFETY AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENTS) COMPULSORY PURCHASE ORDER 2007** was made under sections 239, 240, 246 and 260 of the Highways Act 1980 and incorporates Parts 2 and 3 of Schedule 2 to the Acquisition of Land Act 1981. It is dated 10 September 2007. It would provide powers for Transport for London to purchase land compulsorily for the purposes of:
 - (a) the improvement of the A406 North Circular Road between a point 138 metres south-west of its junction with Station Road/Bounds Green Road and a point 13 metres east of its junction with Connaught Gardens;
 - (b) the construction of highways, the improvement of existing highways and the provision of private means of access in pursuance of the above Side Roads Order;
 - (c) use by Transport for London for the construction and improvement of highways and the provision of new means of access to premises;
 - (d) mitigating the adverse effect which the existence or use of the highway to be improved as mentioned in sub-paragraph (a) above would have on the surroundings thereof; and
 - (e) giving land in exchange for some of the land acquired.
- Transport for London has submitted the Orders to the Secretary of State for Transport for confirmation.

Summary of Recommendation: I recommend that the Orders be confirmed, subject to modification

1. PREAMBLE

- 1.1 On 11-13 March 2008, I held concurrent public local inquiries into the above orders at Trinity-at-Bowes Methodist Church, Palmerston Road, London N22 8RA.
 - 1.2 In addition to an unaccompanied visit before the inquiry opened, I carried out an inspection of part of the site during the inquiry, accompanied by an objector and a representative of Transport for London (TfL).
 - 1.3 The purpose of the Orders is to provide improvements along a 3.2 km length of the A406 North Circular Road, most of which lies within the London Borough of Enfield with only a very small part (near the junction of the A406 with Bounds Green Road [see map at Inquiry Document (ID) 1.13.4] being within Haringey.
-

-
- 1.4 Three objections (two statutory and one non-statutory) to the CPO were outstanding at the start of the inquiries, one of which was subsequently withdrawn. There were no outstanding objections to the SRO. Two objectors appeared at the inquiries.
- 1.5 The main grounds of objection are:
- The widening of the A406 in order to provide for a cycleway and a lane for traffic turning right into Wilmer Way is unnecessary.
 - The consequent loss of trees and verges would result in an unjustified loss of visual amenity and privacy.
 - Noise and pollution would be greater than suggested by TfL.
 - Congestion on the Wilmer Way approach to the A406 would be increased.
 - Without hard shoulders being provided, unnecessary congestion would occur on the A406.
 - Large lorries should not be allowed on the A406.
 - The demolition of residential properties would be inappropriate and unnecessary.
 - Pedestrians crossing the A406 would be more vulnerable and community severance would be increased.
 - Better alternative design schemes have not been fully explored and should be investigated by independent consultants.
- 1.6 TfL confirmed at the inquiries that it had complied with all the required statutory formalities.
- 1.7 This report contains a brief description of the site of the proposals and its surroundings, the gist of the cases presented and my conclusions and recommendations. Lists of inquiry appearances, documents and plans are attached as appendices to this report.

2. DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

- 2.1 A map showing the extent of the scheme can be found at ID 1.13.4.
- 2.2 The site follows the corridor of the North Circular Road (A406) from a point on Pinkham Way, just to the north-east of the railway bridge, and then along Telford Road and Bowes Road to a point near Connaught Gardens about 0.49 km to the east of the junction of the A406 with Green Lanes.
- 2.3 Starting at its south-west end, the A406 is 4-lane (two in each direction) single carriageway as it emerges from under the Pinkham Way railway bridge. It then reduces to three lanes shortly after it leaves the Bounds/Green Road/Station Road junction so that traffic is restricted to only one lane when travelling north-east until about 150 metres before the bridge carrying the Piccadilly Line over the A406. At that point, the lane splits into two at the expense of the south-westbound traffic, which can pass under the bridge only
-

in single file. About 100 metres short of the junction with Wilmer Way, the speed limit is reduced from 40 to 30 mph, at which point the road widens to allow two lanes in each direction. It remains in this configuration until 100 metres or so short of the junction with Green Lanes, after which the A406 becomes a dual 3-lane road.

- 2.4 The four junctions with Bounds Green/Station Road, Wilmer Way, Brownlow Road/Powys Lane and Green Lanes are signal-controlled.
- 2.5 Apart from the strip of open grass backed by woodland (within which Bounds Green Brook runs) on the north-western side of Telford Road and that running for some 4-500 metres along the northern side of Bowes Road immediately to the west of the Green Lanes junction, the A406 is bounded predominantly by residential property. However, there are a number of mixed retail/residential parades together with a few other commercial properties along the Bowes Road section of the A406. Many of the dwellings fronting the A406 appear to be derelict or in very poor condition.
- 2.6 The dwellings and footway on the south-eastern side of Telford Road, and for about 1,400 metres immediately to the east of the Wilmer Way junction on the northern side of Bowes Road, are separated from the carriageway by a wide grass verge, some trees growing on the Bowes Road section.

3. THE CASE FOR TRANSPORT FOR LONDON

The material points are:

3.1 Need for the Scheme

- 3.1.1 The A406 North Circular Road is an important thoroughfare in North London, much of it being dual two-lane or dual three-lane carriageways with grade-separated junctions. The 3.2 km section affected by the scheme, between Bounds Green Road and Green Lanes, serves east-west strategic traffic movements through the London Boroughs of Enfield and Haringey. It also serves local movements within and between the two boroughs, as well as local journeys linking the residential areas to the north and south of the A406 corridor. However, it is mostly single carriageway but carries approximately 60,000 to 65,000 vehicles per day. This localised constraint causes substantial traffic congestion in both the morning and evening peak traffic periods and over much of the rest of the day.
 - 3.1.2 There are numerous side roads joining the A406. Although the junctions at Bounds Green Road, Wilmer Way, Brownlow Road and Green Lanes all operate under signal control, their operation is not linked. All other junctions use only 'Give Way' priority to control traffic. These methods of junction control not only cause congestion, but also contribute to the high incidence of accidents recorded on this length of the A406.
 - 3.1.3 Bus passengers are being delayed because buses are held up in the queues of traffic, resulting in unreliable and unpunctual services.
 - 3.1.4 There are large numbers of pedestrians, including shoppers, schoolchildren and bus passengers living in the area, who need to cross the A406 on foot.
-

Inadequate crossing facilities hinder movements, particularly for children and people with visual and mobility impairments. Traffic congestion also creates difficult conditions for other road users, especially for cyclists.

- 3.1.5 Queuing on the A406 causes some drivers to seek alternative routes through local streets. Origin and destination surveys completed by the London Borough of Enfield in November 2004 indicate that up to approximately 50% of traffic in some residential side roads (in the area bounded by Bowes Road, Telford Road and Bounds Green Road) is "rat running". This adds to the environmental problems of the area.

3.2 Earlier Schemes

- 3.2.1 Several schemes have previously been considered for this section of the A406, namely:
- a. The Highways Agency "Inherited" Scheme. This would have involved the construction of a dual three-lane carriageway commencing at Pinkham Way and terminating at Chequers Way (the junction of the A406 and the A10), reducing to a dual two-lane underpass between Wilmer Way and Green Lane. The scheme also included grade separation, with tunnels and flyovers, at the four major road junctions along this section. However, it would have necessitated the demolition of 312 properties and would have cost about £266 million at 2004 prices. As the government's 2004 Spending Review failed to provide funding, the TfL Board decided not to continue with the scheme.
 - b. The 2002 Scheme. This was a smaller safety and environmental scheme. It comprised a four-lane carriageway with improved at-grade junctions incorporating facilities for pedestrians and cyclists. It was estimated to cost approximately £20 million at 2002 prices and required no demolition of residential properties. However, traffic congestion on the A406 would have increased "rat-running" on adjacent residential roads and the scheme would have precluded the construction of a larger scheme in future if policy and funding permitted. As a result, the 2002 Scheme was not carried forward.
 - c. The Intermediate Scheme. This scheme would have provided limited grade separation at junctions but was not taken beyond the conceptual stage. It would have cost approximately £120 million at 2006 prices.
 - d. The 2005 Scheme. The 2005 Scheme was developed from the 2002 Scheme but included a number of specific changes, including the replacement of footbridges with street-level pedestrian crossings, road closures and banned turns on and off the A406 to improve road safety, and introduction of a new signalised junction with pedestrian crossing at the Warwick Road junction. However, it had a footprint similar to that required for the Intermediate Scheme and, as a result, required the demolition of approximately 80 residential and commercial properties along the corridor. The cost of the 2005 Scheme was estimated at £44.8 million at 2005 prices. This scheme made available considerable space for streetscape improvements.
-

3.3 Aims of the Current Scheme

- 3.3.1 The proposed scheme is essentially a safety and environmental scheme. It corrects the deficiencies of the 2005 Scheme, largely maintaining its safety and environmental characteristics but keeping within a reduced footprint, thereby reducing the number of properties affected and minimising overall costs. It was approved by the TfL Board at its meeting on 23 October 2006 (CD 12).
- 3.3.2 The scheme has the following objectives:
- to promote the safety and security of all road users, through a reduction in the number and severity of accidents;
 - to encourage sustainable modes of travel, through provision of enhanced cycling and walking facilities and the improvement of bus movements;
 - to protect and enhance the local environment and to encourage traffic which might otherwise use minor residential roads to transfer to the A406;
 - to reduce community severance by providing new and improved pedestrian crossing facilities at traffic signal junctions and other key locations; and
 - to maintain overall existing traffic capacity.

3.4 Description of the Scheme

- 3.4.1 The Telford Road section would remain a single carriageway, though with central hatching for much of it, and with the addition of another lane so that the existing three-lane stretch would become four lanes. Turning movements into and out of the residential roads to the south would be rationalized with Tewksbury Terrace, Evesham Road and Pevensy Avenue physically being closed off from the A406. Central islands would restrict turns to left-in and left-out only for Bexhill Road. Right turn movements from Telford Road into Station Road and from Bounds Green Road into Telford Road would be banned. A new cycleway would be provided on the north-western side of Telford Road.
- 3.4.2 The Bowes Road section between the Wilmer Road and Green Lanes junctions would be upgraded to dual two-lane carriageway along the majority of its length, although the carriageways immediately to the east of the Brownlow Road junction would be separated by hatched marking rather than by physical median. This section would be widened to the north and include provision of a cycleway along the entirety of its length and an eastbound bus lane at the approach to Green Lanes.
- 3.4.3 Stanley Road would be physically closed off from the A406; Ollerton Road would become left-in only (with no egress to the A406); and Highworth Road, Natal Road and Palmerston Road would become left-in and left-out only. The existing footbridges at the Primary School and between Pymmes Road and Pymmes Close would be removed, but the former would be replaced by a new footbridge further west, crossing the A406 diagonally to

-
- run between Wilmer Way and Ollerton Road. 15-metres at the end of the Palmerston Crescent cul-de-sac would be stopped to facilitate landscaping.
- 3.4.4 The A406 to the east of the Green Lanes junction would remain dual carriageway, with a cycleway on the northern side and an almost continuous westbound bus lane between Green Lanes and Connaught Gardens. Melville Gardens would become left-out only and thus no longer have access from the A406.
- 3.4.5 The scheme would also include the following features:
- the Bounds Green/Station Road, Wilmer Way and Green Lanes junctions would be provided with full pedestrian facilities;
 - the A406/ Brownlow Road junction would be modified, but would keep within the existing highway boundaries as far as possible so that, except for the north-west corner property, demolition of the corner properties would be avoided;
 - also at this junction, full pedestrian facilities would be provided, including an east/west crossing of Brownlow Road to facilitate pedestrian movements to and from the nearby Primary School;
 - where the existing pedestrian footbridges are removed without replacement, at-grade pedestrian facilities would be provided by toucan crossings;
 - the new cycle track and the pedestrian footway would be segregated from each other as far as is possible.
- 3.4.6 A number of other changes would be made at three of the existing signalled junctions to reduce the likelihood of accidents and to mitigate the effects on traffic flow of introducing the new pedestrian and traffic management facilities.
- 3.4.7 The Wilmer Road Junction. The provision of full pedestrian facilities at the Wilmer Road junction would be mitigated by local widening and the banning of a right turn movement from the A1110 Bowes Road (west) into the A406 Telford Road. The widening of the southbound carriageway of Telford Road from one to two lanes would remove the forced two-to-one lane merge at this point. Consequently, the overall performance of this junction would improve and the queues on each approach would be reduced significantly. The latter effect would give some flexibility of traffic management to TfL network operators in that it would be possible to relocate queues from upstream junctions or hold vehicles from proceeding to the next junction downstream should network conditions dictate.
- 3.4.8 The Brownlow Road/Powys Lane Junction. Except for the six buses per hour using the 184 route (for which the traffic signals would operate on demand), there would be no right turn into Brownlow Road.
- 3.4.9 The Green Lanes Junction. This junction has been redesigned to accommodate a proportion of the reassigned rat-running traffic from the banned left turn at Melville Gardens. It would be altered substantially, with the provision of improved pedestrian facilities, new bus lanes on both A406
-

approaches, the removal of internal stop-lines and the provision of segregated right turn movements from the A406. The impact of these measures on the operational capacity of the junction would be mitigated by local widening on both A406 approaches.

Properties to be Demolished

3.4.10 17 property units (of which 12 are residential) within five building structures would need to be demolished to deliver the scheme [see photographs at ID 1.18.7 but ignore that entitled "Ritz Parade Extension", which is no longer earmarked for demolition].

