

Dartmouth Park Healthy Neighbourhood scheme FOIFAQs

We have put together this document to answer questions on this subject with links to relevant resources for further information. This may help to provide guidance before submitting a further Freedom of Information request. All of these responses can be viewed on our [Open Data Portal](#) at the following link - [Camden Freedom Of Information Response Search](#). Just enter the relevant CAM reference in the search field.

CAM8176

For the Dartmouth Park Healthy Neighbourhood Proposals :

1. How many elapsed weeks did it take to prepare the proposals?

Clarification: Please can you clarify what you mean by “elapsed weeks” considering proposals on the ‘four roads project’ in this area were first shared in 2018.

A. I am trying to understand whether the “co-design” is a genuine attempt to engage residents in the design of the proposed project or a just tick-box exercise. The question asks how long the Camden team worked on the proposals compared with the time they allowed for public responses.

As outlined on the Project website plans to reduce motor vehicle traffic in the area were shared with local people in 2018. Therefore proposals have been considered in this area since 2018.

2. How many elapsed weeks did you allow for public responses?

As outlined on the project engagement materials: project website/leaflets delivered to all properties and trifolds in area the engagement period is 6 weeks from 8th July to 18th August. This 6-week phase 2 engagement follows phase 1 engagement previously undertaken in September 2023.

3. In setting such a short response period, what consideration was given to;

Our usual engagement period is 4 weeks for similar projects; however we have extended this to 6 weeks for the Dartmouth Park Healthy Neighbourhood project.

3a. The length, complexity, obscure wording, significant cost and major public impact of the proposals?

Please see Camden’s Cabinet approved approach to Consultation which is outlined in [this document](#). While this project is not a consultation the engagement process aligns to this report.

3b. The response period being in the holiday season?

The approach for large schemes is four weeks. This phase 2 engagement is 6 weeks. The online and in-person events took place on or before the final day of the LB Camden and LB Islington’s School term.

3c. The reputational risk to Camden Council from another consultation where many of your voters and taxpayers believe that you have decided the outcome you want when designing the consultation process?

This is not a consultation rather Phase 2 engagement building on from Phase 1 engagement undertaken in Sept/Nov last year. There is no decision rather feedback is being sought on initial proposals shared, and this feedback will help develop proposals for public consultation.

3d. The need to live up to your "co-design" title?

Clarification: Please clarify what your question is, as this reads as a statement.

A. Question 3 has four parts, so 3d should be read as “3. In setting such a short response period, what consideration was given to the need to live up to your "co-design" title?”.

The question asks for the information that Camden holds, including internal documents on the design of the co-design, which discuss the name, wording, and response period of the project which may shed light on the extent to which Camden genuinely wished to hear and act on residents’ views.

The council generally undertakes engagement over a four-week period. This is in line with the council’s process for public consultations of the schemes of this size which is outlined in the Cabinet approved [Consultation and Decision Making report](#). Dartmouth Park Area Healthy Neighbourhood had a six-week engagement period for phase two which took into account the summer holidays. The council consciously planned the online engagement event and two in person engagement events to take place before the full holidays began. The online event took place on Wednesday, 17th July 2024 and the in-person events took place on Tuesday 23rd July 2024 and Wednesday 24th July 2024 which was before or on the final day of the LB Camden and LB Islington’s school term, respectively.

The project has three phases of engagements focused on engaging local people with the project. The first phase was undertaken in Sept/Nov 2023 asking stakeholders what they wanted to see in their area. Feedback from this phase helped develop the second phase of engagement and initial proposals. These initial proposals were now shared in the second phase of engagement with residents undertaken in July/Aug 2024. After this phase there will be another opportunity for engagement and feedback via the third phase which will be the public consultation. Project timeline can be seen here on the website:

<https://dartmouthpark.commonplace.is/timeline>

4. How many individuals and how many groups have asked for the constitution period to be extended?

We are currently in phase 2 engagement which is not a consultation period. The next step will be the consultation period.

5. Will you extend the consultation period?

The current co design engagement stage takes place over six weeks. We would normally look to run an engagement like this for over four weeks. This four week period is in line with public consultations of the schemes of this size which is outlined in the Cabinet approved

Consultation and Decision Making report linked above. We have consciously planned the online engagement and two in-person engagement events before the full holidays begin. The in-person events took place on or before the final day of the LB Camden and LB Islington's School term. We are not proposing to extend the engagement period and local people have until 18th August to send us their feedback/comments.

