

Exempt Information

Local Government Act 1972 Schedule 12A

Part 1: Descriptions of Exempt Information

1. Information relating to any individual.
2. Information which is likely to reveal the identity of an individual.
3. Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any person (including the authority holding that information).
4. Information relating to any consultations or negotiations or contemplated consultations or negotiations in connection with any labour relations matter arising between the authority or a Minister of the Crown and employees of, or office holders under, the authority.
5. Information in respect of which a claim to legal professional privilege could be maintained in legal proceedings.
6. Information which reveals that the authority proposes -
 - (a) To give under any enactment a notice under or by virtue of which requirements are imposed on a person; or
 - (b) To make an order or direction under any enactment.
7. Information relating to any action taken or to be taken in connection with the prevention, investigation, or prosecution of crime.

Note: It is insufficient to simply identify a category of exemption, you must also conduct a public interest test on the basis specified in the Act as follows:

Information falling within categories 1-7 is exempt if and so long as in all the circumstances of the case the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

Confidential Decisions

1. The decision contains information provided by a Government department on a non disclosure basis
2. There is a Court order against disclosure

Report for: Head of Service for Highways and Parking following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Resident Services and Tackling Inequality

Title: B106 Durnsford Road, Albert Road and Alexandra Park Road - Bus Priority Scheme

Report authorised by: Simi Shah, Group Engineer Traffic and Parking Projects
Simi.Shah@haringey.gov.uk

Report Author: Yavuz Kalayci - Streetspace Manager
Yavuz.Kalayci@haringey.gov.uk

Syed Ahmed - Engineer Traffic & Parking
Syed.Ahmed@haringey.gov.uk

Ward(s) affected: Bounds Green, Alexandra Park and Fortis Green

**Report for Key/
Non-Key Decision: Non-Key Decision**

1 Describe the issue under consideration

1.1 To determine if the proposed bus lanes and upgraded crossings should proceed to statutory consultation, following an informal public consultation exercise.

2 Cabinet Member Introduction

2.1 N/A

3 Recommendations

The Head of Highways and Parking following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Resident Services and Tackling Inequality is asked to:

3.1 Consider all feedback received regarding the informal public consultation carried out from 03 November to 28 November 2025 set out in appendix E, on the proposals outlined in appendix B, together with officers' views regarding that feedback set out in section 10 of this report.

3.2 Not approve progressing the proposals outlined in appendix B/undertake a statutory consultation regarding those proposals.

4 Reasons for decision

4.1 The Council as a local authority has a duty under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to manage traffic and promote road safety, whilst balancing these responsibilities with the views and concerns of the local community. Following the informal public consultation, the Council has carefully considered all feedback received. Given the significant level of negative feedback from the local community including in relation to access to premises/effect on the amenities in the area, the recommendation is to not proceed the full proposals to statutory consultation.

- 4.2 The decision does not result in a contract being awarded or expenditure in excess of £500,000 being incurred nor any virements, so it is not a key decision for that reason.
- 4.3 The recommendation decision is not to proceed to statutory consultation and if approved will therefore not result in any impact on communities living or working in the Bounds Green, Alexandra Park and Fortis Green wards because substantial public interest/significant social, economic or environmental risk will not arise if the proposals are not implemented and so will not be a key decision.