3.5 Traffic

3.5.1 The Traffic Assessment can be found at DD 19.

Existing Conditions

3.5.2 Given the nature of the A406 corridor and despite the relatively good level of availability of, and accessibility to, public transport, car-borne trips make up the vast majority of trips along the scheme route. However, it is worth noting that, for trips starting in the Enfield area, assessed across the whole day and for all journey purposes – 47% of trips are made by car or motorcycle, 28% are walk trips and 24% are by public transport.

3.5.3 To determine the level and make up of road traffic, a full programme of surveys was undertaken in December 2005, supplemented by further data collection in May/June 2006. These showed that:

- this section of the A406 currently carries approximately 60,000 to 65,000 vehicles per day, of which approximately 9% are heavy commercial goods vehicles, buses and coaches;
- the average two-way volume of traffic along the Order route is of the order of 3,200 vehicles per hour, with the western section of the route (Telford Road) peaking at about 5,000 vehicles per hour;
- traffic congestion occurs for approximately three hours in both the morning (07:00 to 10:00) and evening (16:00 to 19:00) peaks. The resulting queuing is particularly evident at either end of the route (ie, at the junction of the A406 with Bounds Green Road to the west and the junction with Green Lanes to the east); and
- a high proportion of 'rat-running' traffic occurs on the local road network to the west of Brownlow Road. During the AM peak, about 33% of the traffic on Warwick Road is 'rat-running', with 45% on Natal Road, 25% on Highworth Road, 31% on Stanley Road and 31% on Ollerton Road. During the PM peak this increases to 54% on Warwick Road, with 34% on Natal Road, 37% on Highworth Road, 21% on Stanley Road and 26% on Ollerton Road.

3.5.4 The scheme would bring or lead to the following specific benefits:

- less traffic congestion along the Order route, particularly outside Bowes Primary School;

-
- a significant reduction in the number and severity of accidents;
 - an improvement of traffic flow by reducing the amount of right turning traffic and providing a more efficient operation at traffic lights;
 - improvements for pedestrians on all arms of the traffic signal-controlled junctions;
 - a new 2-way cycle route along the A406 (removing cyclists from the main carriageway), providing a link to the existing London Cycle Network's Link 52/84 at the A10 Great Cambridge Roundabout and Link 54/78 (running north-south across the A406 at Green Lanes). It would also provide a link to Link 55/79 (running north-south across the A406 at Brownlow Road);
 - improved crossing facilities for pedestrians and cyclists at Palmerston Road;
 - priority lanes, moving traffic away from the immediate frontages of residential properties along the route and providing a quieter environment for residents;
 - bus priority lanes on the A406 approaches to the A406 Bowes Road/Green Lanes junction, allowing buses to reach the junction ahead of queues in other lanes;
 - a considerable improvement in the streetscene by extensive landscaping and provision of a path beside the brook at Station Road;
 - a substantial reduction in rat-running as a result of traffic management measures and consequent improvement in the local environment of adjacent residential streets; and
 - removal of the historic blight in the area, caused by the consideration of earlier schemes, facilitating the disposal of surplus properties.

Impact of the Scheme on Flows

- 3.5.5 One of the objectives of the scheme is that no overall increase in throughput along the A406 corridor should result from the proposals. Although the A406 would be widened, flows would be controlled by the improved at-grade facilities for pedestrians to cross the road, the signalled crossing being linked. The increase in flows along this section of the A406 would be only that resulting from re-routing away from the minor residential roads facilitated by the Side Road Strategy [see Section 3.13 below].
- 3.5.6 Only two side roads would be expected to experience measurable increases in traffic flow: these are Warwick Road (up to 89 vehicles/hour) and the A105 Green Lanes south (up to 440 vehicles/hour). The B106 Brownlow Road and Highworth Road might experience a marginal increase in traffic but flows would reduce significantly on roads where closures or restricted turning movements would be put in place. These include:
- Tewkesbury Terrace (reduction of up to 107 vehicles/hour)
 - Evesham Road (reduction of up to 17 vehicles/hour)
-

-
- Pevensey Avenue (reduction of up to 21 vehicles/hour)
 - Ollerton Road (reduction of up to 21 vehicles/hour)
 - Stanley Road (reduction of up to 64 vehicles/hour)
 - Natal Road (reduction of up to 72 vehicles/hour)
 - Palmerston Road (reduction of up to 71 vehicles/hour)

3.5.7 The most significant reduction in traffic flow would be at Melville Gardens as a result of the proposed banned left turn access from the A406. Traffic flows here would reduce by 868 vehicles in the AM peak.

Impact on Queues and Journey Times

3.5.8 The modelling results [DD 19] show that the combined effect of scheme proposals would be broadly neutral. Hence, although there might be local changes in queuing patterns, the overall impact would be that journey times along this section of the A406 should not change significantly from the present day. However, by linking the signalled junctions and bringing them under coordinated control, the journey time variability would be reduced. This would be an important benefit, particularly in respect of managing the passage of buses along the A406.

3.5.9 During the off-peak hours, the reduction in speed limit from 40mph to 30mph on the A406 Telford Road might have a marginal adverse effect on journey times. However, this measure is seen as crucial to the tranche of safety measures being proposed for Telford Road and, as such, this slight effect would be outweighed by the benefits of its introduction.

3.6 Public Transport

Existing Situation

3.6.1 Four bus routes serve the A406 between the Wilmer Way junction and the Green Lanes junction and another eight pass close to the A406. The routes are illustrated at ID 1.13.3. Intervals range between 8 and 15 minutes. Bus routes 34, 102, 184 and 232 frequently suffer delays along the A406. In particular, buses are often delayed for over two minutes at the Green Lanes junction and up to three minutes at the Brownlow Road junction.

3.6.2 The area is also well connected to the underground rail network via the Bounds Green and Arnos Grove tube stations, which provide access to the Piccadilly Line, and to the rail network via stations at Palmers Green, Bowes Park and New Southgate.

3.6.3 Levels of accessibility to public transport vary from less than average up to good - typical of Outer London areas. The Mayor's Transport Strategy recognises that there is a general need to enhance access to public transport services and to assist their operation, particularly through on-street measures to assist bus movements.

Impact of the Scheme

- 3.6.4 The scheme would provide a bus lane on the A406 on both approaches to the junction with Green Lanes. Buses would be given priority at this junction through selective vehicle detection; this would enable an approaching bus to register its demand and trigger the relevant signal phase.
- 3.6.5 At the junction of the A406 with Brownlow Road, the right turn into Brownlow Road from the western arm of the A406 would be restricted to buses only and, again, selective vehicle detection would be employed.
- 3.6.6 These specific proposals, together with the introduction of the linked traffic signals control would help to speed the passage of buses along the route and through junctions. They would help not only to reduce the delays currently experienced by bus services but also to make journey times more reliable. For example, bus journey times for Route 102 would reduce by over 3 minutes in the PM peak.

3.7 Pedestrians and Cyclists

Existing Conditions

- 3.7.1 The map at ID 1.13.2 shows the existing crossing facilities for pedestrians and cyclists along, and in the immediate vicinity of, the Order route. The highest pedestrian movements are across the eastern arm of the A406 at the Wilmer Way junction (313 pedestrians in the AM peak) and across the Brownlow Road arm of the A406/Powys Lane junction (237 pedestrians in the PM peak).
- 3.7.2 However, the existing road layout and traffic conditions cause local accessibility problems. The lack of at-grade pedestrian crossing facilities, in particular, contributes to a level of severance that is a concern to the communities in the residential areas to the north and south of the corridor. Although there are currently two over-bridges that allow pedestrians and cyclists to cross in safety, it is clear that suitably located and better controlled at-grade facilities would have the effect of encouraging more movement between the two sides of the A406.
- 3.7.3 As ID 1.13.1 illustrates, the Order route is joined by a number of sections of the London Cycle Network. These including Links 52/84, 54/78 and 55/79. However, it does not provide a high standard of facilities for cyclists at present.

Impact on Pedestrians and Cyclists

- 3.7.4 Facilities for both pedestrians and cyclists would be improved, with the provision of full crossing facilities at each of the major traffic signal-controlled junctions. In addition, a cycle track would be provided along the whole length of the western side of A406 Telford Road and the whole length of the northern side of A406 Bowes Road.
- 3.7.5 The cycle track would be segregated from the footway for the vast majority of its length. The only locations where the two would be combined are those where the physical limits of the road corridor do not afford sufficient space to be able to achieve the separation.
-

- 3.7.6 The location and geometry of the existing footbridges across the A406 is such that use of them is relatively limited. They would be removed. At-grade crossing facilities would be provided at all main junctions and one new footbridge would be provided across Bowes Road.
- 3.7.7 These changes would help to promote both pedestrian and cycle travel along and across the corridor. Those walking and cycling along and across the A406 would be safer in that the notional increase in exposure to risk due to the facilities now being at-grade would be outweighed by the reduction in uncontrolled crossing movements currently made elsewhere by those who do not wish (or are not able) to use the over-bridges. Community severance would be reduced considerably.

3.8 Road Safety

Accident Analysis

- 3.8.1 This section of the A406 has a high incidence of accidents. In the three years to the end of May 2007, approximately twice as many accidents occurred on this section as would have been expected on routes with similar characteristics elsewhere in London (see CD 44A). The main causes of accidents include speeding traffic, conflicting traffic movements at junctions and vehicles turning into and out of side roads.
- 3.8.2 Records of personal injury accidents along the Order route have been obtained from the TfL's London Road Safety Unit (LRSU) for the three years to 31 May 2007. This represents the latest data available (the accident data in the Section 305 of the Transport Assessment [DD19] covers the 3 year period to December 2005). The following table provides a breakdown of the severity of accidents for each link and each junction where accidents have been recorded.

All Accidents by Links and Nodes (3 years to May 2007)

Accident Location (All on A406)	Fatal	Serious	Slight	Total
Wilmer Way to Powys Lane	0	3	14	17
Powys Lane to Palmerston Road	0	0	10	10
Palmerston Road to Green Lanes	0	0	3	3
Green Lanes to Melville Gardens	0	0	5	5
Melville Gardens to Connaught Gardens	0	1	9	10
Bounds Green Road to Wilmer Way	2	1	12	15
A406 junction with Bounds Green Road	0	3	35	38
A406 junction with Wilmer Way	0	0	13	13
A406 junction with Powys Lane	1	1	10	12

A406 junction with Palmerston Road	0	0	9	9
A406 junction with Green Lanes	1	3	33	37
A406 junction with Melville Gardens	0	0	5	5
Total	4	12	158	174

3.8.3 The following table shows the severity of these accidents:

	Fatal	Serious	Slight	Total	Study Route	Norm in London
KSI	4	12	-	16	9%	15%
Slight	0	-	158	158	91%	85%
Total	4	12	158	174	-	-

3.8.4 The fact that 91% of accidents were only slight may be because many accidents occurred at low speed, a reflection of the congested traffic conditions that persist across much of the day on the A406.

Economic Benefit in Accident Savings

3.8.5 The assessed savings in accident savings over a future three-year analysis period, using LRSU and Royal Society for the Prevention of Accidents (RoSPA) guidelines, are that, over a three-year period, 63.5 accidents would be avoided, representing a saving of 36%. Using the current LRSU monetary value of saving of £81,275 per accident, this would equate to a saving of £5.16 million.

3.8.6 The anticipated complementary traffic management measures proposed for the local roads, to be implemented by the Enfield and Haringey Councils, would serve to reinforce these forecast safety benefits.

3.9 Environmental Impact

3.9.1 As required under the terms of Directive 85/337/EEC as amended by Directive 97/11/EEC and article 3 of Directive 2003/35/EC, as given legal effect through national regulations, an Environmental Impact Assessment has been undertaken for the scheme. The Environmental Statement and Non-Technical Summary can be found at DD 18. These were published and put on deposit at the same time as the draft Orders and the other core documents.

Noise and Vibration

3.9.2 A detailed assessment of noise impacts has been undertaken for both the construction and operation stages of the scheme. The operation noise and

vibration assessments have been undertaken in accordance with current standards and guidelines, in particular the Stage 3 requirements of the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB). The full methodology as presented in the DMRB, Volume 11 Section 3, Part 7, Stage 3 Environmental Assessment is presented in full in Volume 1, Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement [DD 18].

- 3.9.3 Predictions of road traffic noise have been carried out using the computer model NoiseMap. This is a 3-dimensional computer model with digitised inputs that include road segments, barriers, buildings and the sites for which the noise level is to be calculated.

Construction Noise

- 3.9.4 Without suitable measures to limit noise during the construction of the scheme, levels at some dwellings are predicted to exceed the normal 75 $\text{dB}_{\text{LAeq},12\text{-hour}}$ target. This is due to their very close proximity to the works. However, control measures would be implemented to reduce noise levels below those predicted.

