

**From:** Bob Pennyfather (ALN) <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** 01 September 2016 11:30  
**To:** Lester Scott (ST)  
**Cc:** Sexton Alex; Shoukris Sara (ST); Reucroft Peter (ST); Freeman Mark (ST); Chin Nathaniel; Blitz Bob (ST); Mandalia Sachin (ST); Agbenyo Luke; Ng Erica; Chin Nathaniel; Peter Batty (ALN); Rob Hudspith (ALN)  
**Subject:** RE: DRAFT TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT CONSULTATION [SEC=OFFICIAL]

Scott,

Thanks for your detailed response, and thanks also for your phone call.

Following your advice, we will, of course, take no further action regarding a public enquiry but you will appreciate that, since we receive only limited information on TfL's position on such schemes, we have to pursue our concerns direct with the Council. We would welcome earlier knowledge of the predicted impact of such schemes. I have forwarded you notification that the leader of the Conservative party group on the Council has called the scheme in because of his concerns.

I note the results of your modelling but our hard-won experience suggests that the impact could be substantially worse than predicted.

The proposal from LB Enfield adds 10 speed tables on route 329 to those already within LB Haringey. The Enfield Council officers that I met were unable to give us any assurances on the ramp gradients, or on the durability of the road surface on either side of the ramps: your own assurance gives us some comfort. Most driver shifts will involve crossing Enfield's speed tables around 100 times per day, and we are concerned at the potential for back injuries. Buses will cross the tables several hundred times per day, and the impact on maintenance shows itself already on many routes. Finally, the speed tables have an impact on journey times.

I look forward with interest to see what mitigation Haringey Council might provide.

What is the experience elsewhere of the conflict between bus passengers and cyclists at bus stops with the proposed cycle lane routeing?

We have now been notified of similar proposals for the A1010 corridor and I would welcome your observations before I respond to the Council.

Regards

Bob

**Bob Pennyfather**  
Commercial Planning Manager

**Arriva London** | Mob: [REDACTED] | DD: [REDACTED] | E: [REDACTED]

Arriva London, 16 Watsons Road, London, N22 7TZ | [www.arrivalondon.com](http://www.arrivalondon.com)

Arriva – a **DB** company

**From:** Lester Scott (ST) [mailto:Scott.Lester@tfl.gov.uk]  
**Sent:** 30 August 2016 10:52  
**To:** Bob Pennyfather (ALN)  
**Cc:** Sexton Alex; Shoukris Sara (ST); Reucroft Peter (ST); Freeman Mark (ST); Chin Nathaniel; Blitz Bob (ST); Mandalia Sachin (ST); Agbenyo Luke; Ng Erica; Chin Nathaniel  
**Subject:** RE: DRAFT TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT CONSULTATION [SEC=OFFICIAL]

Bob

I have been asked to respond to your email.

It would be unwise to request a local public inquiry as a contractor of London Buses. The A105 scheme is a TfL funded scheme and London Buses have been working with LB Enfield for over two years to help mitigate any impacts on the bus services in the design and traffic management of the Cycle Enfield programme.

Throughout the scheme there are benefits to bus users as shown in the modelling results due to the improved junction design and signals as well as having bus stops in carriageway. We acknowledge that the 329 southbound in the PM does have some delay therefore London Buses are working with the borough and Haringey as neighbouring borough to provide suitable mitigation.

BusRoute		Proposed	
		0% Reduction	
		AM	PM
377	Northbound	-30 to +30 secs	-30 to +30 secs
	Southbound	-30 to +30 secs	-30 to +30 secs
329	Northbound	-5 to +55 secs	-35 to +25 secs
	Southbound	-63 to -3 secs	+28 to +88 secs
125	Northbound	+8 to +68 secs	+18 to +78 secs
	Southbound	-30 to +30 secs	-30 to +30 secs
121	Northbound	-41 to +19 secs	-70 to -10 secs
	Southbound	-119 to -59 secs	-83 to -23 secs
W6	Northbound	-44 to +16 secs	-82 to -22 secs
	Southbound	-56 to +4 secs	-26 to +34 secs
W8	Northbound	-18 to +42 secs	-9 to +51 secs
	Southbound	-41 to +20 secs	-36 to +24 secs

London Buses, as part of TfL, is supportive of the A105 scheme and recognises the wider benefits of encouraging people to cycle and as such TfL has ensured the impact on bus passengers is kept to an absolute minimum. To provide mitigation for the cycling programme and to reduce pinch points causing delay to bus passengers across London, TfL is investing £200m over the next five years in bus priority measures across London which will help improve reliability.