5 Alternative options considered

- 5.1 None

6 Background Information

- 6.1 Strategic Bus Analysis was carried out by Transport for London (TfL) and identified an irregular bus network pattern on the B106 corridor from Bounds Green Road junction to Colney Hatch Lane junction. Bus Speeds on this road is in the bottom 25% of speeds for buses in Outer London, underlining that the corridor has one of the least reliable journey times in comparison to the rest of London. There are currently no bus lanes present on the B106 corridor.
- 6.2 The council commissioned consultants Project Centre Limited (PCL) to carry out a feasibility study and arrive at potential solutions which would help reduce delays to bus services. The study considered the following:
1. Observed traffic conditions and bus journey times
 2. Post LTN Bounds Green Traffic data
 3. I-bus data received from TfL on journey times between bus stops
 4. Road Traffic Collision data
- 6.3 PCL undertook site visits for both the morning peak (07:00–08:00) and afternoon peak (15:30–16:30) to observe existing traffic conditions, measure road widths, and record bus journey times. In the morning peak, queues were noted at the signalised junctions of Alexandra Park Road/Colney Hatch Lane and Durnsford Road/Bounds Green Road, though traffic along the study section generally flowed smoothly with minimal obstruction from parking or loading activities. In contrast, the afternoon peak revealed severe congestion northbound from St Andrew's Church to Durnsford Road/Bounds Green Road, with queues extending approximately 1.6 km.
- 6.3.1 Bus journey times were recorded for Routes 102 and 299, which serve the full corridor. During the morning peak, average journey times were 8 minutes northbound and 9.5 minutes southbound, though delays were observed near Rosebery Road bus stop due to loading and unloading activities. In the afternoon school peak period, average journey times increased significantly to 16.5 minutes northbound and 12 minutes southbound, with a maximum of 20 minutes recorded for northbound services. The extended travel times were primarily caused by heavy congestion, while parking before and after bus stops created additional difficulties for buses accessing and departing stops. Overall, traffic congestion was notably worse in the afternoon peak, particularly northbound, and bus journey times deteriorated sharply during afternoon school peak hours.
- 6.4 I-Bus data use GPS tracking to provide real-time and historical bus journey times, helping assess delays and reliability impacts of traffic schemes based on actual

conditions. I-Bus data for bus routes 102, 184, and 299 along the study corridor, was analysed with records divided by bus stop sections. Route 299 was identified as the most delayed service, particularly along parallel sections Woodfield Way (GD) to Bounds Green (BN) and Bounds Green (BB) to Woodfield Way (GZ) bus stops, where consistent delays occurred throughout the day. Northbound delays averaged 50 seconds during the evening peak (16:00–19:00), while southbound delays averaged 27 seconds in the early morning (05:00–07:00).

- 6.5 Traffic count data collected in early 2023 (post Bounds Green LTN being implemented) on Durnsford Road between Woodfield Way and Wroxham Gardens recorded an average daily traffic volume exceeding 12,000 vehicles, with over 6,700 northbound and nearly 6,000 southbound. Peak flows were recorded at more than 800 vehicles during both the morning and afternoon peak periods.
- 6.6 The council undertook a parking beat survey within the study area and 50m into adjacent side roads. The survey assessed parking occupancy across three time periods: 7am–7pm, 7am–1pm, and 1pm–7pm. Findings indicated that the section of Alexandra Park Road between Colney Hatch Lane and Albert Road showed a mix of low and high occupancy. The stretch from Albert Road/Alexandra Park Road junction to Durnsford Road/Crescent Rise junction recorded consistently low occupancy, while the section of Durnsford Road from Crescent Rise to Bounds Green Road generally exhibited low occupancy overall. However, disabled parking bays and resident permit holder spaces in this area demonstrated high occupancy levels.

7 Proposals

- 7.1 The study has identified three sections of bus lanes being proposed along the B106 corridor (see appendix B) to help reduce bus delays, improve service reliability, and upgrade pedestrian crossings to enhance safety. The proposed bus lanes would operate between 4:00pm and 7:00pm.
- 7.2 New Bus Lane – Alexandra Park Road westbound towards Colney Hatch Lane (Operating Mon to Sat, 4pm to 7pm)
- 7.2.1 Proposed new bus lane on Alexandra Park Road between Curzon Road and Colney Hatch Lane (105m).
- This will mean the loss of 20 parking spaces located opposite the proposed bus lane
 - 13 parking spaces located in the bus lane will not be available during the operational hours of the bus lane.
- 7.3 New Bus Lanes – Eastbound towards Bounds Green Road (Operating Mon- Sat, 4pm to 7pm).
- 7.3.1 Proposed new bus lane on Albert Road and Durnsford Road between Clifton Road and No.84 Durnsford Road (495m).
- This will mean the loss of 25 parking spaces located opposite the proposed bus lane
 - 59 parking spaces located in the bus lane will not be available during the operational hours of the bus lane.