Operation Noise

- 3.9.5 Traffic noise levels once the scheme was in operation have been calculated in accordance with DMRB and Calculation of Road Traffic Noise ("CRTN") procedures. Four scenarios have been considered: for the Do-Nothing situations (without the scheme) in the opening year (2008) and design year (2023), and for the Do-Something (with the scheme) situations for 2008 and 2023.
- 3.9.6 In the Do-Nothing situation, the minimal traffic growth predicted over the existing road network between 2008 and 2023 would result in noise level changes of less than $1\text{dB}_{\text{LA}10,18\text{-hour}}$ at all residential dwellings considered, with an average change of approximately +0.2 dB(A).
- 3.9.7 Comparing the Do-Nothing and Do-Something scenarios, there would be no changes without the scheme but with the scheme there would be both increases and decreases in noise and noise nuisance. The changes would mainly be due to large changes in traffic flows on side roads and low noise surfacing on the A406.
- 3.9.8 In the Do-Something scenario, predictions indicate that 102 dwellings would experience an increase in traffic noise. However, no dwelling would experience an increase in noise greater than $3\text{dB}_{\text{LA}10,18\text{-hour}}$ (the minimum level generally viewed as being perceptible). Against this, 5084 would experience a decrease.
- 3.9.9 Changes in noise nuisance in the Do-Something situation indicate that the same 102 dwellings would experience an increase in noise nuisance, and 5030 would experience a decrease.
- 3.9.10 No dwellings are predicted to be eligible for noise insulation under the mandatory powers of the Noise Insulation Regulations (NIR) 1975 (as amended 1988). However, under NIR discretionary powers three dwellings are predicted to be eligible for offers of noise insulation. A full NIR noise
-

assessment would be undertaken prior to the road being opened, using the final scheme design and traffic flow information.

Vibration

- 3.9.11 An assessment of vibration impacts, following guidance given within DMRB Volume 11, Section 3, Part 7, shows that 51 dwellings within 41 metres of the A406 would be likely to experience an increase in road traffic induced vibration. However, some 665 dwellings would experience a decrease. The reduction would be due to the use of a low noise road surface. Those dwellings that would experience an increase in vibration are in areas where widening of the A406 would cause the carriageway to move closer to them.

Air Quality

- 3.9.12 As a result of the scheme being within two Air Quality Management Areas ("AQMAS"), a detailed air quality assessment has been undertaken to assess the impact of the scheme both during the construction and when in operation.
- 3.9.13 Air quality has been assessed for a Base Year (2006) and for the Opening Year (2008) with and without the scheme. It has also been also been assessed for 2010, when the European Union (EU) Limit Values for nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) come into force. The air quality study area can be seen at Figures 6.1a and 6.1b, Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement [ID 18]

Existing Air Quality

- 3.9.14 The scheme is located in the London Boroughs of Haringey and Enfield, both of which have declared AQMAS for their entire boroughs for both nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) and particulates with a diameter of less than 10 µm (PM₁₀).
- 3.9.15 Monitoring indicates that current levels of NO₂ are above the annual average UK Air Quality Standards ("AQS") objective (40µg/m³) at 14 of the locations monitored. The highest average concentration of 106.1µg/m³ was recorded at the junction of Greens Lane and the A406.

Operational Air Quality

- 3.9.16 The concentration of benzene, 1,3-butadiene, carbon monoxide (CO), NO₂, and PM₁₀ have been calculated at 18 identified local sensitive receptors, selected along roads likely to be affected by the scheme and include worst case locations (e.g. junctions).
- 3.9.17 Concentrations of CO, benzene and 1,3 butadiene are predicted to be below UK AQS Objective/EU Limit Values in the Base Year (2006), Opening Year (2008) and 2010, both with and without the Scheme.
- 3.9.18 Colour contour plots for NO₂ and PM₁₀ can be seen at Figures 6.3 to 6.22
- 3.9.19 Compared with the AQS objectives, which are policy targets set by the UK Government and devolved administrations, and the EU Limit Values (which are legally binding), PM₁₀ levels would exceed the 24 hour mean EU Limit Value at one sensitive receptor in 2008 - with or without the scheme.
-

However, in 2010, the 24 hour limit would not be exceeded in either scenario.

- 3.9.20 On the other hand, NO₂ modelling predicts exceedances of the AQS Objective/EU Limit Value (hourly and annual average) in both 2008 and 2010 at some points, with or without the scheme. However, the number of receptors exceeding the limits would reduce with the scheme. A contour plot indicating the difference in annual average NO₂ concentrations between With and Without the scheme scenarios in 2010 can be seen at Figure 6.23 in Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement [DD18].
- 3.9.21 The slight increase in CO₂ that would occur with the scheme is a result of the reduced speed limit on Telford Road, which would be justified in the interests of improved road safety.
- 3.9.22 No additional exceedances of any UK AQS Objectives or EU Limit Values are predicted at modelled receptors with the implementation of the scheme.
- 3.9.23 From the wider viewpoint, the generalised assessment indicates that the scheme would produce an overall improvement in PM₁₀ and NO₂ in its opening year (2008), 2010 and 2023. The regional assessment also indicates that there would be small changes in emissions of pollutants, but less than 0.6%.

Construction Air Quality

- 3.9.24 With mitigation, as managed under the contractor's Construction Environmental Management Plan, there are likely to be negligible impacts from construction dust, even on properties within 150 metres of the scheme.

Townscape and Visual Amenity

- 3.9.25 For the purposes of assessing the townscape and visual impact of the scheme, the A406 has been divided into six townscape character areas, as depicted at Figure 10.1a in Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement [DD18]. The scheme would have a slight adverse impact on four of the six (Areas 2A, 2C 2D and 2E) and a moderate adverse effect on two (Areas 1A and 2B).
- 3.9.26 The main impacts of the scheme would result from the widening of the road pavement into the existing highway verge, which would require the loss of existing street trees, grass verges and some garden frontages.
- 3.9.27 The effect on the views would be moderate/slight adverse for 259 residential properties and slight adverse for 11 (none would benefit). On the other hand, there would be improvements in visual amenity for pedestrians and road users due to the consistency in surface materials throughout the scheme.
- 3.9.28 The negative elements can be addressed through appropriate mitigation such as planting, the consistent use of materials throughout the proposed scheme and through compensatory habitat as agreed with the London Borough of Enfield.
-

Cultural Heritage

- 3.9.29 The scheme would affect one listed building – the boundary wall to Bowes Road Primary School (a three-storey late Victorian building fronting the A406 at the junction with Stanley Road). The scheme would involve the part demolition and part alteration of the wall.
- 3.9.30 The officer report accompanying the Listed Building Consent Application is at DD 22. It concludes that the alteration to and construction of a replacement wall would not harm the special architectural and historic interest of this Grade 2 building. Following referral of the application to the Government Office for London, Listed Building Consent was issued by the London Borough of Enfield on 19 December 2007 (DD 23A).
- 3.9.31 Removal of the footbridge outside the school would have a beneficial effect on the setting of the building.
- 3.9.32 No archaeological sites would be affected by the Scheme.

Ecology and Nature Conservation

- 3.9.33 There are no nationally important sites of nature conservation interest on, or near the road corridor, although the existing road crosses a local site of nature conservation interest. No protected species would be affected.
- 3.9.34 During construction, vegetation clearance would be avoided during the bird-breeding season and those trees to be retained would be carefully protected.

Drainage

- 3.9.35 There would be a significant benefit from the introduction of a sustainable urban drainage scheme (SuDS). This would not only deal with surface run-off in a sustainable manner, but would also help to create new ecological habitats, in line with planning policy aspirations in the Mayor's Biodiversity Strategy [DD 38] and in UDP policies.

3.10 Planning Considerations

Planning Policy

- 3.10.1 A full assessment of the scheme against national, regional and local planning policy has confirmed that the scheme complies with the requirements of all relevant Policy Guidance Notes and Planning Policy Statements. It would promote the improvement of environmental quality of life and accessibility for future generations. It would thus represent sustainable development and support the aims of the government's document *Securing the Future*, published in March 2005 [DD31].
- 3.10.2 In particular, the scheme has been considered against Objective 5 and Policy 3C.15 of the London Plan [DD 32] in relation to accessibility and road development proposals and against Policy 4G.8 of the Mayor's Transport Strategy [DD 33]. It would accord with these policies because it would:
- contribute to London's economic regeneration and development;

-
- not increase the net capacity of the corridor;
 - provide a net benefit to London's environment;
 - improve safety for all road users;
 - improve conditions for pedestrians, cyclists, disabled people, public transport and business; and
 - integrate with local strategic land use planning policies.

3.10.3 In resolving to grant planning permission both the Enfield and Haringey Borough Councils confirmed that the scheme complied with relevant policies contained in their Local Development Plans [DDs 42 & 44].

Removal of Blight and Area Regeneration

3.10.4 Uncertainty over the future of the A406 in this area has resulted in planning blight to the area over a number of years. Many properties fronting the A406 are unoccupied and in poor condition, some being derelict.

3.10.5 The London Borough of Enfield is preparing an Area Action Plan for the North Circular Area [draft at ID 1.19]. This will cover not only the proposed improvements to the A406 under the scheme but also the regeneration of the wider corridor through this part of the Borough. This regeneration depends on the future of this section of the A406 being settled.

3.10.6 Confirmation of the Orders and implementation of the scheme would largely remove this blight.

3.11 Planning Permission for the Scheme

3.11.1 Subject to certain conditions, the London Borough of Haringey granted planning permission for the scheme on 24 July 2007.

3.11.2 Following the signing of a Section 106 Agreement with TfL [ID 1.5] (to secure a financial contribution towards air quality monitoring and safeguard land for any future 'Intermediate Scheme') on 11 March 2008, the London Borough of Enfield granted planning permission for the scheme, subject to various conditions, on 12 March 2008.

3.11.3 As the Sustainability Appraisal [DD20] attached to the planning applications confirms, the scheme would support a wide range of sustainable objectives relating to community issues, accessibility, health and safety, water quality and drainage.

3.12 The CPO

Land Use

3.12.1 The use of land fronting the A406 ranges from commercial properties (including mixed-use buildings with retail units at ground floor level and living or office accommodation above) and community facilities (school, dentist) to social amenities and residential properties. Some of the housing stock is in quite poor condition and both TfL and the London Borough of

Enfield have been taking steps recently to improve the level of maintenance to both the houses and grounds.

- 3.12.2 In the hinterland to the north and south of the A406 corridor, but within the area of interest, the predominant land use is private residential, with isolated commercial and other employment uses along the major crossing routes.

Order Land in the Ownership of TfL

- 3.12.3 Excluding the land shown tinted green on Plans 2, 3 and 4 of ID 1.18.1, which is being acquired in exchange for the open space lost ("the Exchange Land"), 2.6948 hectares of land are required for implementation of the scheme. Of this total, TfL already holds the freehold interest in 1.7599 hectares. This calculation includes the forecourt area to No 196 Bowes Road, where legal formalities for the property's acquisition by TfL are currently being concluded. This is a significant land holding, representing 65.31% of the total land requirement.
- 3.12.4 The bulk of this land was inherited from the Secretary of State for Transport in 2000 by TfL, as successor highway authority to the Highways Agency. The Agency had been assembling land over several years for a much larger scheme involving several carriageway and junction upgrades along the North Circular Road to meet contemporary government policy for increasing road capacity to accommodate predicted future traffic growth.
- 3.12.5 Land already in TfL's ownership has been included in the Order for the purpose of acquiring or overriding any third party rights and covenants attaching to that land. It is required in order to comply with the requirements of Section 12(2)(a) of the Acquisition of Land Act 1981 (as amended) with respect to the extended categories of person entitled to be served with notice of the making of the Order.
- 3.12.6 All tenanted residential and commercial property has been demised on terms that allow TfL to gain possession for its operational requirements outside the Order process.

Order Land to be Acquired

- 3.12.7 Some 0.9349 hectares of the 2.6948 hectares required to implement the scheme is in private or local authority ownership, thus representing 34.69% of the total land requirement. However, 0.3791 hectares of this land is needed only for temporary working space during construction and can be returned to claimants upon completion of the scheme. The net amount of land needing permanently to be acquired amounts, therefore, to only 0.5558 hectares.

Land to be Acquired Permanently

Residential Property

- 3.12.8 Residential property to be acquired comprises two owner-occupied properties and five tenanted flats, together with front garden land to two freehold reversionary interests that are held on long lease by TfL.
-

-
- Owner occupied properties at No 9 Powys Court and No 108 Bowes Road (Order plots 36 [part] & 43)
 - Tenanted properties at Nos 6, 7, 10, 11 & 12 Powys Court (Order plot 36 [part])
 - Front garden land to freehold reversionary interests at Nos 230 and 202 Bowes Road, which are held on long lease by TfL and let directly to the occupying tenant in respect of No 230 and to the London Borough of Enfield in respect of No 202 (Order plots 23s & 23ag)

Commercial Property

3.12.9 Small areas of frontage land would be required out of the curtilages of the following seven operational business premises:

- BP Pinkham Way Connect, Pinkham Way, New Southgate N11 2UU forecourt fuel sales and convenience store (Order plots 1, 1a, 2, 2a);
- New Southgate Seat, Pinkham Way, New Southgate N11 3UT – new and used car dealership with forecourt display (Order plot 2b);
- Niki's Ladies and Gents Haircare, 194 Bowes Road, N11 2JH - hairdressing premises (Order plots 28, 28a);
- Vehicle Solutions Ltd, 190 Bowes Road N11 2JH - a dissolved company (Order plots 30, 30a); Dental Surgery, 138 Bowes Road N13 4NP - a dental practice (Order plots 40, 40a);
- The Faltering Fullback, 88 Green Lanes, Palmers Green N13 5UP - destination public house for a niche (sports) market (Order plots 58, 58a);
- Stephens Engineering, 379 North Circular Road, Palmers Green N13 5UU - motor engineering repair workshop for automatic transmissions (Order plots 59, 59a).

3.12.10 Four vacant retail shop units at Nos 140 - 152 Bowes Road N11 2JG, forming part of a three storey building known as Powys Court, would need to be demolished for the scheme (Order plots 36, 35a, 36b).