We have received a healthy number of responses since we launched on 8th July and currently over 550 people have filled out the online engagement survey in addition to the well-attended online and in-person events. Therefore, we are confident local people are informed of the current engagement and are feeding into the proposals.

As outlined on the scheme's webpage this co design stage is not the final stage of the process with residents and there will be more opportunities for involvement via the public consultation process which would follow this co design stage.

6. What range of costs have you estimated for completing this project?

At present Phase 2 co-design stage of the project, we are sharing initial proposals for feedback. Cost estimates are not developed currently and hence we do not hold this information.

7. What comparative community health benefits have you considered for spending this amount on alternative projects such as child services, sports facilities, safe cycling training, health education?

Clarification: Please clarify exactly what you are asking as it is not clear.

A. This proposal is entitled "Healthy Neighbourhood". It will cost money. Camden is responsible for a wide range of activities which could improve the health of its residents. It could be that money earmarked to this project would achieve more health benefits if spent on alternative projects.

What consideration has Camden given to the expected health improvements and other measurable benefits to the community from this project compared with alternative projects which could make a larger impact for less cost?

The aims of Camden's transport projects are discussed in detail in our CTS delivery plan: <https://www.camden.gov.uk/documents/20142/18708392/1925.7+Camden+Transport+Strategy+Main+Document+FV.pdf/d7b19f62-b88e-31d4-0606-5a78ea47ff30> . This document discusses Camden's focus on health and wellbeing through active travel and improving streets projects. The Cabinet approved CTS delivery plan 2022-25 included this project and this can be found as item 15

<https://democracy.camden.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=122&MId=10173&Ver=4>)

The council has a clean air action plan: <https://consultations.wearecamden.org/supporting-communities/camden-clean-air-action-plan-2022-2026/> and we also monitor air quality in the borough which can be seen here: [Camden Air Quality Monitoring](#)

8. What estimates have you made of revenues from additional fines from the proposed new regulations?

At present Phase 2 co-design stage of the project, we are sharing initial proposals for feedback. Cost estimates are not developed currently and hence we do not hold this information.

9. In designing the Dartmouth Park Healthy Neighbourhood Proposals, what visual design options have been visited to make Camden a more visually attractive place to live?

Clarification: Please can you clarify what you mean by “visual design options”.

A. I can best explain the question with three paragraphs of background:

Every change to the built environment has a social impact on people and communities and is therefore highly relevant to the mental health and crime aspects of the Healthy Neighbourhood.

Some councils, notably Kensington and Chelsea have put a considerable effort into design of changes they implement, resulting in the area becoming a more attractive, safer and healthier place to live.

Projects in Camden have been criticised for being poorly designed. For example a) the design of cycle lanes is inconsistent and is therefore confusing for cyclists and car drivers; b) the design of the cycle lane in Haverstock Hill has ugly posts which have quickly become degraded and c) planters in Boris Nemtsov Place have been sited in the middle of the pavement where they are a hazard to visually impaired people and d) recent changes have resulted in installation of an excessive number of unsightly road signs.

Please provide the information that Camden has on visual design options that Camden has considered for Healthy Neighbourhoods, for example its visual design manuals and its assessment of projects from other councils.

Please see Camden’s design manual here: <https://www.camden.gov.uk/streetscape-design-manual>

10. Have any design options been published as part of your consultation?

Proposals at this stage are subject to feedback from residents and residents can propose alternative options which the council can consider.

11. How many new road signs will be required to implement the proposals in addition to the forest of signs which have already been installed in the area in the last ten years?

At present Phase 2 co-design stage of the project, we are sharing initial proposals for feedback. Signage schedule has not been produced at this stage of the project.

In the Dartmouth Park Healthy Neighbourhood Proposals, the traffic will be concentrated into a small number of boundary roads including Highgate West Hill, Highgate Road, Fortress Road, Highgate High Street and Highgate Hill.

For each of the boundary roads:

12. What measures have been made of recent traffic congestion?

Please see counts in the [proposals overview document](#) .