Kind Regards

**Scott Lester**  
**Borough Programme Manager (North & West)**  
**Borough Project & Programmes**  
**Surface Strategy & Planning | Surface Transport | Transport for London**

*Providing inspiration, strategic leadership and challenge to ensure the delivery of Surface Transport outcomes*

**Mail:** Palestra 10B2, 197 Blackfriars Road, Southwark, London SE1 8NJ  
**Phone:** [REDACTED] (auto [REDACTED])  
**Email:** [scott.lester@tfl.gov.uk](mailto:scott.lester@tfl.gov.uk)  
**Mobile:** [REDACTED]

---

**From:** Shoukris Sara (ST)  
**Sent:** 26 August 2016 14:20  
**To:** Reucroft Peter (ST); Sexton Alex; Brown Janet (ST); Freeman Mark (ST); Chin Nathaniel  
**Cc:** Blitz Bob (ST); Mandalia Sachin (ST); Agbenyo Luke; Ng Erica  
**Subject:** FW: DRAFT TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT CONSULTATION [SEC=OFFICIAL]

Hello Alex and Nathaniel  
Hopefully you can help and reply regarding Bob's email below, not sure what to reply as this is a TfL funded scheme  
Regards Sara

**Area Manager North - Enfield and Haringey**  
**Bus Operations - Surface Transport - London Buses**  
**Turnpike Lane Bus Station**  
**Green Lanes, London N15 3NX**

**Mobile:** [REDACTED]  
**Tel:** [REDACTED]  
[sara.shoukris](mailto:sara.shoukris@tfl.gov.uk)

---

**From:** Bob Pennyfather (ALN) [[mailto:\[REDACTED\]](mailto:[REDACTED])]  
**Sent:** 26 August 2016 10:17  
**To:** Shoukris Sara (ST)  
**Cc:** Reucroft Peter (ST); Brown Janet (ST); Peter Batty (ALN)  
**Subject:** FW: DRAFT TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT CONSULTATION [SEC=OFFICIAL]

Sara,

You will see below that the leader of the Conservative group at Enfield council is suggesting that we take the Council to public enquiry over the cycle lane proposals.

We act as contractor to London Buses so we would be uncomfortable about ploughing our own furrow here. What s London Buses' formal position, please?

Regards

Bob

**Bob Pennyfather**  
Commercial Planning Manager

**Arriva London** | Mob: [REDACTED] | DD: [REDACTED] | E: [REDACTED]

Arriva London, 16 Watsons Road, London, N22 7TZ | [www.arrivalondon.com](http://www.arrivalondon.com)

Arriva – a **DB** company

---

**From:** Helen Otter [[mailto:\[REDACTED\]](mailto:[REDACTED])] **On Behalf Of** Cllr Terry Neville  
**Sent:** 24 August 2016 15:09  
**To:** Bob Pennyfather (ALN); Cllr Terry Neville  
**Cc:** Rory Scanlan  
**Subject:** RE: DRAFT TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT CONSULTATION [SEC=OFFICIAL]

Classification: OFFICIAL

Thanks very much for getting back to me.

You might not know this but the Cabinet Member for Environment has just approved the implementation of the scheme with only minor amendments which do not affect your concerns.

Below is a copy of an email I have sent principally to Asmat Hussein, Assistant Director Legal Services as well as Councillor Anderson, Cabinet Member for Environment and Ian Davis, Director of Environment.

I think that Arriva should now formally write asking that a Local Public Enquiry be held as I believe this is the only way to get the council to take notice. In this connection the officers report confirms that they received over 1600 objections to the statutory consultation – the highest number I have seen on something like this in very many years.

Please let me know what you decide, however I do urge you to proceed with the request for a Local Public Enquiry.

Regards,

Terry

Cllr.Terry Neville OBE JP  
Leader of the Conservative Group  
LB Enfield and Member for Grange Ward

**From:** Helen Otter **On Behalf Of** Cllr Terry Neville  
**Sent:** 24 August 2016 10:18  
**To:** Cllr Daniel Anderson; Ian Davis; Asmat Hussain  
**Cc:** Cathy Hunnisett; David B Taylor  
**Subject:** FW: Cycle Enfield A105 For approval/amendment [SEC=OFFICIAL]  
**Importance:** High

Classification: OFFICIAL

### **Cycle proposals for A105**

I shall as a separate exercise be calling in the decision of the Cabinet Member to approve the proposals recently consulted upon.

However I write now because it seems to me that there is, on the face of the report, an error of law occurring in that we have clearly received objections from interested parties about:

- (a) The restriction of loading and unloading of vehicles along this route
- and

(b) From the relevant bus company about what they see as a restriction of the passage of buses along the route.

Both of these issues are specifically dealt with in Regulation 9(1) of the Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996, which requires the order making authority to cause a Public Inquiry to be held before making an order to which regulation 9(3) applies. The two issues referred to above are both covered by this regulation.

