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Executive summary

About the consultation:

Between 27 January and 13 March 2016, we consulted on proposed improvements to pedestrian and cycle facilities on (A10) Great Cambridge Road at its junction with Bury Street, and where it crosses Salmon’s Brook.

We received a total of 51 responses, with 20 responses supportive or partially supportive of the proposals at Salmon’s Brook, and 28 supportive or partially supportive of the proposals at the Bury Street junction. The main concerns of respondents in respect of both sets of proposals included a possible increase in congestion and, consequently, emissions, and the potential for conflict between pedestrians and cyclists using shared-use pathways.

Conclusion and next steps:

After considering all responses, we intend to proceed with the proposals as set out in the consultation documents, with the following addition:

Great Cambridge Road/Bury Street junction

The consultation drew our attention to an issue with the layout of the pedestrian crossing and traffic island on Cambridge Terrace. The spacing between the two islands provides the opportunity for vehicles approaching the junction from Bury Street to avoid queuing to turn right onto the Great Cambridge Road at the junction. Instead, they can travel straight ahead onto Cambridge Terrace and use the space between the two islands as a U-turn before turning left onto the Great Cambridge Road – the approach from Cambridge Terrace being less busy than Bury Street.

The area is heavily used by children who often cross in between stationary traffic and are at risk from vehicles making unexpected manoeuvres.

To prevent this practice, we will extend the island so that it joins the pedestrian crossing, thereby closing the gap between the two.

Next steps

Subject to further investigations and design work, we plan to start construction in winter 2016/17.
1 Background

The Mini-Hollands programme aims to encourage more people to cycle more safely and more often, whilst providing better streets and places for everyone.

We are working in partnership with Enfield Council on Cycle Enfield, which is funded through our Mini-Hollands programme. Enfield Council is proposing a network of Quietways and Greenways across the borough, some of which cross (A10) Great Cambridge Road, which forms part of the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN). TfL is responsible for any proposed changes that affect the TLRN.

2 Introduction

We invited the public and stakeholders to take part in a public consultation on proposals to make changes to (A10) Great Cambridge Road at its junction with Bury Street and where it crosses Salmon’s Brook. They were able to express their views using the TfL consultation tool online, via email or by post.

2.1 Purpose of the planned changes

Our proposals aim to address gaps in cycling routes between the east and west of the borough, by enhancing existing facilities to benefit both cyclists and pedestrians. We want to make provision to accommodate the predicted increase in the number of cyclists along the route.

We proposed the following changes:

**Great Cambridge Road/Bury Street Junction**

- Widen the existing crossing on the southern arm of Great Cambridge Road to provide more space for pedestrians and cyclists
- Upgrade the existing pedestrian crossing on Cambridge Terrace to a 'Toucan' crossing, for use by cyclists and pedestrians
- 'Countdown' facilities, which indicate the time available for pedestrians and cyclists to safely use the crossing
- Dropped kerbs and tactile paving on the east and west pavements, and the central reservation, for safety and accessibility
- Three new shared-use footways for pedestrians and cyclists, to link the widened crossings to a proposed Greenway
Great Cambridge Road/Salmon’s Brook crossing

- Install a new staggered (two-stage), 4 metre wide ‘Toucan’ crossing across Great Cambridge Road. Toucan crossings can be used by pedestrians and cyclists
- ‘Countdown’ facilities, which indicate the time available for pedestrians and cyclists to safely use the crossing
- Dropped kerbs and tactile paving on the north-west and south-east pavements, and the central reservation, for safety and accessibility
- Create two new shared-use footways for pedestrians and cyclists, to link the Toucan crossing with the proposed Enfield Town to Meridian Water Quietway
- Remove 165 metres of vegetation from the central reservation to make space for the crossing and to improve visibility for pedestrians, cyclists and motorists

2.2 Location map

- Yellow: Great Cambridge Road/Bury Street Junction
- Red: Great Cambridge Road/Salmon’s Brook crossing
2.3 Map of the proposed scheme

A10 Great Cambridge Road / Bury Street
Proposed crossing modifications

- Upgrade the existing pedestrian crossing
- Greenway route in green area to be designed by LB of Enfield
- Create new shared-use footways
- Install dropped kerbs and tactile paving
- Create new shared-use footways
- Install dropped kerbs and tactile paving

Key:
- Existing footway or traffic island
- Existing road markings
- Existing kerb line removed
- Existing tree
- Existing tactile paving
- New footway or traffic island
- New signalised pedestrian crossing
- New shared-use space for pedestrians and cyclists
- New road markings
- New bollard
- New tactile paving
- The Greenway
3 The consultation

We consulted on the proposals from 27 January to 13 March 2016.