13. What estimates have been made of the increased traffic once the plans have been implemented?

At present Phase 2 co-design stage of the project, we are sharing initial proposals for feedback. Estimates are not developed currently and hence we do not hold this information. However previous monitoring reports of previous similar projects are available here: [Appendix H - Camden Square Final Monitoring.pdf](#) and [Appendix H - Queens Crescent Final Monitoring.pdf \(camden.gov.uk\)](#)

14. On his many days in the last year (or similar period) has each of these boundary roads been a) have roadworks, b) have temporary traffic lights and c) have reduced traffic capacity from an accident or incident?

Information attached. This data goes back 1 year. Information not held for point 'c'.

15. Following implementation of the proposals, what estimates have been made of the impact of days with reduced traffic capacity and what mitigations have been considered?

Clarification: Please can you clarify what you mean by 'impact of days with reduced traffic capacity'.

A. Currently there are multiple North / South routes through and around the Dartmouth Park Area. The proposed closure to normal traffic of Swains Lane and Dartmouth Park Hill will concentrate traffic onto Highgate West Hill, Highgate Road and Kentish Town Road.

On many days over the last several years these three roads have been closed or have reduced capacity from road works.

After implementation, there will be no nearby alternative routes for most traffic.

What estimates has Camden made of the likely impact, on days when there are road works, of the delays from having no alternative routes (e.g. in terms of reduced traffic capacity, the resulting lack of bus capacity, the time cost to car and van drivers of the traffic jams)?

Information not held as this was Phase 2 Engagement with initial proposals.

What mitigations has Camden considered, such as reopening closed roads by disabling traffic filters on the days when the few remaining roads have road works?

Information not held as this was Phase 2 Engagement with initial proposals.

CAM8179

The name of businesses consulted about The Dartmouth Park Proposals

All properties, including business, in the project area were hand delivered a leaflet which outline the details of this phase of engagement. Additionally an email update was sent to local stakeholders sourced from Cindex, the local community information directory, and an email update was sent to all those who had registered for communications on the project's website. In addition to this a number of 'trifolds' were installed across the project area informing local stakeholders, including businesses, about the engagement.

Further to attending the web meeting last week, I would like evidence that Camden businesses were consulted , as declared.

In addition to the above, Camden is undertaking business engagement currently. As part of this phase of engagement, business letters have been hand delivered to businesses in the area which includes details of a business focused engagement session.

I have a prominent commercial premises in the area and I also live in the area. I wasn't contacted re the proposals nor did I request for the proposed changes and do not know any other business owner that was.

All properties, including business, in the project area were hand delivered a leaflet which outline the details of this phase of engagement. Additionally an email update was sent to local stakeholders sourced from Cindex, the local community information directory, and an email update was sent to all those who had registered for communications on the project's website. In addition to this a number of 'trifolds' were installed across the project area informing local stakeholders, including businesses, about the engagement.

Furthermore, I would like to know your projected income from the cameras that would be installed under your plans.

At present Phase 2 co-design stage of the project, we are sharing initial proposals for feedback. Financial estimates are not developed currently and hence we do not hold this information.

CAM8199

The consultation on the Dartmouth Park Healthy Neighbourhood proposals appears to avoid the phrase Low Traffic Neighbourhood (LTN).

1. Why has Camden chosen to avoid the phrase Low Traffic Neighbourhood (LTN)?

The measures proposed are a holistic package of measures which are not limited solely to measures which seek to reduce traffic volumes; therefore the proposals have not been branded as an LTN. The proposals at this stage of engagement include: a Traffic management plan, bus priority, improved walking and cycling and street improvements in the area.

2. Does Camden consider that the proposals do comprise a LTN?

One of the proposals within the Healthy Neighbourhood project, the traffic management plan, aims to reduce total traffic volumes across the area.

3. If Camden does consider that the proposals comprise an LTN, have they complied with Government Statutory Guidance on "Implementing Low Traffic Neighbourhoods" published March 2024.

In this current Phase 2 engagement feedback is being sought for initial proposals that have been shared. Following this stage of engagement Camden, in conjunction with the London Borough of Islington, will consider the approach, including the relevant legislation, to consultation and subsequently delivery of any proposals following a public consultation.

4. If Camden does not consider that the proposals comprise an LTN provide the rationale on which they have made this assessment and the legal advice which they have considered when making this assessment?

In this current Phase 2 engagement feedback is being sought initial proposals that have been shared. Following this stage of engagement Camden, in conjunction with the London Borough of Islington, will consider the approach, including the relevant legislation, to consultation and subsequently delivery of any proposals following a public consultation.