- 7.3.2 Propose new bus lane on Durnsford Road between Woodfield Way and Bounds Green Road (110m).
- This will mean the loss of 6 resident permit bays between Woodfield Way and Bounds Green Road
 - 5 parking spaces located in the bus lane will not be available during the operational hours of the bus lane.
 - 4 general disabled parking bays will be moved to the adjacent footway.
- 7.4 To improve pedestrian safety, it is proposed that four pedestrian crossings (two zebra crossings and two informal crossings) be upgraded to signalised pedestrian crossings and one informal crossing to be upgraded to a zebra crossing.
- Two informal crossings located near junctions with Wroxham Gardens and Muswell Avenue will be upgraded to signalised pedestrian crossings (push button to activate green man). Upgrading the crossing near Muswell Avenue will result in a loss of 6 parking spaces.
 - Two zebra crossings located near junction with St Regis Close and west of Sunshine Garden Centre to be upgraded to signalised pedestrian crossings.
 - The informal crossing near Grasmere Road will be upgraded to a zebra crossing.
- 7.4.1 The introduction of a new bus lane will create an additional traffic lane, which would reduce pedestrian visibility at the current zebra crossing locations. Converting the zebra crossings to signalised crossings will provide pedestrians with dedicated green time, ensure drivers are required to stop, and offer a safer crossing environment in response to the new proposed traffic layout.
- ## 8 Consultation Process
- 8.1 Public consultation documents were distributed to properties in the vicinity of the proposals on 3 November 2025 which included the whole section of B106 and approximately 50m into each side road. Appendix A contains a copy of the consultation letter and questionnaire, appendix B includes the consultation plans, and appendix C sets out the consultation boundary.
- 8.2 Public consultation documents were also distributed to all ward councillors on 3 November 2025. Whilst the ward councillors had seen the proposals at draft stage and provided comments, unfortunately the internal process was missed in that the full consultation documents were not shared with them for their comments in advance of them being sent to the public.
- 8.3 Posters with links to the consultation and questionnaire were displayed on lamp columns throughout the B106 corridor.
- 8.4 In addition, the consultation documents were published on the council's website to ensure wider accessibility.
- 8.5 An error in the consultation plan recorded the property address as No. 68 Durnsford Road, based on information from Google Maps. However, this proved inconsistent, and feedback received during the consultation confirmed that the correct address is No. 84 Durnsford Road.
- 8.6 A total of 2,272 responses were received through the consultation process

9 Consultation Summary

9.1 The full consultation report from which the results were extracted, is attached as appendix E. Below are the summarised results:

9.2 How would you describe your connection to the London Borough of Haringey?

		Count	%
Resident or Business	Resident	2079	92%
	Business	64	3%
	Community	33	1%
	Other / not-local	96	4%
	Total	2272	100%

9.3 Do you support introducing bus lanes to improve bus journeys and reliability (tick only one).

		Count	%
Support putting in bus lanes?	Yes	426	19%
	No	1846	81%
	Total	2272	100%

9.4 Bus Lane – Westbound towards Colney Hatch Lane (Operating Mon to Sat, 4pm to 7pm)

9.4.1 Do you support the proposed bus lane on Alexandra Park Road between Curzon Road and Colney Hatch Lane? This will operate Monday -Saturday 4pm to 7pm (tick only one). This will mean the loss of 20 parking spaces located opposite the proposed bus lane and 13 spaces in the bus lane will **not** be available when the bus lane is operational.

		Count	%
Bus lane Curzon Rd - Colney Hatch Lane?	Yes	330	15%
	No	1873	82%
	Don't know	69	3%
	Total	2272	100%

9.4.2 The table below summarises the 1,966 comments grouped into recurring themes that reflect the reasons most respondents gave for their choices. It highlights the top five negative themes identified from the feedback:

#	Theme	No. of Comments
---	-------	-----------------

1	Loss of parking / displaced parking to side streets	1,164
2	Increased congestion / traffic and will not alleviate it	1,163
3	Road too narrow / unsafe layout (pinch points, three lanes)	578
4	Impact on local businesses / schools / church / park	444
5	Prefer alternatives (signals/junction/A406 fixes)	330

9.4.3 The table below highlights the most frequently mentioned positive theme for the above question:

#	Positive Theme	No. of Comments
1	Encourage public transport / fewer cars / environmental benefits	120

9.5 Bus Lane – Eastbound towards Bounds Green Road (Operating Mon- Sat, 4pm to 7pm)

9.5.1 Do you support the proposed bus lane between Clifton Road to No.84 Dunsford Road? (tick only one). This will mean the loss of 25 parking spaces, and 59 spaces will **not** being available in the bus lane during the operational times.