3.12.11 Agreements with Clear Channel UK Ltd, Titan Outdoor Advertising Ltd, JC Decaux Ltd and Excel Outdoor Media Ltd for the display of advertisement hoardings would need to be terminated (Order plots 36, 58/58a, 59/59a, 60).

Network Rail Property

- 3.12.12 Network Rail land comprising non-operational ground beneath the railway over-bridge supporting the Kings Cross to Cambridge main line (Order plot 50).

Land at Bowes Primary School

- 3.12.13 Order plots 39 and 39a identify land forming part of the school playground required, permanently (Order plot 39) and temporarily (Order plot 39a), to provide a turning head (dependent on the SRO stopping up the northern end of Stanley Road to vehicular traffic). The London Borough of Enfield, in consultation with the school, has agreed to its replacement within the area of stopped up highway. This provision, which is shown on the scheme's General Arrangement Drawing No 3 [ID 1.4], enables the replacement area to be approximately double the 88 square metres of land that would be lost to the school.

Preparation for Acquisition

- 3.12.14 In accordance with ODPM Circular 06/2004, TfL has undertaken informal negotiations with affected parties during the preparation of the Order.
- 3.12.15 TfL would comply with the provisions of sections 150 to 152 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 with respect to statutory blight where a valid Blight Notice complying with Section 149 has been served by a claimant prior to the service of a Notice to Treat under a confirmed Order.

Exchange Land

- 3.12.16 The improvements to the A406 Pinkham Way/Telford Road/Bounds Green Road/Station Road junction would require land that forms part of the public open spaces that abut the north-western end of Bounds Green Road on both sides. To compensate for the loss of this 'Open Space Land', suitable land must be provided in accordance with the requirements in section 19 of the Acquisition of Land Act 1981. TfL has identified suitable 'Exchange Land' for this purpose along the northwest side of Telford Road.
- 3.12.17 The Exchange Land Map at DD 9 shows the open Space Land shaded in purple and the Exchange land (Area A) shaded in yellow.
- 3.12.18 The Secretary of State issued a certificate on 19 December 2007 [DD8] confirming that she is satisfied that the exchange land is not less in area and would be equally advantageous to the public as the existing Open Space Land.
- 3.12.19 On implementation of the CPO, the exchange land would be laid out as public open space by TfL as part of the scheme works [see Plans 2, 3 & 4 at ID 1.18.1]. This would include the provision of a footpath running its entire length. Provision has been made to reserve the necessary rights of pedestrian access over the vehicular access located between CPO Plots 8
-

and 10 and under the railway arches to the London Underground Piccadilly Line between Plots 10 and 13.

- 3.12.20 TfL's intention was that this land would then be transferred to the London Borough of Haringey (because Haringey is the current owner of the open space land). However, because the exchange land lies in the London Borough of Enfield, TfL is also discussing its long-term future with the Enfield Borough Council. It may be that the exchange land would eventually be transferred to, and maintained as open space, by the London Borough of Enfield. Nevertheless, because of Enfield Borough Council's concern about accepting responsibility for its maintenance, it may yet be that the exchange land would have to be transferred back to TfL with TfL maintaining it as open space for public use.

ODPM Circular 06/2004

- 3.12.21 TfL believes that:

- there is a compelling case in the public interest for the CPO;
- the purposes of the CPO sufficiently justify interfering with the human rights of those with an interest in the land affected;
- the public benefit would outweigh private loss;
- all necessary resources would be available to implement the scheme within a reasonable time-scale; and that
- there are no impediments to the implementation of the scheme.

3.13 The Side Roads Order

Vehicular Accesses to Properties

- 3.13.1 In the majority of cases, provision has been made for affected vehicular accesses to the A406 to be maintained in an equivalent position on the realigned highway boundary. Where this has not been possible, alternative access would be provided in a satisfactory location on the property's new highway boundary. Vehicular and pedestrian access to properties would be maintained at all times during the construction works.

Access to Side Roads

- 3.13.2 To achieve the removal of the rat-running traffic and to reduce the risk of traffic accidents associated with side road movements, a 'Side Road Strategy' has been developed which defines the traffic management measures that would be implemented along this section of the A406. This strategy has been developed in discussions with both the Enfield and Haringey Councils. It would be implemented by means of the SRO and a number of Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs).

3.13.3 The following table identifies the proposed measures to achieve the required re-routing:

Location	Change	Effect	Implementation Mechanism
Bounds Green Rd at j/w A406 Telford Rd	Right turn into A406 Telford Rd banned	Traffic reassigned to Brownlow Rd, then straight ahead to Powys Lane	TRO
A406 Telford Rd at j/w Bounds Green Rd	Right turn into Station Rd banned	50% traffic reassigned to Wilmer Way right turn into A1110 Bowes Rd and 50% to A406 Bowes Road straight ahead into A1110 Bowes Rd	TRO
A1110 Bowes Road at j/w Wilmer Way	Right turn into A406 Telford Rd banned	50% traffic reassigned away from network and 50% reassigned to travel straight ahead into A406 Bowes Rd, right into Warwick Rd, right into Bounds Green Rd and left onto A406 Pinkham Way	TRO
Tewkesbury Terrace	Closed at j/w A406 Telford Road. (Currently stopped up by Enfield Council)	All movements reassigned to Bounds Green Rd, except for the right turn out onto A406 Telford Rd which has been reassigned to Warwick Rd	SRO + TRO
Evesham Rd	Closed at j/w A406 Telford Rd	Left out/ right in movements are reassigned to Bounds Green Rd, the displaced left in turn reassigned to Ollerton Rd and the right out movement reassigned to Warwick Rd	SRO + TRO
Bexhill Rd	Right turn in and right turn out at j/w A406 Telford Rd banned	Traffic reassigned to Hastings Rd	SRO + TRO
Pevensey Avenue	Closed at j/w A406 Telford Rd	Left turn in and out movements reassigned to Bexhill Rd, right turn in and out movements to Hastings Rd	SRO + TRO
Ollerton Road	Left out into A406 Bowes Rd banned, left turn in only permitted	Right turns in/out from/to A406 Bowes Rd reassigned to Warwick Rd. Left out into A406 Bowes Rd reassigned to Highworth Rd	SRO + TRO
Stanley Road	Closed at j/w A406 Bowes Rd	Right turns in/out from/to A406 Bowes Rd reassigned to Warwick Rd. Left out reassigned to Highworth Rd and left in reassigned to Ollerton Rd	SRO + TRO
Highworth Road	Left in/left out only permitted at A406 Bowes Rd	Right turns in/out from/to A406 Bowes Rd reassigned to Warwick Rd	SRO + TRO

Location	Change	Effect	Implementation Mechanism
Warwick Road	New signal control at j/w A406 Bowes Rd. All movements permitted	New control required to accommodate reassigned traffic	-
Natal Road	Left in/left out only permitted at j/w A406 Bowes Rd	Right turn out reassigned to Brownlow Rd and right turn in reassigned to Warwick Rd	SRO + TRO
A406 Bowes Road	Right turn into Brownlow Rd banned except for buses	All other traffic currently turning right into Brownlow Rd reassigned to Warwick Rd	TRO
Palmerston Road	Right turn in from A406 Bowes Rd prohibited	Traffic reassigned to turn right into Green Lanes south	SRO + TRO
Melville Gardens	Left turn in from A406 Bowes Rd banned. Left turn out from Melville Gardens retained	Left turn in from A406 Bowes Rd reassigned to: A10 (42.5%) and away from study area; left turn into Green Lanes (42.5%); and A406 Bowes Rd then A406 Telford Rd through to A406 Pinkham Way (15%)	SRO + TRO

- 3.13.4 This strategy is an integral and vital part of the scheme as it would discourage rat-running traffic from using the side roads rather than staying on the A406. It would also result in safety benefits at junctions along the A406 and improve the local environment through reduction in noise levels, improvement in air quality and accident risk reduction on the local roads through the removal of the non-local traffic.
- 3.13.5 Where it is proposed that the access to a side road be closed, provision for a turning head on that road would be made as close as possible to the point of closure.
- 3.13.6 Along the A406 itself, the opportunity would be taken to regularise waiting and loading facilities and points of access (such as forecourts) to bring them in line with current standards and to make sure that all safety aspects would be given due consideration.

3.14 Consultation

- 3.14.1 Consultation with the public has formed an important part of TfL's decision to pursue this safety and environmental improvements scheme. As can be seen from ID 1.9, TfL has maintained comprehensive and regular contact with stakeholders and the general public through a series of meetings, exhibitions and correspondence.
- 3.14.2 In addition to these consultations, TfL is obliged to consult under the regulations for Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). This consultation process took place between June 2005 and November 2006 and supported

the preparation of the Environmental Statement [DD 18], which accompanied the planning application for the scheme.

3.14.3 Those consulted under this exercise were:

- Arriva London
- British Trust for Ornithology
- British Waterways
- Natural England (ex Countryside Agency)
- Enfield Borough Council
- English Heritage
- Natural England (ex English Nature)
- Environment Agency
- Haringey Borough Council
- Health and Safety Executive
- National Trust
- Network Rail
- Thames Water
- The Coal Authority

3.14.4 Full details of this consultation can be found in the Environmental Statement at DD18.

3.15 Funding and Cost-Benefit

3.15.1 The cost of the scheme is estimated to be £44.5m at 2006 prices (inflated to programmed construction dates), including the provision of a replacement footbridge and associated additional land/property acquisition costs. This expenditure has been approved by the TfL Board and is now included in its January 2008 Business Plan. Thus, funding for the scheme is assured.

3.15.2 An Appraisal Summary Table, based on the WebTAG format, can be found at ID 1.21. The quantifiable benefits of the scheme would outweigh its costs by a ratio of 1.7:1 over a period of 30 years. Thus, the project is sensible and would provide benefits that would outweigh the initial cost of the scheme.

3.16 Implementation of the Scheme

3.16.1 TfL is not aware of any impediments to the implementation of the scheme. Given timely confirmation of the Orders, works could start on site in or around June 2009. Construction would be complete in about 18 months.

3.16.2 Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) would be required to implement a number of changes proposed within the 'Side Road Strategy' of the scheme. TfL sees no reason as to why these TROs could not be made within the appropriate timeframe.

3.17 Modifications

3.17.1 To reflect the fact that only a small section of the frontage of the Ritz Parade is now proposed for compulsory acquisition, TfL asks that the CPO be

modified by substitution of three pages (50, 51 and 52) of Table 1 of Schedule 1 by the eight pages at ID 1.10 and by the substitution of CPO Plan 5 of 9 with that at ID 1.11.

3.18 TfL's Conclusions

- 3.18.1 The Orders are necessary to implement a road scheme that would bring about urgently required road safety and local environmental improvements. The CPO has been made to acquire only the land and property necessary to implement the scheme. The SRO has been made in order to improve and stop up existing highways, to construct new highways and to stop up and provide new accesses, all for the purposes of, and to enable the implementation of, the scheme.
- 3.18.2 In resolving to make the CPO, the Board of TfL has taken into account the rights of property owners and occupiers under the European Convention of Human Rights, as incorporated into domestic law by the Human Rights Act 1998. In this respect, TfL has had particular regard to Article 1 of the First Protocol of the Convention which relates to the protection of the rights of everyone to the peaceful enjoyment of possessions and to Article 8 which relates to the protection of private and family life, home and correspondence. TfL is satisfied that any interference with individual rights is necessary, proportionate and justified by the public benefits afforded by the scheme.
- 3.18.3 TfL has been conscious of the need to strike a balance between the rights of the individual and the interests of the public. In the light of the significant benefits arising from the implementation of the scheme, TfL has concluded there is a compelling case in the public interest for the Orders to be confirmed.
- 3.18.4 The fact that there are now no objections from anyone to the SRO suggests that TfL have struck the appropriate balance in its proposals.
- 3.18.5 The five remarkable features of the inquiries have been that:
- a. having been satisfied with the proposals, neither of the highway authorities that would be affected by the scheme have felt it necessary even to attend the inquiries;
 - b. no one is suggesting that the scheme is too minimalist;
 - c. no one who would be permanently dispossessed by the scheme has chosen to appear at the inquiries;
 - d. apart from Mrs Adamczyk, no member of the public has argued that the Orders should not be confirmed or that they should only be confirmed subject to modifications; and
 - e. no one has argued that the scheme fails to comply with any relevant transportation or planning policy – a rare situation.
- 3.18.6 Given the compelling need for the scheme in the public interest, TfL therefore requests that the Orders be confirmed subject only to the modifications to the CPO set out at paragraph 3.17.1 above.
-

4. THE CASE FOR THE SUPPORTERS

The material points are:

The Governors of Bowes Primary School

- 4.1 The Governors of Bowes Primary School strongly support Transport for London's proposals for the A406 for a number of reasons [ID 2].

Coach Bays

- 4.2 Bowes Primary School is a thriving focal point for the local community, with 450 children who make extensive use of coaches but have difficulty in doing so safely. The two coach bays included in the scheme are therefore extremely important for the school. Pupils often have to disembark on the A406 because the coaches cannot turn round at the end of Highworth or Stanley Roads. The school's site manager sometimes has had to hold up traffic on the A406 so that the coach can reverse back onto the road.
- 4.3 The bays would also be very useful for delivery vans, which find it difficult to negotiate and park in the narrow residential roads nearby.

Closure of Stanley Road Junction with the A406

- 4.4 The additional parking space that would be made available with the closure of Stanley Road would also benefit the school as well as helping to ease parking difficulties for local residents.