5. Provide the "robust evidence base on which to develop proposals and make decisions referred to in the Guidance, including the "intended impacts and outcomes of the schemes" and the "traffic, pedestrian and cyclist counts, traffic speed and journey times within and around the perimeter" and the "air quality data, particularly the possible air quality impacts of displaced traffic".

The proposals presented in this phase of engagement align with Camden's Transport Strategy, which aligns with the Mayors Transport Strategy. Following this stage of engagement Camden, in conjunction with the London Borough of Islington, will consider the approach, including the relevant legislation, to consultation and subsequently delivery of any proposals following a public consultation. Traffic count data is provided in the proposals overview document here. Camden's air quality monitoring data can be found here: Camden Air Quality Monitoring

6. Provide the evidence referred to in the Guidance on the impacts of various groups in a way which recognises the rationale for the investment which the guidance states should be collected before the scheme is implemented.

Following this stage of engagement Camden, in conjunction with the London Borough of Islington, will consider the approach, including the relevant legislation, to consultation and subsequently delivery of any proposals following a public consultation.

CAM8203

Objection to the Dartmouth Park Area Healthy Neighbourhood Proposal Overview

As I am sure you can imagine, there have been quite a few phone calls, WhatsApps and emails going back and forth this afternoon regarding the above scheme. My earlier email (below) sits roughly in the middle of that chain of communication.

Since there is now a feeling that vested interests may, possibly, be playing a part in these proposals, would you please release to us within say three working days:

- 1. The minutes of Council meetings which led to the decision to inflict this scheme upon us (we presume all minutes include attendance records)**
- 2. Emails relevant to the scheme, particularly any which refer to the consultation process/timeline/the 18.08.24 deadline**
- 3. The full home addresses of those present at those meetings and those who may have influenced them (or, if that creates a security risk, the first three characters of their domestic postcodes so we can roughly place their sphere of interest)**
- 4. Details of any external advisors used and fees paid**
- 5. Full costings of enacting the scheme and of 'unravelling' it when it is found, as seems possible, to have made things worse. These details to be sent regardless of whether they are buried somewhere in the document pack**

I seem to remember that a FOI request can be quite a prolonged process. If so, please let us know the best route to a quick reply to the above request and confirm to us that the supposed deadline of 18th August will be extended until at least a month after we have seen your full reply. We definitely need to know whether it could be argued that conflicts of interest exist. In the meantime, we will assume that this email brings with it all the power of a FOI request with none of the delays.

The Council will not process your request as it falls under an exception in the EIR 2004 because the cost or burden of dealing with your request is manifestly unreasonable. See the refusal notice below.

Refusal Notice:

Under Regulation 12(4)(b) it would be considered manifestly unreasonable to provide the information for question 2 because the cost of compliance, and burden of dealing with your request, is excessive. The exception protects the Council's ability to carry out its public functions and provides a balance between transparency and the protection of resources.

We have 6 officers working on this project who would be receiving project related emails. One officer's mailbox shows that they have received 2300 emails on this project in the last 6

months. Checking just one officer's inbox to find relevant emails which refer to the consultation process / timeline / the 18.08.24 deadline, would likely take over 76 hours based on taking at least 2 minutes to check each email for relevancy. In addition extracting the emails and redacting personal information would increase this time.

In applying this exception the Council has also considered the balance of the public interest in line with the Environmental Information Regulations 2004.

The public interest argument for releasing this information is:

- It would improve transparency to the general public of the Council.
- The presumption in favour of disclosure in the regulations.

The public interest arguments for withholding the information are:

- Processing this request would be a large burden in terms of Officer time and cost to the Council.
- This request would necessarily constitute a significant diversion of resources away from the Council's core business activities.
- It would consequently have a proportionally detrimental impact on the provision of services to the public.
- It is not in the public interest that the Council neglect its provision of services to the public to focus on one information request.

It is felt that in all the circumstances of the case, the public interest in maintaining the exception outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

Advice and Assistance:

As advice and assistance, the Safe and Healthy Streets Team have already provided me with some information, so we can advise you of the following for your other questions:

1. The minutes of Council meetings which led to the decision to inflict this scheme upon us (we presume all minutes include attendance records).

This information is not held as no decision has been made. This is an engagement phase where feedback is being sought on initial proposals shared.