		Count	%
Bus lane Clifton Rd up to 68 Durnsford Rd?	Yes	316	14%
	No	1879	83%
	Don't know	77	3%
	Total	2272	100%

9.5.2 The table below summarises the 1,908 comments grouped into recurring themes that reflect the reasons most respondents gave for their choices. It highlights the top five negative themes identified from the feedback:

#	Theme	No. of Comments
1	Impact on local businesses / schools / church / park	979
2	Loss of parking / displaced parking to side streets	827
3	Increased congestion / traffic and will not alleviate it	717
4	Prefer alternatives (signals/junction/A406 fixes)	315
5	Safety concerns for pedestrians/cyclists/children	174

9.5.3 The table below highlights the most frequently mentioned positive theme for the above question:

#	Positive Theme	No. of Comments
1	Encourage public transport / fewer cars / environmental benefits	98

9.5.4 Do you support the proposed bus lane between Woodfield Way and Bounds Green Road? (tick only one). This will mean the loss of 6 parking spaces, and 5 spaces will **not** being available in the bus lane during the operational times. In addition, 4 general disabled bays being repositioned to the adjacent footway.

	Count	%
Bus lane Woodfield Way -		
Yes	414	18%
Bounds Green Rd?		
No	1715	75%
Don't know	143	6%
Total	2272	100%

9.5.5 The table below summarises the 1,773 comments grouped into recurring themes that reflect the reasons most respondents gave for their choices. It highlights the top five negative themes identified from the feedback:

#	Theme	No. of Comments
1	Increased congestion / traffic and will not alleviate it	688
2	Impact on local businesses / schools / church / park	650
3	Loss of parking / displaced parking to side streets	570

4	Prefer alternatives (signals/junction/A406 fixes)	342
5	Pollution / air quality / noise will worsen	133

9.5.6 The table below highlights the most frequently mentioned positive theme for the above question:

#	Positive Theme	No. of Comments
1	Encourage public transport / fewer cars / environmental benefits	84

9.6 Do you support the informal pedestrian crossing near Wroxham Gardens being upgraded to signalised pedestrian crossing? (tick only one).

		Count	%
Signalise Wroxham Gdns ped crossing?	Yes	938	41%
	No	1268	56%
	D/K	66	3%
	Total	2272	100%

9.7 Do you support the informal pedestrian crossing near Muswell Avenue being upgraded to signalised crossings and will result in a loss of 6 parking spaces? (tick only one).

		Count	%
Signalise Muswell Ave ped crossing?	Yes	537	24%
	No	1683	74%
	D/K	52	2%
	Total	2272	100%

9.8 Do you support the zebra crossing near St Regis Close being upgraded to signalised pedestrian crossings? (tick only one).

		Count	%
Upgrade Zebra (St Regis Cl) to signalised crossing?	Yes	688	30%
	No	1507	66%
	D/K	77	3%
	Total	2272	100%

9.9 Do you support the zebra crossings west of Sunshine Garden Centre being upgraded to signalised pedestrian crossings? (tick only one)

		Count	%
Upgrade zebra (Sunshine Gdn) to signalised crossing?	Yes	842	37%
	No	1379	61%
	D/K	50	2%
	Total	2271	100%

9.10 Do you support the informal pedestrian crossing near Grasmere Road being upgraded to a zebra crossing? (tick only one).

		Count	%
Upgrade Grasmere Rd informal to a zebra crossing?	Yes	1020	45%
	No	1180	52%
	D/K	72	3%
	Total	2272	100%

9.11 The table below summarises the 1517 feedback which asked for any feedback including alternative proposals suggested by respondents for improving the B106 corridor between Bounds Green Road and Colney Hatch Lane. It is grouped into recurring themes and highlights the top five negative themes identified from the feedback:

#	Theme	No. of Comments
1	Increased congestion / traffic and queues	973
2	Prefer alternatives (signal improvement/A406 fixes/junction improvement/bus gate/enforcement)	881
3	Impact on local businesses / church / park	628
4	Oppose LTNs / blame LTNs for congestion	529
5	Safety concerns for children/pedestrians/cyclists	520

9.11.1 The table below highlights the most frequently mentioned positive themes for the above question:

#	Positive Theme	No. of Comments
---	----------------	-----------------

1	Support safer crossings / specific locations (e.g., Sunshine Garden Centre)	239
2	Encourage active travel / cycling / fewer cars	177