Dealing first with issue of waiting and loading, it is said in the report by way of comment on the objection at paragraph 76 of the Schedule of Objections, that in effect, since the proposal includes the same number of loading bays in Palmers Green and Winchmore Hill as currently exists, and at this stage the council is not making an order which prohibits the loading or unloading, there is therefore no need to cause a Public Inquiry to be held. That seems to me to be based on a fundamental misunderstanding, and incorrect interpretation, of Regulation 9(3) of the 1996 Regulations. By way of reminder, the wording of Regulation 9(3)(a) says that it applies to an order if:

“its **effect** is to prohibit the loading and unloading of vehicles.....”.

As I understand the draft Traffic Management Order as published with the consultation documents, it will subject to exception for emergency services etc., prevent any vehicles entering the cycle lane during the relevant period. It therefore must follow that, whether or not loading bays continue to exist, if vehicles cannot enter the cycle lane they clearly cannot use the bays because self-evidently to get to the parking bay they need to enter the cycle lane.

Turning to the question of bus services, likewise the provision in Regulation 9(3) (b) says it applies if

“its **effect** is to prohibit or restrict the passage of public service vehicles along.....” the route.

The report makes it plain in paragraphs 5.17 – 5.21 that Arriva have formally objected and expressed serious concerns about narrowness of parts of the carriageway, "major concerns" about the introduction of speed tables, and specifically they object to the removal of bus lanes because of the effect on "predictability of journey times".

Paragraph 5.18 of the report acknowledges additional delays along the corridor.

It is clear that the report as approved does not resolve these objections and as such the Council is obliged to hold a Public Inquiry.

Please confirm that this will now be put in train and that no further work on the scheme will take place until such Inquiry has been held and adjudicated upon. In the absence of such confirmation, it is extremely likely that there will be an application to the courts for an injunction.

Regards,

Terry

Cllr. Terry Neville OBE JP  
Leader of the Conservative Group  
LB Enfield and Member for Grange Ward



---

**From:** Bob Pennyfather (ALN) [mailto: [REDACTED]]  
**Sent:** 24 August 2016 11:05  
**To:** Cllr Terry Neville  
**Cc:** Rory Scanlan  
**Subject:** RE: DRAFT TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT CONSULTATION [SEC=OFFICIAL]

Dear Councillor Neville,

I had hoped to be able to update you further by now, but I can tell you that I met council officers to discuss this scheme and that nothing from that meeting has eased my concerns over the impact on bus services.

I am grateful for your correspondence, which was indeed helpful in my discussions.

Regards

Bob

**Bob Pennyfather**  
Commercial Planning Manager

**Arriva London** | Mob: [REDACTED] | DD: [REDACTED] | E: [REDACTED]

Arriva London, 16 Watsons Road, London, N22 7TZ | [www.arrivalondon.com](http://www.arrivalondon.com)

Arriva – a **DB** company

**From:** Helen Otter **On Behalf Of** Cllr Terry Neville  
**Sent:** 24 August 2016 10:18  
**To:** Cllr Daniel Anderson; Ian Davis; Asmat Hussain  
**Cc:** Cathy Hunnisett; David B Taylor  
**Subject:** FW: Cycle Enfield A105 For approval/amendment [SEC=OFFICIAL]  
**Importance:** High

Classification: OFFICIAL

### Cycle proposals for A105

I shall as a separate exercise be calling in the decision of the Cabinet Member to approve the proposals recently consulted upon.

However I write now because it seems to me that there is, on the face of the report, an error of law occurring in that we have clearly received objections from interested parties about:

- (a) The restriction of loading and unloading of vehicles along this route  
and
- (b) From the relevant bus company about what they see as a restriction of the passage of buses along the route.

Both of these issues are specifically dealt with in Regulation 9(1) of the Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996, which requires the order making authority to cause a Public Inquiry to be held before making an order to which regulation 9(3) applies. The two issues referred to above are both covered by this regulation.

Dealing first with issue of waiting and loading, it is said in the report by way of comment on the objection at paragraph 76 of the Schedule of Objections, that in effect, since the proposal includes the same number of loading bays in Palmers Green and Winchmore Hill as currently exists, and at this stage the council is not making an order which prohibits the loading or unloading, there is therefore no need to cause a Public Inquiry to be held. That seems to me to be based on a fundamental misunderstanding, and incorrect interpretation, of Regulation 9(3) of the 1996 Regulations. By way of reminder, the wording of Regulation 9(3)(a) says that it applies to an order if:

“its **effect** is to prohibit the loading and unloading of vehicles.....”.