3. The full home addresses of those present at those meetings and those who may have influenced them (or, if that creates a security risk, the first three characters of their domestic postcodes so we can roughly place their sphere of interest).

This information will not be provided under Regulation 12(3) of the EIR Regulation.

This is because the information is personal information as it allows a living individual to be identified. We have considered the legitimate public interest in disclosure against the interests of the data subject/s and concluded that disclosure would contravene the principle in the General Data Protection Regulation that personal data is processed fairly and lawfully. In the circumstances of the case disclosure would not be fair to the individuals particularly considering that Environmental Information Regulation responses are public documents and published to the world and not provided just to the requester.

4. Details of any external advisors used and fees paid.

We are unable to answer this question and would need you to clarify it. If you were to make a new request asking this question we would need you to clearly explain what you mean by an external advisor. For example we have paid a variety of consultants for different roles (security, hosting online meetings, staffing help at in person events, transport consultants etc.) To make a new request please email FOI@camden.gov.uk with a clearly laid out question.

5. Full costings of enacting the scheme and of 'unravelling' it when it is found, as seems possible, to have made things worse.

This information is not held as scheme costs have not been produced at this stage of the project.

CAM8234

It has come to my attention that some of the councillors and Camden Council employees, who are spearheading the above scheme, live in or around the Dartmouth Park area, the obvious beneficiaries of the initiative.

I have carried out some background checks that seem to indicate this statement to be correct. However, before the Pond Square Residents Association consults the Open Electoral Roll, it would be very helpful and, of course, totally transparent, if you could confirm this or otherwise.

I believe that, in the event that this information is indeed correct, it would be wholly unsatisfactory if councillors or Camden Council employees continue to be involved in this matter whilst living in the NW5/N19 postal codes.

In the event that there is a conflict of interest, I am sure that you will agree that any councillors or employees of Camden linked to the scheme must surely stand down.

Further, you will recollect that the Swains Lane/South Grove Scheme NRT was eventually axed by Camden after serious traffic flow problems arose in South Grove and Pond Square, as we told Camden on so many occasions would be the case before Camden unilaterally sanctioned the scheme.

Would it be unreasonable, therefore, that should the scheme be assessed by professional and independent Transport Planners (obviously, xxxxxxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxxx's (Camden's Principal Transport Planner) current proposal is anything other than independent) and it is deemed that it will create the same or an even worse nightmare traffic condition in South Grove and Pond Square, that the current proposal as it now stands will be scrapped?

Your request for this information is refused as explained in the refusal notice below.

Refusal Notice:

Regulation 12(3)

The council has withheld this information under the absolute exemption in Regulation 12(3). The information withheld is personal information because it allows a living individual to be identified. We have considered the legitimate public interest in disclosure against the interests of the data subject/s and concluded that disclosure would contravene the principle in the General Data Protection Regulation that personal data is processed fairly and lawfully. In the circumstances of the case disclosure would not be fair to the individuals particularly considering that Environmental Information Regulation responses are public documents and published to the world and not provided just to the requester.

CAM8263

Re: the Dartmouth Park Healthy Neighbourhood proposals

1) What analysis was done of the overall reduction in through traffic if these proposals were implemented, assuming no change to public transport provision:

This information is not held as this is Phase 2 engagement in which we are sharing initial proposals for feedback and comments. But examples of monitoring reports of previous schemes are available at <https://safetravelcamden.commonplace.is/proposals/about-page/step4>. A similar approach would be taken for the Healthy Neighbourhood.

2) how much traffic would cease to try to cross Camden & Islington AND Highgate, and how much would simply be diverted up the proposed "alternative routes"

Analysis has not been done as this is Phase 2 engagement in which we are sharing initial proposals for feedback and comments. Proposals are subject to develop further after phase 2 engagement. Examples of monitoring reports of previous schemes are available at <https://safetravelcamden.commonplace.is/proposals/about-page/step4>. A similar approach would be taken for the Healthy Neighbourhood.

3) What analysis was done of the capacity of the alternative routes to take on this diverted traffic?

Monitoring reports are available to view on previously delivered projects outlining the traffic volumes on roads in project areas such as Camden Square and Queens Crescent. These reports are available as part of the Decision Reports for these schemes at the following link <https://safetravelcamden.commonplace.is/proposals/about-page/step4> A similar approach would be taken for the Healthy Neighbourhood.