The potential outcomes of the consultation were:

- We decide the consultation raises no issues that should prevent us from proceeding with the scheme as originally planned
- We modify the scheme in response to issues raised in consultation
- We abandon the scheme as a result of issues raised in the consultation

The objectives of the consultation were:

- To give stakeholders and the public easily-understandable information about the proposals and allow them to respond
- To understand the level of support or opposition towards the proposals
- To understand any issues that might affect the proposal of which we were not previously aware
- To understand concerns and objections
- To allow respondents to make suggestions

3.1 Who we consulted

The consultation intended to seek the views of a range of different groups potentially affected by or interested in the proposals. Those we consulted included:

- Local residents and businesses
- Local stakeholders, including the London Borough of Enfield, local politicians and local interest groups
- Local emergency services
- Cycling and road user representative bodies
- Other road user groups

A list of the stakeholders we consulted is shown in Appendix D. A summary of their responses is given in Section 4.4.

3.2 Consultation material, distribution and publicity

We sent a letter and map describing the proposals to 10,666 addresses within a 400 metre radius of either junction. A copy of this letter is shown in Appendix B and a map of the distribution area can be found in Appendix C.

We also an email sent to 93 stakeholder contacts. A list of the groups consulted is shown as Appendix D.
The consultation invited participants to comment on the proposed changes. There were two closed and two open questions, as listed below:

1. Do you support the proposed changes on (A10) Great Cambridge Road at its junction with Bury Street?
   - Support
   - Partially support
   - No opinion
   - Not sure
   - Don’t support

2. Do you have any comments on the proposed changes on (A10) Great Cambridge Road at its junction with Bury Street?

3. Do you support the proposed changes on (A10) Great Cambridge Road where it crosses Salmon's Brook?
   - Support
   - Partially support
   - No opinion
   - Not sure
   - Don’t support

4. Do you have any comments on the proposed changes on (A10) Great Cambridge Road where it crosses Salmon's Brook?

Participants were invited to respond in the following ways:

- Online survey at consultations.tfl.gov.uk/cycling/a10-salmons-brook-bury-street
- Emailing consultations@tfl.gov.uk
- Post
4 Overview of consultation responses

4.1 About the responses

We received 51 responses to the consultation. 34 were submitted online, 13 were received by email and four were received by post. Three responses were from stakeholder groups and 48 were from members of the public. Please see section 4.5 for more information about stakeholder responses.

Postcode analysis

Of the 36 respondents who supplied a postcode, 24 were from the local EN1 postcode area. The remainder were spread across Greater London and the UK.

4.2 Support level for proposed changes on (A10) Great Cambridge Road at its junction with Bury Street, and where it crosses Salmon's Brook

The first closed question asked ‘Do you support the proposed changes on (A10) Great Cambridge Road at its junction with Bury Street?’

The second closed question asked ‘Do you support the proposed changes on (A10) Great Cambridge Road where it crosses Salmon’s Brook?’

Table 1: Answers received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you support the proposed scheme?</th>
<th>Question 1: Bury Street</th>
<th>Question 3: Salmon’s Brook</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially support</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t support</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not answered</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1: Pie chart to show support of Bury Street proposals

**Bury Street/Great Cambridge Road: Do you support the proposed changes?**

- **Yes**: 18
- **Partially**: 17
- **No**: 10
- **No Opinion**: 2

Figure 2: Pie chart to show support of Salmon’s Brook proposals

**Salmon's Brook: Do you support the proposed changes?**

- **Yes**: 13
- **Partially**: 22
- **Not Sure**: 2
- **No**: 7
- **No Opinion**: 1
4.3 Summary of overall comments received for proposed changes on (A10) Great Cambridge Road at its junction with Bury Street

There were 51 unique respondents. 35 responded to the second question, and left a comment about this scheme.

The following is a summary of the most popular comment themes, with a count indicating how often it was raised. A comment theme is listed in this report if it was mentioned by three or more respondents.

**Unnecessary proposal and a waste of resources:** 12 respondents suggested that the scheme was a waste of resources, or that the funds available would be better spent elsewhere.

**Shared use pathway:** Seven respondents raised concerns regarding the potential for conflict between pedestrians and cyclists as a result of the shared use pathways. It was also noted that the central pedestrian island could become overcrowded during busy periods.