Pedestrian crossings

- 4.5 The pedestrian crossing facilities included in the scheme are desperately needed. For many years, the governors have been acutely aware of the dangers run by parents and children as they walk to and from school. Particular concerns are the junction of Brownlow Road with the A406, the junction of Telford Road/Bowes Road with Wilmer Way and, of course, the difficulty of crossing Bowes Road itself. Local facilities such as the swimming pool and library near Arnos Grove would be much more accessible to the school once the pedestrian crossings were in place.

Footbridge

- 4.6 The proposed removal of the footbridge overlooking the school is another welcome aspect of the scheme. The footbridge is little used by the school as few pupils live on the north side of the A406. It is inaccessible, as well as being a magnet for the accumulation of rubbish. It dominates the entire north face of the school, overhanging the school's perimeter wall, and detracts from the surroundings of what is a listed building.

5. THE CASE FOR THE OBJECTORS

The material points are:

5.1 Mrs Adamczyk (statutory objection to the CPO)

- 5.1.1 Mrs Adamczyk has lived in No 242 Bowes Road, on the north side of the A406 some 80 metres to the east of its junction with Wilmer Way, since 1973. The nearest four metres of her garden to the road (CPO Plot 23m) would need to be acquired temporarily for the construction of the scheme but would be returned to her following completion.
- 5.1.2 The proposed widening of the A406 at this point would move the northern edge of the carriageway nearer to her house. This and the addition of the cycleway would necessitate the removal of trees and all but one metre of the strip of grass directly in front of her house, the historic value of which has been ignored.
- 5.1.3 Mrs Adamczyk argues that neither the right turn lane for westbound traffic on the A406 onto Wilmer Way nor the cycleway would be necessary. The scheme would have an unnecessarily adverse impact on her environment and its disbenefits would outweigh its benefits.

Right Turn into Wilmer Way

- 5.1.4 The suggestion that failure to provide a lane for traffic turning right into Wilmer Way would result in congestion at the junction is unconvincing. Slow moving accidents would result as frustrated drivers try to get into the correct lane. Much of the evidence submitted is unsupported by other schemes of a similar nature - in particular, the general assumption of no increase in traffic is unproven. If continued congestion at the A406/Wilmer Way junction is to be avoided, such a right turn should be banned

Cycleway and Footway

- 5.1.5 Few cyclists use the A406 at this point and a cycleway is not needed. Notwithstanding the requirements of the London Plan and the Enfield UDP, the destruction of trees and grass verge to accommodate the proposed changes would not represent a reasonable trade-off.
- 5.1.6 With the cycleway being adjacent to the footway, both cyclists and pedestrians (especially children) would inevitably stray onto the other way, causing accidents and being a hazard to Mrs Adamczyk as she emerges from her front gate. The few cyclists who use this length of the A406 would be better served by one lane in the main carriageway being specifically reserved for local traffic and cyclists.
- 5.1.7 If a cycleway has to be provided, a feasibility study should be undertaken to assess whether a full cycleway is needed or whether a narrower one could be provided so that the trees and more of the grass verge could be retained. Even if the full width is needed, at least it could be moved nearer the carriageway on the approach to Wilmer Way, thus saving some trees.
- 5.1.8 To minimise the additional noise, visual impact and loss of privacy resulting from traffic running closer to the houses, bushes should be planted on the
-

remaining grass verge. In the absence of a central reservation between opposing traffic lanes, a buffer in the form of a metal fence should also be provided on the carriageway side of the verge (with or without the bushes).

Visual Amenity

- 5.1.9 The proximity of the A406, increase in concrete and, in particular, the loss of trees would represent a significant loss of in Mrs Adamczyk's visual amenity and privacy. The feasibility of retaining as many trees as possible should be investigated.

Noise and Air Pollution

- 5.1.10 TfL's suggestion that noise levels would not increase are unconvincing. Noise and vibration would be made worse by the removal of trees and vegetation. The use of low noise threshold surfacing material would be negated by the increased traffic levels (especially heavy lorries) and additional lanes. Heavy lorries should be banned from using the A406 as they cause congestion and are intimidating for children, pedestrians and cyclists.
- 5.1.11 Air pollutants, noise levels and vibration should all be reduced to appropriate levels before the scheme is implemented.
- 5.1.12 Residents living adjacent to the scheme would suffer from excessive levels of dust during the construction period and thereafter.

Congestion

- 5.1.13 Even with the planned slip for left-turning traffic, the problem of congestion on the Wilmer Way approach to the A406 has not been sufficiently addressed. Traffic on this road could not adequately be controlled by traffic lights at Alderman's Hill because local traffic would arrive from a variety of directions. The additional traffic on Wilmer Way would result in more congestion on the approach to the A406.
- 5.1.14 The failure to provide a hard shoulder on the A406, which could be used as a parking area in the event of breakdowns, would create both congestion and accidents.

Demolition of Residential Properties

- 5.1.15 The demolition of residential properties would be unnecessary.

Community Severance

- 5.1.16 The scheme would reinforce the boundary not only between town and country but also between the rich and poor.
- 5.1.17 Widening of the road to six lanes at the Brownlow Road junction and the provision of at-grade pedestrian crossings with several stages would make pedestrians more vulnerable and cause community severance. Local residents have to cross the A406 at this point to visit local shops.
-

Blight

- 5.1.18 The unwarranted destruction of visual amenity would lead to further uncertainty and blight on properties. The social and economic cost of the scheme could be far higher than anticipated.

Consultation

- 5.1.19 Consultation with the local residents and the information supplied to those directly affected by the scheme has been inadequate.

Independent Assessment of the Scheme

- 5.1.20 Although the Haringey and Enfield Borough Councils appear to have put a great deal of effort into negotiation with TfL on this project, an independent assessment should be undertaken to eliminate anomalies and provide a better perspective. The overall costs of the scheme have been underestimated. Better alternative schemes have not been fully explored.

TfL's Response to Mrs Adamczyk's Objection

- 5.1.21 A written response to Mrs Adamczyk can be found at ID 1.2.
- 5.1.22 The scheme would not take any part of the properties or front gardens of 202 to 258 Bowes Road permanently. A strip of land at the front of these properties would be required only temporarily for the construction of the footway and cycleway adjacent to the properties.
- 5.1.23 As far as Mrs Adamczyk's front garden is concerned, although her roses and other plants, together with her front wall, would be removed, they would all be replaced. TfL undertakes to consult the residents before replacement takes place.

Right Turn into Wilmer Way

- 5.1.24 13 accidents have occurred at the Wilmer Way junction over the three years ending 2007. Traffic counts show [DD 19, Figs 3.2.and 3.3] that a significant number of drivers turn right into Wilmer Way, especially in the peak hours. No one apart from Mrs Adamczyk has suggested that such a turn should be banned.
- 5.1.25 It would not be not appropriate for there to be one lane both for straight ahead traffic and for traffic turning right into Wilmer Way because right-turning traffic would block ahead traffic and cause unacceptable queues. The scheme includes advance direction signing and carriageway destination markings, which would ensure that drivers have plenty of time to get into the correct lane on the approach to this junction. These two lanes would also be required to give pedestrians sufficient time to cross the carriageways if congestion is to be avoided.
- 5.1.26 Without the additional lane, the junction would be running at over 95% capacity during the AM peak; it would greatly exceed capacity during the PM peak.
-

Cycleway and Footway

- 5.1.27 TfL concedes that the use of Bowes Road by cyclists is currently negligible. However, the cycleway has been provided to comply with Policy 3C.21 in the London Plan [DD 32] and Policies T7 and T12 in the Enfield UDP [DD 42], in both of which there is a consistent requirement to cater for the needs of cyclists.
- 5.1.28 The proposed cycleway would be provided to the design standard agreed with the Cyclists' Touring Club [ID 1,14]. Both the footway and cycleway in front of Mrs Adamczyk's house (the median between which would be a raised marking) would be 2 metres wide. No potential safety problems were identified in the safety audit [ID 1.20]. No problems with abutting footways and cycleways have been experienced elsewhere in London and there is no reason why any problems should be experienced by those emerging from their front gates onto the footway. Additional compulsory purchase, perhaps including demolition, would not be justified in order to achieve a greater separation between the cycleway and the footway.

Visual Amenity

- 5.1.29 TfL acknowledges that the loss of trees in the area of Mrs Adamczyk's house would represent an averse effect on her visual amenity. However, it would be an inevitable consequence of the scheme and would be justified by the wider advantages of the scheme to the public. However, insofar as it is feasible, replacement planting is a requirement (Conditions 5-8) of the planning permission granted for the scheme [ID 1,22]. Soft landscaping and the use of new materials would result in a net improvement in visual amenity.
- 5.1.30 It might be possible to retain about two trees by running the cycleway nearer the carriageway between the bus stop near Mrs Adamczyk's house and Wilmer Way but this would not be possible nearer to the house. Nor would it be possible to plant bushes or shrubs on the remaining one-metre wide grass verge strip between the cycleway and carriageway at that point without a risk of them obstructing traffic in due course.
- 5.1.31 Thus, in spite of the loss of street trees and grass verges along this stretch of the A406, there would be overall improvements in visual amenity due to improvements in surface material consistency and the general streetscape.

Noise and Air Pollution

- 5.1.32 Although the eastbound carriageway of the A406 would be realigned closer to Nos 202 to 258 Bowes Road, there would still be a buffer of approximately 5 metres (comprising verge, cycleway and footpath) between the carriageway and the front boundaries of these properties. Furthermore, all of these properties would retain their front gardens (of approximately 6 metres in depth) following completion of construction.
- 5.1.33 Using 18-hour annual average weekly traffic data, it is predicted that first floor level noise levels at Mrs Adamczyk's house would reduce as a result of the scheme – albeit by only an imperceptible 0.1 dB $L_{A, 18\text{-hour}}$.
-

-
- 5.1.34 To reduce pollution levels to significantly lower levels before scheme implementation would be impracticable. For example, to reduce noise levels from 75dB $L_{A10, 18\text{hour}}$ to the 68dB noise insulation standard would require traffic using the A406 to be reduced by 75%.
- 5.1.35 Monitoring of pollution levels would continue for at least one year after the scheme was opened.
- 5.1.36 The production of a certain amount of dust during construction would be inevitable. However, dust levels would be minimised through the use of remedial measures (the wetting of stockpiles, etc).

Congestion

- 5.1.37 The predictions of traffic flows and congestion are based on computer models (eg, the Transyt model) in general use and recognised by government departments and local authorities. The forecasts are the most reliable available and TfL has no reason not to accept them as a basis for judgements on the effects of the scheme.
- 5.1.38 Although there would be a small increase in flows along the A406 as a result of the diversion of 'rat-running' from local side streets, the effect of the proposed road widening on capacity would be off-set by the additional pedestrian crossing facilities.
- 5.1.39 The provision of a left turn out of Wilmer Way, including the slip lane, has been included in the scheme at the specific request of Enfield Borough Council as a means of reducing 'rat-running' through the residential side roads. Modelling shows that congestion on the Wilmer Way approach to the A406 should be a little better than hitherto.
- 5.1.40 Similarly, the new junction arrangement should result in less queuing for eastbound traffic leaving the A1110 to join the A406.
- 5.1.41 Provision of a hard shoulder would not be appropriate for an urban road of this type. As the A406 would be slightly wider, drivers would be better able to manoeuvre round broken-down vehicles than has been possible hitherto.

Heavy Lorries

- 5.1.42 One of the purposes of the North Circular Road is to keep heavy lorries off the residential side roads. Congestion caused by heavy lorries blocking junctions should be reduced by the scheme and the risks reduced by the imposition of the lower speed limit on Telford Road.

Community Severance

- 5.1.43 The current lack of at-grade pedestrian facilities across the A406 is a cause of community severance. With the provision of full crossing facilities at each of the major traffic signal controlled junctions, the scheme would improve facilities for pedestrians and cyclists, and thus reduce community severance significantly.
-

Blight

- 5.1.44 The scheme would greatly reduce the existing blight on properties alongside the A406. The retention of land (no dwellings would be involved) for a further 20 years at the request of Enfield Borough Council [ID 1.22], in order to cater for any alternative intermediate scheme in the future, ought not to cause any blight.

5.2 Sunstar Estates Limited (statutory objection to the CPO)

- 5.2.1 Sunstar Estates Limited owns a commercial property on the ground floor of Powys Court, on the north-west corner of the junction of the A406 with Powis Lane/Brownlow Road. In objecting to compulsory acquisition of this property, the company argues that better alternative design schemes have not been fully explored.

TfL's Response to Sunstar's Objection

- 5.2.2 All previous schemes, except the 2002 scheme, would have required the demolition of the properties owned by Sunstar Estates.
- 5.2.3 Widening of the A406 in this area, and the consequent need to acquire this property, is required to accommodate the controlled pedestrian facilities at the Bowes Road/Brownlow Road junction and to maintain sufficient capacity to accommodate displaced rat-running traffic.
- 5.2.4 Although the objection raises the question of alternatives by which the property might not be taken, none has been identified by the objector. The real dispute concerns compensation, the appropriate level of which is still being negotiated by the parties.

5.3 Mr P A J Brown (non-statutory objection to the CPO)

- 5.3.1 Mr Brown is concerned about the status, preservation, protection and future maintenance of 58 pink flowering horse chestnut trees forming woodland on the north side of Telford Road. He is also concerned about the possibility of flash flooding from the Bounds Green Brook, which flows through the woodland. [ID 4.1]
- 5.3.2 However, he regards TfL's assurances [ID 4.2] that the trees would be preserved and properly maintained and that flooding would be avoided by SuDS as an adequate and sufficient reply to his objection. He is therefore prepared to withdraw his objection, notwithstanding uncertainty about the future ownership of the land, on condition that his concerns and TfL's response are recorded in this report.