4) In particular, what analysis was done of the capability of Cholmeley Park to safely take on the diverted traffic (mentioned in 9 places) given the one-car width at the top of the road, and the proximity of a large school.

The maps references are not 'diverting traffic' to Cholmeley Park rather these maps outline how journeys can be made in the area. For example on Figure 9 the route from Archway Road to South Grove outlines the quickest route between those two points on the map which is via Cholmeley Park. This route is unchanged by the proposals.

5) What consultation and involvement has there been of residents, businesses and schools in Highgate for those roads affected by these proposals?

- Prior to launch of phase 2 engagement multiple resident groups were engaged including the Highgate Society for feedback.
- Stakeholders from Camden's Community Index of local organisations were sent project launch emails, along with local groups such as the Highgate Society.
- People who had subscribed to commonplace webpage of the project were sent notifications of phase 2 start.
- Leaflets through the post were sent area wide to all properties (including Highgate area of the project) with project details/event registration details.
- Trifolds were placed on local streets and around transport links informing local people of phase 2 engagement.
- Business Engagement was undertaken for the project, where all local businesses in the area (including Highgate) were hand delivered business letters informing them of phase 2 engagement and requesting them to take part in our business meetings.

6) What analysis has been done of the REASONS for people to take vehicles across this area and the neighbouring Highgate areas affected, and what is needed to provide those people with alternatives to using their own vehicles.

An annual travel in London report is produced by TfL which is shared with each borough. The most recent report in Dec 2023 Travel in London 2023 - The travel behaviour of London residents based on the London Travel Demand Survey (tfl.gov.uk) includes a section on journey purposes which can be referred to. The data is presented London wide, but data is collected based on surveys for a sample from each borough. Additionally, the project aims

and objectives aligns with our CTS (Camden Transport Strategy) d7b19f62-b88e-31d4-0606-5a78ea47ff30 (camden.gov.uk). In the CTS section 2C details transport and travel in Camden. The CTS aligns with the Mayor Transport Strategy.

In regard to alternatives, some of the council's programmes are our car club programme ie to provide a car when there is essential need and our bike hire systems in the borough.

7) What consideration has been given to more localised solutions for specific traffic bottlenecks, rather than this major intervention in traffic patterns.

See project background which is on the project website and also the engagement event videos which outline a response to this question.

CAM8268

I am making a freedom of information request in relation to the "Dartmouth Park Area Healthy Neighbourhood" scheme.

Please provide the following information:

1. Why has the scheme not been publicised as a low traffic neighbourhood (LTN)?

The measures proposed are a holistic package of measures which are not limited solely to measures which seek to reduce traffic volumes therefore the proposals have not been branded as an LTN. The proposals at this stage of engagement include: a Traffic management plan, bus priority, improved walking and cycling and street improvements in the area.

2. Please provide the Data Protection Impact Assessment, Equality Impact Assessment and Cost Benefit Analysis carried out in connection with the scheme, or confirm that none have been carried out.

At this stage of the project the only document of those requested is the engagement related DPA – pre-screen.

3. Please provide full details of the feedback that has prompted the proposal of the scheme. How many households were consulted and what was their feedback? How many businesses were consulted and what was their feedback?

Comments/Feedback received in Phase 1 engagement can be found here on the website:

<https://dartmouthpark.commonplace.is/en-GB/map/interactive-map> . And here on the website you can see engagement stats of Phase 1:

<https://dartmouthpark.commonplace.is/en-GB/proposals/engagement-summary/step1>

4. In percentage terms measured against the total residential population in the area, what percentage has provided positive feedback on this scheme?

At the time of writing (14/08/2024) the co-design phase is ongoing, and the feedback received during this stage has not been analysed.

5. Which disability groups have been consulted in connection with the scheme and what was their feedback?

Consultation with disability groups will take place during phase 3 (public consultation phase).

6. Which emergency services have been consulted in connection with the scheme and what was their feedback?

Engagement with the emergency services will take place during phase 3 (public consultation phase).

7. Please provide the traffic data which is being relied upon to propose the scheme and the dates and times such data was obtained, including traffic counts (including on boundary roads), pedestrian counts, cyclist counts, accident and speeding hotspots, points of congestion, origination and destination information, types of vehicle, purpose of journeys, times of day when traffic is concentrated, length of journeys, and traffic projections (including on the boundary roads).