**Impact on traffic/congestion:** Seven responses contained concerns about traffic management, and all seven comments suggested that the scheme would lead to increased congestion. Two further comments suggested that the scheme would lead to increased pollution and emissions.

**Design of Bury Street crossing:** Three respondents were unsupportive of the concept of the four stage crossing, suggesting that the crossing would be too slow for cyclists.

**Safety:** Opinions were divided on the safety of the proposed changes. Three respondents suggested that the scheme would improve safety for all users, yet two other respondents believed the scheme did not address safety risks or increase the safety of pedestrians.

4.4 Summary of overall comments received for proposed changes on (A10) Great Cambridge Road where it crosses Salmon's Brook

40 of the 51 unique respondents responded to the fourth question and left a comment about this scheme.

The following is a summary of the most popular comment themes, with a count indicating how often it was raised. A comment theme is listed in this report if it was mentioned by three or more respondents.

**Impact on traffic/congestion:** All 16 comments regarding traffic management suggested that the scheme would lead to increased congestion or would impede traffic flow. Three of
these comments also suggested that there would be an increase in pollution and emissions as a result of the scheme.

**Unnecessary proposal and a waste of resources:** 13 respondents were unsupportive of the proposed scheme, stating it was unnecessary or that it was a waste of the money available. Four respondents suggested that the crossing was unnecessary due to its close proximity to existing crossings, and a further three believed that cyclists would not use the proposed route.

**Shared use pathways:** Six respondents had concerns with the implementation of shared use pathways. All felt that they are dangerous, due to potential conflicts between cyclists and pedestrians.

**Ecological concerns:** Five respondents raised concerns about the removal of vegetation, citing the importance of hedgerows for nature and as a noise barrier.

**Safety:** Three comments expressed concerns with vehicle speeds and stopping distances in the vicinity of the crossing. Three comments suggested that implementing an additional set of traffic lights was dangerous. A further three responses were concerned with the lack of visibility caused by overgrown hedgerows, particularly on the south side of the A10. However, two respondents were in support of the scheme due to the opinion that it would make crossing the A10 easier and safer for all users.

### 4.5 Summary of responses from stakeholder groups and businesses

**Confederation of Passenger Transport**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bury Street Responses</th>
<th>Salmon’s Brook Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The organisation did not answer the closed question or provide any comments.</td>
<td>• The organisation was undecided about their support for the scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Felt that the proposed scheme would not be heavily used by cyclists; therefore the impacts to other road users would need to be closely examined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Suggested that the proposals would create a detrimental environmental impact as the traffic flow would be impeded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Raised concerns about the disruption to the road network whilst the scheme was being constructed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Suggested constructing a ramped bridge over A10 Great Cambridge Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Federation of Enfield Residents & Allied Associations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bury Street Responses</th>
<th>Salmon's Brook Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The organisation was supportive of the scheme, however did not provide any further comments</td>
<td>• The organisation was unsupportive of the scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Suggested that the positioning of the crossing was dangerous and unnecessary, due to the close proximity of the Church Street and Bury Street junctions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Concerned that the traffic signals will be low and less visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Suggested making a short stretch of cycle path to either the Church Street or Bury Street junction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### London Fire Brigade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bury Street Responses</th>
<th>Salmon's Brook Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The organisation had no opinion on the proposed scheme</td>
<td>• The organisation had no opinion on the proposed scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Stated that the scheme would not impact on fire brigade attendance times</td>
<td>• Stated that the scheme would not impact on fire brigade attendance times</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5 Conclusion and next steps

After considering all responses, we intend to proceed with the proposals as set out in the consultation documents, with the following addition:

**Great Cambridge Road/Bury Street Junction**

The consultation drew our attention to an issue with the layout of the pedestrian crossing and traffic island on Cambridge Terrace. The spacing between the two islands provides the opportunity for vehicles approaching the junction from Bury Street to avoid queuing to turn right onto the Great Cambridge Road at the junction. Instead, they can travel straight ahead onto Cambridge Terrace and use the space between the two islands as a U-turn before turning left onto the Great Cambridge Road – the approach from Cambridge Terrace being less busy than Bury Street.

The area is heavily used by children who often cross in between stationary traffic and are at risk from vehicles making unexpected manoeuvres.

To prevent this practice, we will extend the island so that it joins the pedestrian crossing, thereby closing the gap between the two.

**Next steps**

Subject to further investigations and design work, we plan to start construction in winter 2016/17.