TfL's Response to Mr Brown's Objection

- 5.3.3 The existing pink flowering horse chestnut trees in the Telford Road Woodland would not be affected by the scheme. The woodland area would become a public open space (in exchange for an area of open space land adjoining Bounds Green Road that is required for the scheme).
- 5.3.4 The woodland area would be landscaped and generally laid out for use by the public. Improvement measures would include topsoiling/grassing,
-

-
- lighting and edge protection from the bank of the running brook. These improvements would be a significant benefit for local residents.
- 5.3.5 TfL would carry out the landscaping works. It has not yet been confirmed whether thereafter the woodland area would be owned and maintained by TfL, the London Borough of Enfield or the London Borough of Haringey. Discussions are taking place with the London Boroughs of Enfield and Haringey regarding the long-term ownership of, and maintenance obligations for, the woodland area.
- 5.3.6 SuDS (Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems) are urban surface water drainage methods that take account of quantity, quality and amenity issues. These systems are designed to be more sustainable than conventional urban drainage methods and are being promoted in this instance by TfL following discussions with the Environment Agency about the most appropriate drainage solution for this area. Areas within the woodland would have gravel basins to cater for highway runoff. The top surface of the basins would be grassed at the same level as the rest of the woodland area.
- 5.3.7 The brook is maintained by the Environment Agency. All proposed measures on the woodland area would be approved by the Environment Agency prior to construction. The Environment Agency has agreed in principle to the use of these SuDS measures as proposed.
- 5.3.8 A flood risk assessment has been carried out to assess the effects of the scheme. The assessment concluded that there would be a net surplus of storage following the scheme, which would reduce the downstream surface-water flood risk.
- 5.3.9 The detailed design of the landscaping has not yet been finalised and would need to be agreed with the London Borough of Enfield and the Environment Agency. However, TfL is proposing that the public open space would be separated from Telford Road by a fence with appropriate gated public access points.
- 5.3.10 The Order does not alter the ownership or status of the narrow strip of land to the north west of the Brook. This strip of land would remain under the control of its current owners. It would not be landscaped or laid out as public open space by TfL.
-

6. CONCLUSIONS

- 6.1 Bearing in mind the submissions and representations I have reported, I have reached the following conclusions, reference being given in square brackets to earlier paragraphs of this report where appropriate.
- 6.2 After setting out the criteria against which the Secretary of State will wish to judge the scheme, I deal with the evidence submitted by topic. I then discuss the points made by the objectors before examining the two Orders and the proposed modifications, and arriving at my overall conclusions.

Criteria

- 6.3 If I am to recommend that the Orders be confirmed, I need to be satisfied that
- a. there is a need for the scheme
 - b. the proposals would meet that need;
 - c. the design of the scheme is appropriate and would be safe;
 - d. the impact of the scheme on the local environment would be acceptable; and
 - e. the scheme would represent the best available option available.
- 6.4 As regards the CPO, and in the context of ODPM Circular 06/2004, I must be satisfied that:
- a. all of the land contained in the Order is required for the purposes of the scheme;
 - b. there is a compelling case for acquisition of the whole of each plot in the public interest;
 - c. this justifies interfering with the human rights of those with an interest in the land affected, having regard, in particular, to the provisions of Article 1 of the First Protocol to the European Convention on Human Rights and, in the case of a dwelling, to Article 8 of the Convention;
 - d. TfL has a clear idea of how it is intending to use the land it seeks to acquire;
 - e. TfL can show that all necessary resources to carry out its plans are likely to be available within a reasonable timescale; and that
 - f. the scheme is unlikely to be blocked by any impediment to implementation.
- 6.5 As regards the Side Roads Order, in the context of sections 14 and 125 of the Highways Act 1980 I must be satisfied that that:
- a. provision has been made for the preservation of the rights of statutory undertakers in respect of their apparatus;
-

-
- b. before any highway is stopped up, another reasonably convenient route would be available or would be provided; and
 - c. before any means of access to premises is stopped up either no access to the premises would be required or another reasonably convenient means of access to the premises would be available.

Need for the Scheme

- 6.6 The A406 North Circular Road forms an important thoroughfare through North London, serving both as a strategic route and as a link between London boroughs and residential areas. However, although much of it is now dual carriageway, most of the length covered by the proposed scheme is single-carriageway, carrying about 60,000 vehicles per day. Although the average two-way flow is about 3,200 vehicles per hour, it peaks at about 5,000. [3.1.1, 3.5.3]
 - 6.7 These traffic flows result in substantial congestion, particularly during the morning and evening peak periods. Consequently, buses are delayed, resulting in unpunctual and unreliable services. Cycling is made difficult and, with inadequate crossing facilities, pedestrians have problems crossing the road, resulting in community severance. [3.1.1–3.1.4, 3.6.1-3.6.3]
 - 6.8 During the peak periods, local residential roads suffer from unusually high levels of 'rat-running' (up to 54%) as drivers seek other routes to bypass congestion on the A406, which adds to the environmental problems of the area. [3.1.5, 3.5.3, 3.1.5]
 - 6.9 This section of the A406 has a high incidence of accidents, with an accident rate approximately twice as high as would be expected on similar routes elsewhere in London. The main causes of accidents are speeding, conflicting traffic movements at junctions and vehicles turning into and out of side roads. [3.8.1, 3.8.2]
 - 6.10 A series of schemes to remedy these deficiencies has been proposed over the years but proposals have become progressively less ambitious in order to minimise land-take, property demolition and expenditure. [3.2.1]
 - 6.11 The existence of these problems was not challenged by the objectors.
 - 6.12 Whilst aiming to maintain the safety and environmental characteristics of the immediately preceding scheme (the '2005 Scheme'), the scheme now proposed seeks to minimise its footprint and the number of properties affected. It also aims to avoid increasing traffic along this section of the A406 beyond that required to reduce 'rat-running' on the local residential side roads. [3.3.1]
 - 6.13 The specific objectives of the scheme [3.3.2] are:
 - to promote the safety and security of all road users by reducing the number and severity of accidents;
 - to encourage sustainable modes of travel, through provision of enhanced cycling and walking facilities and the improvement of bus movements;
-

-
- to protect and enhance the local environment and to encourage traffic which might otherwise use minor residential roads to transfer to the A406;
 - to reduce community severance by providing new and improved pedestrian crossing facilities at traffic signal junctions and other key locations; and
 - to maintain overall existing traffic capacity.
- 6.14 Save for the need to cater for cyclists, the objectors do not dissent from these objectives.
- 6.15 One objector suggests that few cyclists use this section of the A406 and that a cycleway is not needed [5.1.5]. However, the current traffic conditions on, and the geometry of, the A406 as it stands hardly encourage cyclists to use the route. It is not, in my view surprising that so few do. The need to cater for cyclists is a requirement of Policy 3C.21 in the London Plan, and Policies T7 and T12 in the Enfield UDP. If cycling is to be encouraged, there is a clear need for suitable facilities to be provided along the A406.
- 6.16 I conclude that there is a need for a scheme capable of achieving all the objectives above.

Scope and Timing of the Scheme

- 6.17 Under the scheme [3.4.1 – 3.4.9]:
- a. a fourth lane would be provided on the Telford Road section of the A406, so that traffic moving in one direction would no longer be limited to a single lane;
 - b. improvements would be made by means of road-widening and other changes at the four major junctions;
 - c. right turns would be prohibited at a number of junctions; access to most minor side roads would either be closed off or restricted to left-in and left-out only [3.13.2 - 3.13.4];
 - d. a cycleway would be provide along the whole length of the scheme, most of it segregated from the adjacent footway by raised marking; and
 - e. pedestrian crossing facilities would be improved.
- 6.18 Although the Environmental Statement, when published, assumed an opening year of 2008 [3.9.17] for its predictions [reflected in 6.42 - 6.44 below], works would not actually start on site before about June 2009 – even with timely confirmation of the Orders. Construction would take about 18 months to complete. [3.16.1]

Impacts of the Scheme

Properties to be Demolished

- 6.19 Only 17 property units (of which 12 are residential) within five building structures would be demolished [3.4.10].
-

Traffic

- 6.20 There would be significant reductions in flows along most minor residential roads, especially during the peak hours when these roads are much used for 'rat-running'. Only two side roads (Warwick Road, with up to 89 vehicles/hour, and the A105 Green Lanes south, with up to 440 vehicles/hour) would experience measurable increases in traffic flows, although the B106 Brownlow Road and Highworth Road might experience a marginal increase. [3.5.6, 3.13.2 - 3.13.4]
- 6.21 The increase in flows along the A406 itself would be only those caused by the re-routeing from the minor residential roads. Although the A406 would be widened, flows would be restricted by the improved at-grade facilities for pedestrians to cross the road. [3.5.5]
- 6.22 The provision of coach bays on the A406 adjacent to Bowes Primary School and closure of access to Stanley Road would greatly assist parking and avoid interference with A406 traffic by school coaches. [4.2 - 4.4]
- 6.23 The combined effect of these changes would be neutral. There would be no overall increase in traffic along the A406 corridor. [3.5.5]
- 6.24 The combined effects of the scheme on queuing times on the A406 would also be broadly neutral. Although there might be local changes in queuing patterns, journey times along this section of the road should not change significantly from the present day. [3.5.8]
- 6.25 Although the reduction in speed limit from 40mph to 30mph on the Telford Road section of the A406 might have a marginal effect on journey times during the off-peak hours, this would be outweighed by the benefits to road safety of its introduction. [3.5.9]
- 6.26 I conclude that the scheme would achieve its objectives in term of traffic management.

Public Transport

- 6.27 The provision of bus lanes on the approaches to the signalled junctions at Green Lanes and Brownlow Road, combined with selective vehicle detection, would help to reduce the delays currently being experienced by bus services [3.6.4 – 3.6.6]. The linking of signalled junctions and bringing them under coordinated control would also reduce journey time variability along the A406. This would be a significant benefit for the management of buses along the A406. [3.5.8, 3.6.6]
- 6.28 I conclude that the implementation of the scheme would be significantly to the benefit of public bus services along the A406 corridor.

Pedestrians and Cyclists

- 6.29 I have no doubt that the new cycleway and improved arrangements for pedestrians to cross the A406 would be beneficial to both their convenience and safety, and would reduce community severance [3.7.4-3.7.7, 4.6].
-

Road Safety

- 6.30 Modelled predictions suggest that the scheme would result in a reduction of 63.5 accidents over a three-year period, reflecting a 36.5% reduction from the 174 recorded over such a period ending in May 2007. Although 91% of the recorded accidents were only slight (perhaps reflecting the slow speeds along this congested route), the reduction would still result in a saving of some £5.16 million. [3.8.1-3.8.5]
- 6.31 This seems to me to be a very worthwhile benefit of the scheme.

Environmental Impact

- 6.32 An Environmental Impact Assessment has been carried out. The Environmental Statement and Non Technical Summary were published and put on deposit at the same time as the draft Orders and the other core documents. [3.9.1] In coming to these conclusions, I have taken into account the Environmental Statement and all other environmental information submitted to the inquiries, including comments and representations by statutory consultees and members of the public.

Noise and Vibration

- 6.33 The scheme would result in both increases and decreases in noise and noise nuisance. The changes would mainly be due to large changes in traffic flows on side roads and low noise surfacing on the A406 itself. Predictions indicate that 102 dwellings would experience an increase in traffic noise and noise nuisance. However, no dwelling would experience an increase in noise greater than 3dB_{LA10, 18-hour} (the minimum level generally viewed as being perceptible). Against this, 5084 would experience a decrease in noise; 5030 would experience a decrease in noise nuisance. [3.9.7-3.9.9]
- 6.34 No dwellings would be eligible for noise insulation under the mandatory powers of the Noise Insulation Regulations (NIR) 1975 (as amended in 1988). However, under NIR discretionary powers, three dwellings would be eligible for offers of insulation. [3.9.10]
- 6.35 Without suitable measures to limit noise during the construction of the scheme, levels are predicted to exceed the normal 75 dB_{LAeq,12-hour} target at some dwellings. This would be due to their very close proximity to the works. However, measures to minimise noise during construction would be implemented at all locations, so that the actual noise levels during the construction phase would be lower than those predicted. [3.9.3] Such construction noise would be an inevitable consequence of the works for these properties but one that, in my view, would be outweighed by the benefits to the public at large once the scheme is complete.
- 6.36 51 dwellings within 41 metres of the A406, where widening of the A406 would cause the carriageway to move closer to them, would be likely to experience an increase in road traffic induced vibration. However, some 665 dwellings would experience a decrease.
- 6.37 I conclude that , subject to appropriate measures being taken, the disbenefits of construction noise and the small increase in noise from operation of the
-

scheme for a few people once it is complete would be greatly outweighed by the noise and vibration benefits of the scheme for the majority.