Traffic data can be found on the following link. Scroll down and open the Dartmouth Park Area Proposals Overview PDF: <https://dartmouthpark.commonplace.is/en-GB/proposals/project-ideas-survey/step1>

8. Please provide the air quality, emissions and pollution data that is being relied upon to propose the scheme (including on boundary roads).

Camden Air Quality Monitoring data can be found here. If a decision is made to proceed with a proposal following a public consultation on Air Quality would be measured and provided to residents as part of a monitoring plan.

9. Please provide the definition of "healthy" that is being relied on in the scheme, and elaborate on how the scheme will improve health.

Project introduction can be found here on the project website explaining aims and objectives.

10. Please elaborate on what maintenance provision will be put in place for the planters described in the scheme.

Information not held as this is Phase 2 engagement in which we are sharing initial proposals for feedback and comments.

11. Why is it necessary for the co-design phase of the scheme to take place during the 6 week period of high summer when many residents are on holiday?

The current co design engagement stage is taking place over six weeks – from early July to 18 August. The council would normally run an engagement like this over four weeks, in line with public consultations for schemes of this size which is outlined in the Cabinet approved

Consultation and Decision Making report. We planned the online engagement event and the two in person engagement events before the full school holidays began and the engagement process started immediately after the general election pre-election publicity period.

This co design stage is not the final stage of the process with residents and there will be more opportunities for involvement via the public consultation process which would follow this co design stage.

12. Please explain the methodology that will be used to determine if the scheme has "clear local support" as required by the March 2024 statutory guidance. Will each resident have a vote?

Information not held as this is Phase 2 engagement in which we are sharing initial proposals for feedback and comments.

13. Please provide the analysis that has been undertaken in respect of whether schools on the boundary roads will suffer increased pollution and emissions due to displaced traffic. This analysis should be provided in respect of St Joseph's School, Channing School, Highgate School, La Sainte Union, Parliament Hill School, Hargrave Park School, and Acland Burghley School.

Information not held as this is Phase 2 engagement in which we are sharing initial proposals for feedback and comments.

14. Please elaborate on the basis on which the conclusion has been reached that vehicle traffic will disappear, rather than shifting to the periphery?

Similar schemes have been delivered by Camden Council. These similar schemes were delivered via a trial, which this scheme would be if it proceeds to public consultation and a decision is made to proceed. Traffic monitoring in these similar schemes recorded traffic volumes in the area before and after the trial.

I have provided two such examples from Camden schemes that have been delivered in the last number of years below.

Camden Square

Queen's Crescent

15. Please clarify the characteristics of the area which have suggested it is appropriate for the imposition of an LTN?

The council has no plans to impose an LTN in Dartmouth Park.

16. Please clarify if the intention behind the scheme is to reduce parking spaces available to residents.

Please refer to project background and aims here:

<https://dartmouthpark.commonplace.is/en-GB/proposals/sample-content-walkingcycling-scheme/step1>

17. Please clarify how the scheme will operate when building works result in road closures.

Information not held as this is Phase 2 engagement in which we are sharing initial proposals for feedback and comments.

18. Please clarify if any road resurfacing will take place as part of the scheme.

Information not held as this is Phase 2 engagement in which we are sharing initial proposals for feedback and comments.

19. Please provide all projections and analysis that has been undertaken in relation to proposed fines imposed as a result of the scheme.

Information not held as this is Phase 2 engagement in which we are sharing initial proposals for feedback and comments.

CAM8269

I request the following information relating to the Council's document "Dartmouth Park Healthy Neighbourhood proposal overview", published jointly with Islington Council.

Figure 3 and Figure 4 - Traffic count data These present figures only for a few of the roads that will be affected by the proposals. Please provide for every road within, or forming the boundary of, the purple zone in Figure 8, the same data for 2023 as is available for Chetwynd Road in the Council's published traffic data for 2023 (sites 22 and 36). If the data for 2024 is available, please also provide it for 2024.

Counts were commission in 2023 and in response to comments made in the engagement additional counts at the same locations as 2023 and at additional locations were undertaken in 2024. These counts are provided in the maps in the attached proposal overview document. Clarity is sought on what is meant by "the Council's published traffic data for 2023 (sites 22 and 36)". The project team does not recognise sites 22 and 36.

If the Council does not have the data, please provide information as to why it doesn't, given that these roads will be fundamentally affected by the proposals.