- 9.12** The written feedback received through the consultation reflected a predominantly negative sentiment toward the proposed part-time bus lanes and upgraded crossings. Respondents were particularly concerned that the scheme would intensify congestion, worsen air quality, and significantly reduce parking availability for residents, visitors, carers, disabled users, businesses, schools, St Andrew’s Church, and OR Tambo Recreation Ground. A large proportion of comments attributed current congestion to broader network issues, notably the displacement effects from the Bounds Green LTN and delays on the A406/North Circular Road, with many stating that altering only the B106 corridor would not address these root causes. Many also expressed concern that the measures could shift the character of the corridor from a residential street to a busy through-route.
- 9.13** Several highlighted that the introduction of additional signalised crossings could increase stop-start traffic and perceived that too many interventions were being proposed without addressing the wider network pressures. Concerns were also raised about consultation reach, with some residents feeling that engagement should be broadened before progressing significant changes.
- 9.14** A minority of respondents expressed support for specific, targeted improvements focused on safety and public transport reliability rather than the full scheme. Supportive comments included: “A bus lane towards Bounds Green station is vital for effective public transport,” “Make the bus lanes 7 am to 7 pm,” and “Anything that improves things for pedestrians and bus passengers is a good idea.” This group generally favoured selective crossing upgrades, improved enforcement, and better signal coordination, with some with a proviso that these improvements should not require substantial parking loss or create fragmented operational arrangements. Their feedback indicates an appetite for focused, safety-led interventions that support sustainable travel while balancing the needs of residents.

10 Officer Response

- 10.1** Following a thorough review of all feedback received, it is clear that the majority of responses expressed strong opposition to the proposed bus lane design. Concerns were raised about the potential loss of parking, displacement of traffic onto side streets, air quality impacts near schools, and the overall effectiveness of the scheme in addressing congestion. Many respondents also highlighted the need for a more holistic approach to tackling traffic issues, including consideration of the North Circular (A406) and the impact of Low Traffic Neighbourhoods (LTNs).

- 10.2 Officers are committed to improving public transport reliability, however, in light of substantial concerns raised on the impact of the proposals, officers recommend **to not proceed** with the current bus lane design proposals. Whilst the intention from the council was to provide a means for buses to speed up making it easier and faster to travel by buses and encouraging use of public transport, it is clear that that any changes to the transport network in this area which is unique due to its close proximity to Bounds Green LTN and the A406 must consider the needs of all road users and local communities. We are committed to working with the local community to find solutions that helps ease congestion on this corridor making it easier to travel by public transport, taking into account how these would impact on local residents and businesses.
- 10.3 The upgrades for two zebra crossing to a signalised crossing (near St Regis Close and Sunshine Garden) were proposed as a key safety improvement, ensuring visibility for pedestrians who would need to be able to see oncoming traffic should a bus be in their line of sight in the proposed bus lane which would essentially be an additional lane created. Given that officers are not recommending the bus lanes being progressed to statutory consultation, there is no need for these conversations and as such officers do not recommend these proposals be progressed to statutory consultation.
- 10.4 Two informal pedestrian crossing points were proposed to be converted to signalised crossings points (near Wroxham Gardens and Muswell Avenue) because sight lines for pedestrians would be impeded as there would be two lanes of traffic (bus lane and general traffic lane) should the bus lane be implemented. An additional informal crossing near Grasmere Road was proposed to be upgraded to a zebra crossing. Whilst officers consider these would benefit to being upgraded, the feedback suggests a majority not in favour. Given the bus lanes are recommended not to progress to statutory consultation, officers recommend these proposals also do not progress to statutory consultation but instead work with the community to look at the whole corridor holistically and arrive at solutions that improves safety for pedestrians using this corridor.

11 Contribution to the Corporate Delivery Plan 2024-2026 high-level strategic outcomes

- 11.1 The proposed bus priority scheme was developed to support Haringey Council's strategic objectives of improving sustainable transport, reducing congestion, and enhancing air quality. While the scheme aligned with these outcomes, the majority of consultation responses raised were negative, and as a result, the recommendation is to not proceed with the proposals being subject to statutory consultation. The consultation process itself has contributed to the Corporate Delivery Plan by ensuring community voices are heard, strengthening transparency, and guiding future transport initiatives to better reflect local priorities and needs.