Air Quality

- 6.38 With mitigation as managed under the contractor's Construction Environmental Management Plan, construction dust would have a negligible impact, even on those properties lying within 150 metres of the works. [3.9.24]
- 6.39 The slight increase in CO₂ that the scheme would cause would be a result of the reduced speed limit on Telford Road. I agree with TfL that this would be justified in the interests of improved road safety. [3.9.21]
- 6.40 Modelled concentrations of carbon monoxide, benzene and 1,3 butadiene are predicted to be below UK Air Quality Standard (AQS) Objective/EU Limit Values, both with and without the Scheme. [3.9.17]
- 6.41 The scheme lies within two Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs), declared by the Haringey and Enfield Boroughs, in which both PM₁₀ particulates and nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) are above the levels set in UK AQS objectives. [3.9.12] EU Limit Values (which are legally binding) for NO₂ come into force in 2010 [3.9.13].
- 6.42 Compared with UK AQS objectives, and the EU Limit Values, PM₁₀ levels would exceed the 24-hour mean EU Limit Value at one sensitive receptor in 2008 - with or without the scheme. However, in 2010, the 24-hour limit would not be exceeded in either scenario. [3.9.19]
- 6.43 On the other hand, NO₂ modelling predicts exceedances of the AQS Objective/EU Limit Value (hourly and annual average) in both 2008 and 2010 at some points, with or without the scheme. However, the number of receptors exceeding the limits would reduce with the scheme [3.9.20].
- 6.44 Thus, although the PM₁₀ level would exceed the 24 hour mean EU Limit Value at one point in 2008, this would not be the case in 2010 when the EU limit Value becomes legally binding and the scheme would result in a reduction in the number of receptors exceeding the 2008 and 2010 NO₂ limits.
- 6.45 No other exceedances of any UK AQS Objectives or EU Limit Values are predicted at modelled receptors with the scheme in operation. [3.9.22]
- 6.46 From the wider viewpoint, the generalised assessment indicates that the scheme would result in an overall improvement in PM₁₀ and NO₂. The regional assessment indicates that changes in the emissions of pollutants overall would be less than 0.6%. [3.9.23]
- 6.47 I conclude that the impact of the scheme would be of net benefit to air quality in the area.

Townscape and Visual Amenity

- 6.48 The main effects of the scheme on Townscape and Visual Amenity would come from the reduction in highway verge, which would require the loss of existing
-

street trees, grass and some garden frontages [3.9.26]. The impact on townscape along the route would vary between slight and moderate [3.9.25].

- 6.49 TfL suggests that the effect on views would be moderate/ slight adverse for 259 residential properties and slight adverse for 11 (TfL acknowledges that none would benefit) [3.9.27]. I accept that the use of consistent surface materials and appropriate mitigation, such as planting and compensatory habitat, would help to offset losses in visual amenity for pedestrians and road users [3.9.27]. However, given the wider area of carriageway pavement and the introduction of the cycleway, the scope for these is bound to be limited in practice.
- 6.50 In my judgement, the impact for those living at the northern end of Bounds Green Road and on the A406 just to the east of the junction with Wilmer Way (especially with the new footbridge over the A406) would be at least moderately adverse. Nevertheless, I conclude that, given the scheme's wider public benefits, this should be regarded as an acceptable impact.

Cultural Heritage

- 6.51 No archaeological sites would be affected by the scheme [3.9.32]. However, it would affect one Grade 2 Listed Building – Bowes Road Primary School (a three-storey late Victorian building fronting the A406 at the junction with Stanley Road). The scheme would involve the part demolition and part alteration of the boundary wall [3.9.29, 3.9.30].
- 6.52 The Enfield Borough Council has concluded that the alteration to and construction of a replacement wall would not harm the special architectural and historic interest of this building. Following referral of the application to the Government Office for London, Listed Building Consent was issued by the Council on 19 December 2007. [3.9.30]
- 6.53 I very much endorse the views of TfL and the school governors that removal of the footbridge outside the Primary School would have a beneficial effect on the setting of the school [3.9.31, 4.6] and conclude that the net effect of the scheme on cultural heritage would be beneficial.

Ecology, Nature Conservation and Drainage

- 6.54 There are no nationally important sites of nature conservation interest on or near this part of the A406 corridor, although the existing road crosses a local site of nature conservation interest. No protected species would be affected. [3.9.33]
- 6.55 Clearly, the removal of some trees from this area without replacement would be a significant disadvantage from the townscape viewpoint and I am a little surprised that the Appraisal Summary Table (AST) assesses the likely impact of the scheme on biodiversity as being "Neutral" in this context. However, I acknowledge that there would be a significant benefit from the introduction of a sustainable urban drainage scheme (SuDS); this would not only deal with surface run-off in a sustainable manner, but would also help to create new ecological habitats [3.9.35] and therefore endorse the AST.
-

-
- 6.56 Given the avoidance of vegetation clearance during the bird-breeding season and the protection of those trees that would be retained [3.9.34], I conclude that the net effect of the scheme on ecology and nature conservation would be no more than slightly adverse.

Open Space

- 6.57 The improvements to the A406 Pinkham Way/Telford Road/Bounds Green Road/Station Road junction would involve land belonging to Haringey Borough Council that forms part of the public open spaces that abut the north-western end of Bounds Green Road on both sides. To compensate for the loss of this open space, TfL has identified suitable 'Exchange Land', belonging to Enfield Borough Council, along the northwest side of Telford Road. This would be laid out as public open space as part of the scheme works. [3.12.16, 3.12.17, 3.12.19]
- 6.58 The Secretary of State has already issued the appropriate Exchange Land Certificate [3.12.18]. Although responsibility for the future maintenance of this new open space has yet to be agreed between TfL and the local borough councils [3.12.20], I conclude that the provision of public open space would be properly catered for under the scheme.

Policy and Planning Considerations

Central Government Policy Guidance

- 6.59 Having examined the relevant deposit documents, I am satisfied that the scheme complies with the requirements of all relevant central government Policy Guidance Notes and Planning Policy Statements. It would promote the improvement of environmental quality of life and accessibility for future generations. It would thus represent sustainable development and support the aims of the government's document *Securing the Future*, published in March 2005. [3.10.1]

Regional and Local Plans

- 6.60 I have also examined the London Plan, the Mayor's Transport Strategy and the relevant Local Plans and agree with TfL's view that the scheme would be fully in accord with, and support, the policies and objectives set out in those plans. [3.10.2, 3.10.3, 3.11.3]

Planning and Commercial Blight

- 6.61 Uncertainty over the future of the A406 in this area has resulted in blight over a number of years. Many properties fronting the A406 are in very poor condition or even derelict [2.5, 3.10.4]. Significant regeneration of this area requires the future of this section of the A406 to be settled [3.10.5].
- 6.62 Whilst small areas of TfL land would be retained to cater for an 'Intermediate Scheme' (ie, one providing limited grade-separation [3.2.1c]), should one be progressed in the next 20 years, no dwellings would be involved and I do not believe that this precaution would result in any significant blight. [5.1.44]
-

6.63 I conclude that confirmation of the Orders and implementation of the scheme would largely remove the planning and commercial blight that currently exists along this part of the A406 corridor [3.10.6].

Planning Permission

6.64 Subject to certain conditions, including the requirement to safeguard land for any future 'Intermediate Scheme', both the Enfield and Haringey Borough Councils have granted planning permission for the scheme [3.2.1, 3.11.1-3.11.3].

Availability of Funding and Cost-Benefit

6.65 The scheme would cost £44.5m at 2006 prices (inflated to programmed construction dates). This expenditure has been approved by the TfL Board and is now included in its January 2008 Business Plan. Thus, funding for the scheme is assured. [3.15.1]

6.66 An Appraisal Summary Table, based on the WebTAG format, has been produced [3.15.2]. Notwithstanding my comment at 6.55 above, I am content with the assessments made in that table.

6.67 The quantifiable benefits of the scheme would outweigh its costs by a ratio of 1.7:1 over a period of 30 years. [3.15.2]

6.68 Thus, I conclude that the proposal would represent good value for money and would provide benefits that would outweigh the initial cost of the scheme.

Matters Raised in the Objections

Objections by Mrs Adamczyk

Right Turn into Wilmer Way

6.69 Mrs Adamczyk argues that the provision of land for traffic turning right into Wilmer way is unnecessary and that accidents would be caused by drivers changing lanes [5.1.4]. However, traffic counts show that a significant number of drivers turn right into Wilmer Way. A right-turn lane, in addition to that provided for straight ahead traffic would, in my view, be essential if congestion and unacceptable queues at this junction (which would otherwise be running at over 95% capacity) were to be avoided. The scheme includes advance direction signing and carriageway destination markings, which would ensure that drivers have plenty of time to get into the correct lane on the approach to this junction. These two lanes would also be required to give pedestrians sufficient time to cross the carriageways if congestion is to be avoided. [5.1.24-5.1.26]

6.70 No one apart from Mrs Adamczyk has suggested that such a turn should be banned [5.1.24] and I conclude that the additional lane would be justified, notwithstanding its impact on Mrs Adamczyk and her neighbours [see 6.74 below].

Cycleway and Footway

6.71 Mrs Adamczyk suggests that the proposed cycleway is unnecessary and that, being adjacent to the footway, conflicts would occur, both between cyclists

and pedestrians, and between pedestrians and those emerging onto the footway from their properties. [5.1.5-5.1.7]

- 6.72 I have dealt with, and endorsed, the need for a cycleway at 6.15 and 6.16 above.
- 6.73 As for potential hazards with the abutting cycleway and footway, none was identified in the Safety Audit and none has been experienced with such arrangements elsewhere in London [5.1.28]. In any case, compulsory purchase and demolition of property would hardly be justified in order to achieve physical separation. In my judgement, there would be little or no conflict between those using the footway, cycleway and those emerging from front gates.
- 6.74 I conclude that Mrs Adamczyk's concerns in this respect are unfounded.

Visual Amenity

- 6.75 TfL acknowledges that the loss of trees in the area of Mrs Adamczyk's house would have an adverse effect on her visual amenity. [5.1.9, 5.1.29] Plant replacement, landscape softening and the use of new materials [5.1.29] might help partially to offset the loss of trees and grass verge. It might also be possible save one or two trees near the Wilmer Way junction [5.1.30]. However, this loss in visual amenity would, undoubtedly, still be very real for Mrs Adamczyk.
- 6.76 On the other hand, this loss would, in my judgement, be an unavoidable consequence of the scheme and would be far outweighed by the wider advantages of the proposed road widening to the public.
- 6.77 I have doubts about the wisdom of planting bushes on a grass verge only one metre wide, if potential conflict between vegetation and traffic or cyclists is to be avoided [5.1.8, 5.1.30]. Given that Mrs Adamczyk's garden is 6 metres in depth, immediately beyond which the footway and cycleway would run, such planting on the verge would, in my judgement, add little to her privacy.
- 6.78 As for her proposal that a metal fence be erected on the carriageway side of the verge [5.1.8], this would, in my view, serve little purpose given the speed limit of 30 mph and nearby facilities for pedestrians to cross the A406.

Noise and Air Pollution

- 6.79 Contrary to her suspicions, noise levels at Mrs Adamczyk's house are predicted to reduce as a result of the scheme – albeit by only an imperceptible 0.1 dB $L_{A, 18\text{-hour}}$. Any increase resulting from the carriageway being moved nearer to her house would be offset by the use of low noise threshold materials (there would be relatively little increase in traffic past her house). There would still be some 11 metres between the front façade of her house and the edge of the carriageway. Although Mrs Adamczyk is unconvinced by TfL's noise predictions, I have no reason to doubt their accuracy and note that she has submitted no evidence to show that they are wrong. [5.1.10, 5.1.33]
- 6.80 I agree with TfL's view that to reduce noise, air pollutant and vibration levels significantly before implementation of the scheme would be impracticable
-

[5.1.11, 5.1.34]. In any case, such action would lie outside the scope of the Orders.

- 6.81 As for the suggestion that heavy lorries should be banned from the A406 [5.1.10], this would, in my view, defeat one of the objects of having a North Circular Road - to keep such vehicles off the minor residential streets. [5.1.42]
- 6.82 The production of a certain amount of dust during construction would be inevitable [5.1.12]. However, dust levels would be minimised by remedial measures (the wetting of stockpiles, etc) and would have a minimal impact on properties even within 150 metres of the scheme. [3.9.24]
- 6.83 I conclude that Mrs Adamczyk's concerns about the impact of noise and air pollution are unfounded; that her suggestions regarding prior reduction of noise, air pollutant and vibrations levels would be impracticable; and that the banning of heavy lorries from the A406 would be undesirable.

Congestion

- 6.84 I have no reason to doubt the traffic flow predictions, which are based on recognised models and suggest that Mrs Adamczyk's fear that congestion on the Wilmer Way approach to the A406 would increase [5.1.13] is unfounded. They indicate that congestion would actually be a little better than hitherto [5.1.37, 5.1.39]
- 6.85 As for her suggestion that failure to provide a hard shoulder on the A406 would result in unnecessary congestion [5.1.14], with a slightly wider road drivers ought to be better-placed to manoeuvre round any breakdowns. I agree with TfL that provision of a hard shoulder would be inappropriate on an urban road of this type [5.1.41], especially as it would involve an even wider road (and, presumably, more land-take).

Demolition of Residential Properties

- 6.86 In my view, the demolition of residential properties proposed in the scheme has been kept to the absolute minimum possible and is necessary if the objectives of the scheme are to be achieved [3.4.10, 5.1.15].

Community Severance

- 6.87 As I indicate at 6.29 above, I believe that the scheme would actually help to reduce community severance and that, with fully controlled crossings, the safety of pedestrians would be improved [3.7.4, 3.7.7, 5.1.16].

Blight

- 6.88 I have dealt with the matter of blight at 6.61 to 6.63 above, concluding that the scheme would largely overcome the problem of blight.