**Response to issues raised**

Our response to issues commonly raised in consultation is available in Appendix A.
Appendix A – TfL response to issues commonly raised

Bury Street

Crossing facilities

Not in favour of shared space
At this particular location, it is not possible to provide a segregated cycle path due to a lack of space. The shared section of the pavement will be clearly marked for both pedestrians and cyclists.

Evidence shows that the number of unexpected interactions and potential conflicts is lower in shared environments than on other paths separated between users. Cyclists are likely to travel more slowly on shared paths compared to dedicated cycle facilities.

Unnecessary proposal and a waste of resources
Our proposals aim to address gaps in cycling routes between the east and west of the borough, by enhancing existing facilities to benefit both cyclists and pedestrians. We are satisfied that the scheme has sufficient benefits for more vulnerable road users, including pedestrians.

Junction layout
We will review the central road markings on A10 Great Cambridge Road around the junction to determine whether any amendments are required to ensure the junction operates effectively. We will make any necessary amendments before the upgraded crossings are operational.

Salmon’s Brook

Crossing facilities

Alternatives to a pedestrian crossing
Installing a ramped bridge instead of a Toucan crossing would require us to acquire land, resulting in a significant and unjustifiable increase in costs. Ramped bridges are also not a convenient option for mobility impaired pedestrians and those with pushchairs.

Not in favour of shared space
At this particular location, it is not possible to provide a segregated cycle path due to a lack of space. The shared section of the pavement will be clearly marked for both pedestrians and cyclists.
A Toucan crossing coupled with shared use footways is an increasingly common layout and there are a number of well-functioning examples across London.

**Ecological concerns**
We need to remove some bushes to install the crossing and related signal equipment. We will ensure that only the minimum amount of vegetation required is removed and will take advice from our arboricultural specialist on how to minimise any impact on wildlife living in the vegetation.

**Safety**

**Speed cameras**
The location of the crossing on A10 Great Cambridge Road does not meet the Department for Transport’s criterion for installing a speed camera, which requires Police agreement. In order to justify the need for a speed camera at a particular location, collision data from a minimum period (at least three years) must be analysed and demonstrate that the location is not operating safely.

**Signage**
We will install signage and road markings to alert motorists to the new crossing on the approach to it.

We will also install a temporary sign to make drivers aware of the new crossing layout, before the toucan crossing is opened for use.

**Allotment entrance / visibility**
The vehicle entrance to the allotment site on the southbound carriageway will remain where it is. The crossing will have no impact on the visibility down the cycle track from inside a vehicle exiting the allotment site. The shared space to the north of the allotment site should improve awareness of pedestrians and cyclists crossing.

**Traffic impact**

**Impact on traffic/congestion**
Detailed modelling has been carried out to analyse the impact of the proposed toucan crossing on traffic flow on the A10 Great Cambridge Road. The results have predicted a negligible increase in journey times for motor traffic, even if the pedestrian crossing is 100% utilised.
29 January 2016

Dear Sir/Madam,

Have your say on proposed changes on (A10) Great Cambridge Road at its junction with Bury Street and where it crosses Salmon's Brook

We are working in partnership with Enfield Council on Cycle Enfield, which is funded through our Mini-Hollands programme. Enfield Council is proposing a network of Quietways and Greenways across the borough, some of which cross (A10) Great Cambridge Road which forms part of the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN). TfL is responsible for any proposed changes that affect the TLRN.

Our proposals aim to address the gaps in cycle routes between the east and west of the borough, enhance existing facilities to benefit pedestrians and cyclists and accommodate the predicted increase in the number of cyclists along the route.

The enclosed consultation drawings show the proposed changes at each of the following locations on Great Cambridge Road:

- at its junction with Bury Street, and
- where it crosses Salmon’s Brook

Note: the numbered descriptions below correspond with the numbered labels on each consultation drawing.

Great Cambridge Road/Bury Street junction

We propose to:

1. **Widen the existing crossing** on the southern arm of Great Cambridge Road to provide more space for pedestrians and cyclists

2. **Upgrade the existing pedestrian crossing on Cambridge Terrace to a Toucan crossing** for use by cyclists and pedestrians, and widen the central island to provide more space. Install “countdown” facilities, which indicate the time available for pedestrians and cyclists to safely use the crossing

3. **Install dropped kerbs and tactile paving** on the east and west pavements, and the central reservation, for safety and accessibility

4. **Create three new shared-use footways** for pedestrians and cyclists, to link the widened crossings to a proposed Greenway
Great Cambridge Road/Salmon's Brook crossing

We propose to:

1. **Install a new staggered (two-stage), 4 metre wide Toucan crossing** across Great Cambridge Road. Toucan crossings can be used by pedestrians and cyclists

2. **Install “countdown” facilities**, which indicate the time available for pedestrians and cyclists to safely use the crossing

3. **Install dropped kerbs and tactile paving** on the north-west and south-east pavements, and the central reservation, for safety and accessibility

4. **Create two new shared-use footways** for pedestrians and cyclists, to link the Toucan crossing with the proposed Enfield Town to Meridian Water Quietway

5. **Remove 165 metres of vegetation from the central reservation** to make space for the crossing and to improve visibility for pedestrians, cyclists and motorists.