As I understand the draft Traffic Management Order as published with the consultation documents, it will subject to exception for emergency services etc., prevent any vehicles entering the cycle lane during the relevant period. It therefore must follow that, whether or not loading bays continue to exist, if vehicles cannot enter the cycle lane they clearly cannot use the bays because self-evidently to get to the parking bay they need to enter the cycle lane.

Turning to the question of bus services, likewise the provision in Regulation 9(3) (b) says it applies if

“its **effect** is to prohibit or restrict the passage of public service vehicles along.....” the route.

The report makes it plain in paragraphs 5.17 – 5.21 that Arriva have formally objected and expressed serious concerns about narrowness of parts of the carriageway, "major concerns" about the introduction of speed tables, and specifically they object to the removal of bus lanes because of the effect on "predictability of journey times".

Paragraph 5.18 of the report acknowledges additional delays along the corridor.

It is clear that the report as approved does not resolve these objections and as such the Council is obliged to hold a Public Inquiry.

Please confirm that this will now be put in train and that no further work on the scheme will take place until such Inquiry has been held and adjudicated upon. In the absence of such confirmation, it is extremely likely that there will be an application to the courts for an injunction.

Regards,

Terry

Cllr. Terry Neville OBE JP  
Leader of the Conservative Group  
LB Enfield and Member for Grange Ward

---

**From:** Helen Otter [mailto: ] **On Behalf Of** Cllr Terry Neville  
**Sent:** 09 August 2016 12:10  
**To:** Bob Pennyfather (ALN); Cllr Terry Neville  
**Cc:** Rory Scanlan  
**Subject:** RE: DRAFT TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT CONSULTATION [SEC=OFFICIAL]

Classification: OFFICIAL

Dear Mr Pennyfather

Thank you for copying me into your company's representations against the A105 Cycle Scheme.

I received from one of my constituents the attached letter which might particularly interest you as it picks up on the issue of the safety of bus passengers. You may want to consider this further in relation to your own representations to the council.

Kind Regards,

Terry

Cllr. Terry Neville OBE JP  
Leader of the Conservative Group  
LB Enfield and Member for Grange Ward

\*\*\*\*\*

Arriva plc Registered in England. Registered no: 347103.

Registered Office: 1 Admiral Way, Doxford International Business Park, Sunderland, SR3 3XP.

The contents of this e-mail are confidential and may be privileged and protected by law and are intended solely for the use of the person to whom they are addressed. If you are not the intended recipient of this message please notify the sender immediately, disclosure of its content to any other person is prohibited and may be unlawful. Please note that any views expressed in this e-mail may be those of the originator and do not necessarily reflect those of this organisation. Copyright in this e-mail and attachment(s) belongs to Arriva plc.

Internet e-mail is not a secure communications medium. Please note this lack of security when responding by e-mail. Accordingly, we give no warranties or assurances about the safety and content of this e-mail and its attachments. Neither Arriva plc nor the sender accepts any responsibility for viruses and it is your responsibility to scan the e-mail and attachments. Any liability arising from any third party acting on any information contained in this e-mail is hereby excluded.

Classification: OFFICIAL



[Follow us on Facebook](#)



[Twitter](#)



<http://www.enfield.gov.uk>

---

Enfield Council is committed to serving the whole borough fairly, delivering excellent services and building strong communities. Opinions expressed in this email are those of the individual and not necessarily those of the London Borough of Enfield. This email and any attachments or files transmitted with it are strictly confidential and intended solely for the named addressee. It may contain privileged and confidential information and if you are not the intended recipient and receive it in error you must not copy, distribute or use the communication in any other way. All traffic handled by the Government Connect Secure Extranet may be subject to recording/and or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.

---

This email has been scanned for viruses but we cannot guarantee that it will be free of viruses or malware. The recipient should perform their own virus checks.



Click [here](#) to report this email as spam.

\*\*\*\*\*

The contents of this e-mail and any attached files are confidential. If you have received this email in error, please notify us immediately at [postmxxxxx@xxx.xxx](mailto:postmxxxxx@xxx.xxx) and remove it from your system. If received in error, please do not use, disseminate, forward, print or copy this email or its content. Transport for London excludes any warranty and any liability as to the quality or accuracy of the contents of this email and any attached files.

Transport for London is a statutory corporation whose principal office is at Windsor House, 42-50 Victoria Street, London, SW1H 0TL. Further information about Transport for London's subsidiary companies can be found on the following link: <http://www.tfl.gov.uk/corporate/about-tfl/>

Although TfL have scanned this email (including attachments) for viruses, recipients are advised to carry out their own virus check before opening any attachments, as TfL accepts no liability for any loss, or damage which may be caused by viruses.

\*\*\*\*\*