Consultation

- 6.89 In view of the evidence of very comprehensive contacts with stakeholders and the general public as submitted to me [3.14.1-3.14.4], I cannot agree with Mrs Adamczyk's assertion [5.1.19] that consultation has been inadequate.
-

Need for Independent Assessment

- 6.90 In my judgement, no useful purpose would be served by subjecting the scheme to further independent assessment [5.1.20]. I have no reason to question the integrity and judgement of those who have assessed the proposals so far, or to doubt the estimates of costs submitted. A number of alternative schemes have been explored over the years [3.2.1].

Objection by Sunstar Estates Limited

- 6.91 Although Sunstar Estates suggest [5.3.1] that better alternative design schemes have not been fully explored, the company has submitted no alternative proposal itself – even in basic outline [5.2.4]. In my judgement, the use of land to the north of the existing A406 carriageway for widening was the only sensible option and the need to incorporate improvement of the Brownlow Road junction in the scheme makes the acquisition of property on the north side of the junction inevitable [5.2.3]. It is noteworthy that most previous schemes have involved demolition of the properties owned by Sunstar Estates [5.2.3].

Objection by Mr Brown

- 6.92 Although Mr Brown did not formally withdraw his objection at the inquiries, I note that he regards TfL's assurances [5.3.3 – 5.3.10] that the trees with which he is concerned would be preserved and that flooding would be avoided by SuDS as an adequate and sufficient reply to his objection [5.3.1, 5.3.2]. Given TfL's response, I conclude that the matters he raises would be satisfactorily dealt with under the scheme.

The Orders***The Compulsory Purchase Order***

- 6.93 Excluding exchange land for open space, 2.6948 hectares would need to be acquired for the scheme. Of this, TfL already holds the freehold interest in 1.7599 hectares (65.31%), which has been included in the Order for the purpose of acquiring or overriding any third party rights and covenants attaching to that land. [3.12.3-3.12.5]
- 6.94 The remaining 0.9349 hectares is in private or local authority ownership. Of this, however, 0.3791 hectares would be required only for temporary working space and could be returned to claimants on completion of construction. The amount needing to be permanently acquired therefore amounts to only 0.5558 hectares. [3.12.7]
- 6.95 Since the CPO was made, TfL has concluded [3.17.1] that it would not be necessary to acquire the whole of the Ritz Parade and that acquisition of only a small section of the frontage of these properties would be essential to the scheme. The CPO therefore needs to be modified by replacement of Plan 5 of 9 and pages 50, 51 and 52 of Table 1 of Schedule 1 to the Order with the new plan and the eight pages submitted by TfL as indicated at paragraph 3.17.1 above.
- 6.96 I agree that the CPO should be so modified.
-

6.97 In the context of ODPM Circular 06/2004, I have examined the case for acquisition of the full extent of each of the other plots and rights as proposed in the CPO. I conclude that, subject to the modification above, all the criteria I have set out at paragraph 6.4 above would be met.

The Side Roads Order

6.98 I have examined each of the proposals for stopping up highways and means of access to premises. I am satisfied that:

- a. before any highway is stopped up, another reasonably convenient route would be available or would be provided;
- b. before any means of access to premises is stopped up either no access to the premises would be required or another reasonably convenient means of access to the premises would be provided; and
- c. provision has been made (under Clause 3 of the Order) for the preservation of the rights of statutory undertakers in respect of their apparatus.

Overall Conclusions

6.99 No alternative schemes have been proposed. Thus, I conclude that:

- a. there is a need for the scheme
- b. the proposed scheme would meet that need;
- c. the design of the scheme is appropriate and would be safe;
- d. the impact of the scheme on the local environment would be acceptable;
- e. given the constraints imposed by regional policies, the scheme would represent the only practicable option currently available; and
- f. the proposed scheme would not prejudice adoption of any future 'Intermediate Scheme' should future regional policies allow.

6.100 I therefore conclude that, subject to the proposed modifications to the CPO to which I refer at paragraph 6.95 above, the Orders should be confirmed.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 I recommend that :

- a. THE TRANSPORT FOR LONDON (A406 – BOUNDS GREEN ROAD TO GREEN LANES SAFETY AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENTS) COMPULSORY PURCHASE ORDER 2007 be modified as indicated at paragraph 6.95 above and that, so modified, the Order be confirmed.

- b. THE TRANSPORT FOR LONDON (A406 – BOUNDS GREEN ROAD TO GREEN LANES SAFETY AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENTS) (SIDE ROADS) ORDER 2007 be confirmed.

A L Roberts

INSPECTOR

Appendices:

- A. List of Appearances
- B. List of Deposit Documents/Core Documents
- C. List of Inquiry Documents
- D. List of Plans
- E. List of Proofs of Evidence

APPEARANCES

FOR TRANSPORT FOR LONDON

Mr Charles George, QC

Counsel, instructed by:
Wragg & Co
(Solicitors for TfL)
55 Colmore Row
Birmingham
B3 2AS

He called:

Mr Graham W Jones BSc Eng
CEng MICE MIHT

Head, North Area Directorate
Road Network Development
Transport for London

Mr John Spiers BSc (Hons)
MSc MCITL MIHT

Director of Transportation
Hyder Consulting Limited
(consultant Project Director)

Mr Ronnen Wise BSc MSc
MIOES AIEMA CEnv

Group Manager for
Environmental Solutions
Hyder Consulting (UK) Limited

Mr Aidan E S Eastwood BSc FRICS

Principal Surveyor (Streets)
Operational Property Division
Group Property & Facilities
Transport for London

Mr Michael W J Crook MA FRICS
DipPM

Head of Planning & Environment
Healey & Baker

SUPPORTERS

For the Governors of Bowes Primary School:

Mrs Suzie Holden

89 Stanley Road
London N11 2LL

OBJECTORS

Mrs M Adamsczyk

242 Bowes Road
London N11 2JH

Mr P A J Brown

37, Belsize Avenue
Palmers Green
London N13 4TL

APPENDIX B

DEPOSIT DOCUMENTS

(Documents submitted by TfL with its Statement of Case and placed on deposit for public examination prior to the inquiries)

Order Documentation

1. Scheme/General Arrangement Drawings
2. Compulsory Purchase Order
3. Compulsory Purchase Order Map
4. Statement of Reasons for the Compulsory Purchase Order
5. Side Roads Order
6. Side Roads Order Site Plans
7. Statement of Reasons for the Side Roads Order
8. Exchange Land Notice
9. Exchange Land Map
- 9A. Statement of Case

Reports and Minutes

10. TfL Board Report and Minutes 9 February 2003
11. TfL Board Report and Minutes 29 October 2003
12. TfL Board Report and Minutes 25 October 2006
13. Exchange Land Report – July 2007

Planning Application Documentation

14. Planning Application (LBE reference number TP/06/2360)
15. Planning Application (LBH reference number HGY/2006/2354)
16. Listed Building Consent Application (LBE reference number LBC/06/0039)
17. Planning Statement
18. Environmental Statement and Non-Technical Summary
19. Transport Assessment
20. Sustainability Appraisal
21. London Borough of Enfield Planning Committee Report and Minutes (regarding planning application reference number TP/06/2360) – 5 July 2007
22. London Borough of Enfield Planning Committee Report and Minutes (regarding listed building consent application reference number LBC/06/0039) – 5 July 2007
23. Planning Permission reference number HGY/2006/2354 granted by London Borough of Haringey – 24 July 2007

Policy Documentation

Extracts from:

24. PPS1: Delivering Sustainable Development
25. PPS9: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation
26. PPG13: Transport
27. PPG15: Planning and the Historic Environment
28. PPS23: Planning and Pollution Control
29. PPG24: Planning and Noise
30. PPS25: Development and Flood Risk
31. Sustainable Development – Securing the Future, 2005
32. The London Plan: Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London, 2004
33. Mayor's Transport Strategy, 2001
34. Mayor's Road Safety Plan, 2001
35. Mayor's Economic Development Strategy, 2005
36. Mayor's Air Quality Strategy, 2002
37. Mayor's Ambient Noise Strategy, 2004
38. Mayor's Bio-diversity Strategy, 2002
39. Mayor's Energy Strategy, 2004
40. Greater London Area Sustainable Development Framework for London, 2007
41. North London Sub-Regional Development Framework, 2006
42. Enfield Unitary Development Plan, 1994 (as amended)
43. Enfield Area North Circular Area Action Plan – Issues and Options, 2007
44. Haringey Unitary Development Plan, 2006
- 44A. Levels of Collision Risk in Greater London (Issue 11) December 2006

Correspondence with Objectors to the CPO, the SRO and the Exchange Land proposal

45. Correspondence with Mrs M Adamczyk
46. Correspondence with EDF Energy Networks (EPN) Limited and EDF Energy Plc
47. Correspondence with Bircham Dyson Bell (solicitors for Esso Petroleum Limited)
48. Correspondence with National Grid Plc
49. Correspondence with Network Rail
50. Correspondence with Sunstar Estates Limited
51. Correspondence with Richard Buxton (solicitors for Bowes Telford Community Action Group)
52. Correspondence with Mr PAJ Brown

APPENDIX C

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED TO THE INSPECTOR DURING THE COURSE OF THE INQUIRIES**1 Documents submitted by TfL**

- 1.1 Letter from Mr Henry Brown, dated 8 March 2008, withdrawing BTCAG's objection.
- 1.2 Response to Mrs Adamczyk
- 1.3 *Smith and other v Secretary of State for Trade and Industry and another* [2007] EWHC 1913 (Admin)
- 1.4 Nine General Arrangement plans.
- 1.5 S106 Agreement between TfL and the London Borough of Enfield, dated 11 March 2008.
- 1.6 Enfield Council letter to Wragg & Co, dated 6 March 2008
- 1.7 List of Objectors to the CPO
- 1.8 TfL London Streets letter, dated 7 March 2008, confirming agreement reached with BTCAG
- 1.9 Appendix 1 to MR Jones' proof of evidence - TFL Scheme Consultation and Key Meetings Chronology
- 1.10 Proposed modification of CPO, Schedule 1, Table 1 of the CPO – replacement pages 50, 51, 52, and new pages 53a, 53b, 53c, 53d and 53e
- 1.11 Proposed modification of CPO - replacement Plan 5 of 9
- 1.12 TfL's response to BTCAG's proof of evidence
- 1.13 Appendices to Mr Spiers' proof of evidence (TFL1):
 - 1.13.1 Map of Cycle Routes
 - 1.13.2 Map of Pedestrian Facilities
 - 1.13.3 Map of Bus Services
 - 1.13.4 Map showing Study Route
- 1.14 Extract from TFL London Cycling Standards
- 1.15 Two Network Rail letters of withdrawal of objection, dated 28 February and 10 March 2008
- 1.16 List of 102 dwellings predicted to experience increase in noise levels with the scheme.
- 1.17 Planning Policy Update
- 1.18 Appendices to Mr Eastman's proof of evidence:
 - 1.18.1 Nine plans: Property Interests affected by CPO
 - 1.18.2 TfL letter to London Underground Limited, dated 16 January 2008, covering draft Memorandum of Understanding
 - 1.18.3 TfL Letter, dated 20 May 2005, requesting voluntary agreement to acquisition of interests in land

-
- 1.18.4 TfL letter, dated 14 October 2005, to occupants of properties concerning the CPO
 - 1.18.5 Three TfL letters, dated 9 November 2007, to occupants of properties concerning the CPO
 - 1.18.6 TfL letter to Network Rail, dated 15 November 2007 concerning CPO Plot 50
 - 1.18.7 Six photographs of properties required for demolition
 - 1.19 Enfield Council: draft North Circular Area Action Plan – Preferred Options
 - 1.20 Extract from Designer’s Response to Stage 1 Road Safety Audit
 - 1.21 WebTAG Appraisal Summary Table
 - 1.22 Enfield Council letter to Hyder Consulting (UK) Ltd, dated 12 March 2008, enclosing grant of planning permission for the scheme (Ref: TP/06/2360), subject to conditions.
 - 1.23 Explanatory Note for the Inspector, regarding extent of zebra hatching on the SRO plans.
 - 1.24 TfL Closing Statement
- 2. Document submitted by Mrs Suzie Holden:** Letter of support on behalf of the Governors of Bowes Primary School, dated 4 March 2008
- 3. Documents submitted by Mrs M Adamczyk**
- 3.1 Summary of Objections
 - 3.2 Additional Issues re North Circular Road
 - 3.3 Questions for 11th March
 - 3.4 Mrs Adamczyk’s closing statement
- 4. Documents submitted by Mr P A J Brown:**
- 4.1 Mr Brown’s letter of objection to the Secretary of State for Transport, dated 11 October 2007
 - 4.2 TfL letter to Mr Brown, dated 5 February 2008
-

PROOFS OF EVIDENCE

NB. The proofs of evidence are as submitted. The statements and opinions they contain may have been amended or withdrawn during the course of examination during the inquiries.

Proofs submitted by the Transport for London Witnesses

1. TFL1 Graham Jones (main proof)
 - a. TFL1S Graham Jones (summary proof)

2. TFL2 John Spiers (main proof)
 - a. TFL2S John Spiers (summary proof)

3. TFL3 Ronnen Wise (main proof)
 - a. TFL3S Ronnen Wise (summary proof)

4. TFL4 Aidan E S Eastman (main proof)
 - a. TFL4S Aidan E S Eastman (summary proof)

5. TFL5 Michael W J Crook (main proof)
 - a. TFL5S Michael W J Crook (summary proof)