

[CALL IN BOWES QN SCHEME- CLLR MARIA ALEXANDROU](#) (10 minutes)

The decision for the Bowes QN scheme has been called in by the Conservative Group

1. The Council's own update leaflet, circulated to all residents in and around the Bowes area does not say the scheme was a success. After an 18-month trial, the best they can say is that **"there are indications that the Bowes LTN is delivering"** on its aims. This is untrue, as the data in the report shows.
2. **On Traffic volumes - FAILED.** For these schemes to work, they must take significant numbers of vehicles off the roads, enough to make residents feel safer, encourage more people to walk and cycle and reduce pollution, noise, CO2 emissions and accidents.

Overall, the reduction in traffic is far too small to achieve any of these objectives, on average only one car fewer every three minutes on the surveyed roads.

This is not surprising as the area was **already low traffic** before the trial.

The traffic data is also unreliable. Data missing from 8 of the 29 roads monitored [28%] is guesswork: The report says **"where possible, assumptions have been made in order to account for these missing data"**.

It is also incoherent with the bus time survey, for example am peak traffic on Brownlow Road increased by 10% where bus delays increased slightly, while on Bounds Green Road traffic fell by 10%, yet here, bus delays increased significantly.
3. **On Cycling - FAILED** The report claims that the scheme has increased cycling by 20% when the data shows it reduced cycling.

The cycling survey over a 2-week period included 18 roads within the QN.

16 of the monitored roads show variations of a similar scale, in the range of -81% and +100%.

But 2 roads show variations of a completely different order of magnitude +2,000% and +8,200%, these are wildly inconsistent.

This data is highly suspect and cannot be used without further investigation and explanation. If the scheme had indeed changed cycling behaviour, a similar trend would be observed on most, if not all roads.

The remaining 16 roads with reasonable looking data show **a decrease in cycling of -1%**.

There were data problems elsewhere, as data was found to be missing on both the A406 Bowes Road and Green Lanes.

Bounds Green Road, bordering the QN area showed a huge **40% reduction in cycling**, but was ignored.
4. **On Walking – NO SURVEY.** Despite being a key objective of the scheme, no survey of walking was done.

There was just one 12-hour sample on only three roads pre and post scheme. There

was no control sample taken. Environmental factors such as weather were not taken into account.

5. **On Pollution and Noise – FAILED** The report admits that the scheme has had no overall effect on either pollution or noise. This could have been anticipated as the change in traffic was so small.
6. **On Speeding – NO IMPACT.** The report (p32) says “analysis of traffic speeds shows that the proposed QN has not had a significant impact on average speeds either within the QN or the wider surrounding highway network”.
The measured reduction of 1mph in average speed is tiny and within the range of uncertainty of data. Traffic speeds were already low on average, only 19mph.
7. **On Accident numbers – FAILED** The report says that the accident rate within the QN increased after the scheme was implemented.
8. **On Bus reliability – FAILED** The Bowes QN report claims bus journey times have improved, (-60% AM, -85%PM), however this is contradicted by the **Green Lanes Priority Scheme report** that indicates buses on the Green Lanes bus routes between 7am and 7pm are operating with “**significant delays to bus times**”. This reveals the detrimental impact of the Bowes scheme on public transport.
9. **On Crime – FAILED** Offences have **increased 8%** across Bowes which is more than the rest of Enfield. Many residents have expressed concerns about rising crime since the QN scheme was implemented.
10. **Clear negative opinions of the QN residents in the consultation- IGNORED**
Residents may be car owners or not, but they are all residents and their views carry equal weight.
People had an opportunity to respond to the consultation, only 28% saw benefits, 50% saw disbenefits, the rest were neutral.
The residents most affected by the scheme, positively or negatively, will be much more likely to respond to the consultation.
The negative impacts of this scheme far outweigh the positive ones, consequently car owners have responded at a higher rate.
The clear **result of the consultation is that residents reject it.**
Yet the report’s author, in contradiction to TFL guidelines, ignores this democratic will of the people, using the assumption that non car owners are less likely to respond to the survey because they don’t own a car. In reality, they responded less because they were less likely to be affected.

11. [The London Ambulance Service](#) warned the Council that delays to ambulances reaching patients in restricted areas could result in death or injury, these warnings were ignored.
12. Legal- The objective to Create healthier streets as set out in the Mayor's Transport Strategy was used to support the scheme. However, this is not allowed as it was not included in the [ETO's Statement of Reasons](#) for the Bowes scheme. Similarly, the [Enfield Healthy Streets Framework policy](#) post-dates the implementation of the Bowes ETO and cannot be applied to support the scheme retrospectively.
13. No prior training was given for officers attending meetings for focus groups with [disabled people](#) and consequently they could not fully understand their needs.

conclusion

1. The evidence in the report proves that the supposed benefits of the scheme do not exist. The report ignores the substantial and **costly disbenefits to local car users and businesses**.
2. The consultation clearly shows that **residents overwhelmingly reject the scheme** which has made the daily lives of many a nightmare.
3. There is no significant decrease in the number of vehicles. The **scheme has not taken cars off the roads**. Instead, traffic in the QN has been **diverted** around the bordering roads making their journey longer. Look at the increase in traffic volumes on Wolves Lane. This scheme increases congestion, pollution and CO2 emissions, working against the climate emergency the Council have declared.
4. No survey was done for **walking**, consequently there is no usable data.
5. The cycling survey shows **cycling in the area has declined**.
6. the report concludes that the impact of this scheme on reducing borough emissions is not provided. It is not known.
7. The scheme has failed in all its objectives, it has not increased active travel, but it has increased congestion, increased emissions, and accidents.
The scheme was never going to work and never will. It must be removed.

Summary (2 minutes)

1. The **main purpose of the scheme** was to significantly reduce the motor traffic in the Bowes area to help the environment and encourage a substantial increase in healthy physical activity like walking and cycling. The data in the report proves it has failed on all counts.
2. **Traffic** within the QN has been **diverted** onto longer journeys around the perimeter roads, there is no useable evidence that it has evaporated.
3. The data shows that the QN has had a negative effect on **Cycling**.
4. No survey was done for **walking**.
5. The **traffic survey data** had to be modified and adjusted making it impossible to draw any firm traffic conclusions.
6. The council have **ignored the negative views** of the vast majority of respondents to the consultation.
7. At the March Environment Scrutiny Meeting, Cllr Caliskan **pre-determined the outcome** of the ETO by confirming it is a political commitment. This explains why she has approved the scheme, despite the fact that it has failed.
8. It is clear that after an 18-month trial, there are no benefits in this disaster of all schemes. There is nothing in this report to suggest keeping the scheme.
9. The data in the report on the Bowes QN clearly proves it has failed in all respects- on traffic, cycling, walking, pollution, accidents and crime. It is your duty as councillors, elected by the residents to serve the residents, to remove the Bowes QN now and end their suffering.