   We may also need to remove the tree situated on the nearside of the north-eastbound carriageway, which would be positioned immediately before the proposed new Toucan crossing. This would help to improve visibility for pedestrians waiting at the crossing. If it were removed, we would investigate suitable alternative locations for tree planting.

Our initial traffic modelling assessments indicate that the proposed changes can be accommodated without undue delay to any road user.

**How to comment on the proposals**

**Website** – For further information or to let us know your views, please visit our website [https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/cycling/a10-salmons-brook-bury-street](https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/cycling/a10-salmons-brook-bury-street)

**Email** – Send to consultations@tfl.gov.uk

When responding by email, please add ‘Mini-Hollands – A10 Salmon/Bury’ as the subject

**Letter** – Write to us at FREEPOST TFL CONSULTATIONS, Mini-Hollands – A10 Salmon/Bury

**The consultation will close on Sunday, 13 March 2016.**

**Related consultations**

We are also consulting on proposed changes further north along Great Cambridge Road, near to Turkey Brook. For more information, please visit: [https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/cycling/a10-turkey-brook](https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/cycling/a10-turkey-brook)

**Further information**

To learn more about the Mini-Hollands programme, please visit [www.tfl.gov.uk/cycle-mini-hollands](http://www.tfl.gov.uk/cycle-mini-hollands)

For more information on Cycle Enfield, please visit [www.cycleenfield.co.uk](http://www.cycleenfield.co.uk)
Please contact us to request any of the enclosed material in large print, braille or another language.

Subject to the outcome of the consultation, construction at both locations is scheduled to start in late autumn 2016.

Yours faithfully

Celine Turner
Consultation Team, Transport for London
Appendix C – Letter distribution area

Bury Street and Salmon's Brook proposals
## Appendix D – List of stakeholders consulted

### Elected Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David Burrows MP</td>
<td>Darren Johnson AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Osamor MP</td>
<td>Joanne McCartney AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan Ryan MP</td>
<td>Caroline Pidgeon AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick deBois</td>
<td>Richard Tracey AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gareth Bacon AM</td>
<td>Valerie Shawcross AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincenzo Coppola AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ward Councillors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chris Bond</td>
<td>Daniel Anderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derek Levy</td>
<td>Dino Lemonides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine Chibah</td>
<td>Nick Dines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Fallart</td>
<td>Toby Simon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicki Pite</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Local Authorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Enfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Brent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Waltham Forest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Police and Health Authorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London Ambulance Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Fire Brigade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Police Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Middlesex Hospital Patients Forum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Local Interest Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alma Residents Association Enfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enfield Safer Transport Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enfield Borough Over-50’s Forum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other stakeholder Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action for Deafness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action on Hearing Loss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age UK Enfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance of British Drivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaign for Better Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing Perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Transport Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confederation of Passenger Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle Enfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CycleFox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHI Freight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Rights UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHI Freight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Rights UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Cab Driver’s Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Cycling Campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Cycling Campaign (Enfield)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Travel Watch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Visual Impairment Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTDA (Licensed Taxi Driver’s Association)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mencap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metroline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle Action Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Autistic Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Hire Board</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enfield Cycling Campaign</th>
<th>RAC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enfield Disability Action</td>
<td>RNIB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enfield Society</td>
<td>Road Haulage Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enfield Vision</td>
<td>Royal London Society for Blind People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight Transport Association</td>
<td>Scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Inclusion</td>
<td>Smart Move Cars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go Ahead</td>
<td>Sustrans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guide Dogs</td>
<td>The Builders Merchant Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Loss</td>
<td>The Old Enfield Charitable Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAM Driving Road Safety</td>
<td>Transport for All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion London</td>
<td>Trailblazers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Civil Engineers London</td>
<td>Unite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Advanced Motorists</td>
<td>University of Westminster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard Cheshire Disability</td>
<td>Wheels for Wellbeing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCH Clearnet</td>
<td>Whizz Kidz Disabled Children's Charity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensed Private Hire Car Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ends