12 Carbon and Climate Change

- 12.1 The proposed bus priority scheme was intended to contribute to Haringey Council's climate objectives by encouraging greater use of public transport, reducing reliance on private vehicles, and lowering associated carbon emissions. While the scheme is recommended to not proceed to statutory consultation due to majority negative feedback, the consultation process has provided valuable insights into community perspectives on climate action. These learnings will inform future initiatives aimed at reducing emissions and supporting the borough's transition to a more sustainable, low-carbon transport network.

Statutory Officers' comments

13 Comments of the Chief Financial Officer

- 13.1 The recommendation to not to proceed with the proposed scheme, if approved, means that further funding will not be required. Any costs related to consultation and preliminary design work will be covered from existing budget which has been secured from Transport for London (TfL) under its Bus Priority programme.

Of the total £235k TfL (Local Implementation Funding) – Bus Priority Programme, £45k is earmarked towards the delivery of the Durnsford Rd Bus Priority Programme. This funding is incorporated within the 2025/26 Council Capital Programme plan under Capital Scheme 309 – TfL - Local Implementation Plan (LIP).

14 Comments of the Director of Legal and Governance

- 14.1 The Council has power to introduce bus lanes and upgrade pedestrian crossings under sections 6 and 23 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.
- 14.2 When a consultation has been undertaken, even where the consultation has not been undertaken because of a statutory requirement to do so, the Council must take into account the representations received in response to that consultation when taking a decision. The report sets out the major themes and sub-themes for the representations received and officers' views in section 10 of the report and Appendix E to this report the consultation responses, which must be taken into account before the decision whether not to proceed with the proposals in Appendix B is taken. The decision maker will need to decide how much weight each representation should be given and whether or not to approve any of the measures in the proposals in light of those representations.
- 14.3 The Courts have held that a decision maker must consider consultation responses with 'a receptive mind' and be prepared to change course if persuaded by a response but is not under a duty to adopt the views of consultees.
- 14.4 The decision not to proceed with the proposals in Appendix B is an executive decision that can be exercised by the Head of Highways and Parking in accordance with the Council's Constitution and delegation given by the Corporate Director of Environment and Resident Experience in his scheme of delegation dated October 2024 and e-mail to the Head of Highways and Parking dated 22 July 2025.

15 Equality Comments

- 15.1 The council has a Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) under the Equality Act (2010) to have due regard to the need to:

- Eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation and any other conduct prohibited under the Act.
- Advance equality of opportunity between people who share protected characteristics and people who do not.
- Foster good relations between people who share those characteristics and people who do not.

The three parts of the duty apply to the following protected characteristics: age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy/maternity, race, religion/faith, sex and sexual orientation. Marriage and civil partnership status applies to the first part of the duty.

Although it is not enforced in legislation as a protected characteristic, Haringey Council treats socioeconomic status as a local protected characteristic.

15.2 The decision outlined in this report is recommended to not proceed to statutory consultation, based on feedback from the public consultation.

- A public consultation opened on 03 November 2025, with relevant documents (see Appendixes A-C) distributed to all households and businesses within the vicinity of the proposals.
- 2272 responses during the public consultation period were received, 426 (19%) in support, 1846 (81%) in objection to introducing bus lanes to improve bus journeys and reliability.
- Other proposals notably conversion of zebra crossings to signalised crossings and informal crossings to signalised crossings all received majority negative feedback.
- Officers have provided a response to the feedback (section 10), acknowledging the strong opposition to the proposals. Key concerns raised include potential congestion, loss of parking, and negative impacts on local businesses. However, it is also noted that a minority of respondents expressed support for the proposals.

15.3 The decision not to proceed with the proposals results in a neutral impact. Although consultation feedback, see appendix D, highlighted potential concerns for protected groups such as older and disabled residents who rely on accessible parking and carers for daily support, these impacts will not materialise.

16 Use of Appendices

Appendix A – Public consultation letter
Appendix B – Public consultation plan
Appendix B – Public consultation plan2
Appendix C – Consultation Boundary
Appendix D – Summarised consultation report
Appendix E – Full responses - REDACTED

17 Background Papers

- None