Counts were commission in 2023 and in response to comments made in the engagement additional counts at the same locations as 2023 and at additional locations were undertaken in 2024. These counts are provided in the maps in the attached proposal overview document. Additional count locations can be

suggested to the council during this stage of engagement for consideration by the Council as part of feedback submitted on the engagement webpage.

Please provide any information that the Council has as to its current perception of how, if its proposals are implemented, the volume of traffic will be altered:

- in each road within, or forming part of the boundary of, the purple zone; in Fortress Road;
- in Fortress Walk;
- in Highgate Road;
- in Highgate West Hill

Similar schemes have been delivered by Camden Council. These similar schemes were delivered via a trial, which this scheme would be if it proceeds to public consultation and a decision is made to proceed. Traffic monitoring in these similar schemes recorded traffic volumes in the area before and after the trial.

I have provided two such examples from Camden schemes that have been delivered above the last number of years below.

Camden Square

Camden Square Scheme Area Roads Daily Average Motor Vehicle Flow (7-Day)

Road	Before scheme	After scheme	% change
Local Streets	16,842	7,710	-54%
Main Roads	54,388	45,176	-17%
Total	71,230	52,886	-26%

Queen's Crescent

Queen's Crescent Scheme Area Roads Daily Average Motor Vehicle Flow (7-Day) (May 2021 and April 2022)

Roads	Before-scheme (May-21)	After-scheme (Apr-22)	% change (May-21 – Apr-22)
Local Roads	25,440	16,625	-35%
Main Roads	20,772	20,651	-1%
Total Roads	46,212	37,275	-19%

Traffic Filters These are described as filters, indicating that some traffic will be allowed through. For each of the following filters, please say what, if any, traffic is proposed to be allowed through, other than buses (Dartmouth Park Hill and Chester Road):

Dartmouth Park Hill (all 3 places)

As outlined on the proposals overview document buses would be permitted to travel through. Statutory services (such as emergency services) would also be able to pass through this camera based restrictions.

York Rise junction with Chetwynd Road)

This is proposed as a physical restriction. This could take the form of a bollard which Statutory services could 'drop' to gain access if they so wish. This would be similar to the circa 80 bollard restrictions across Camden.

Laurier Road, junction with Dartmouth Park Hill (presumably, this means the junction of Dartmouth Park Road and Dartmouth Park Hill, as the road from the junction of Dartmouth Park Road and Laurier Road to Dartmouth Park Hill is part of Dartmouth Park Road, not Laurier Road), Chester Road

Laurier Road (Camden) junction with Dartmouth Park Hill: Camera-enforced traffic filters located at Laurier Road would prevent east-west and west-east vehicle movement. As outlined on the proposals overview document buses would be permitted to travel through. Statutory services (such as emergency services) would also be able to pass through this camera-based restrictions.

CAM8272

I would like to obtain any information held by Camden which should have been included in the consultation material in relation to the proposed DPHN.

This information is not held as the consultation material was correct and did not omit anything.

As advice and assistance, further information on the scheme is here. Other information requests on the scheme will be published here over the next few weeks. Type "Dartmouth Park" into the 2nd search box that looks like this:

As the information not held is environmental we have to comply with a technicality and tell you that because it is not held it is excepted under Regulation 12(4)(a). The Information Commissioner does not require a public interest test where the information is not held.

CAM8292

Has there been discussion of a cost/benefit analysis of the proposals contained in the Dartmouth Park Healthy Neighbourhood scheme?

Please supply any documents which refer to such discussions.

At present we have completed Phase 2 co-design stage of the project, where we shared initial proposals for feedback. Cost estimates are not developed currently and hence this information is not held.

Does there exist in draft or in any form such a cost/benefit analysis?

If so, please supply the appropriate documentation. And if not, please explain why not.

At present we have completed Phase 2 co-design stage of the project, where we shared initial proposals for feedback. Cost estimates are not developed currently and hence this information is not held.

Is there a proposed mechanism for assessing the effect of the proposed scheme.

If so, please supply all documentation of discussions of such a mechanism. And if not, the please explain why the Council believes the scheme should proceed without such a mechanism.

Similar schemes have been delivered by Camden Council. These similar schemes were delivered via a trial, which this scheme would be if it proceeds to public consultation and a decision is made to proceed.

Two such examples from Camden schemes that have been delivered in the last number of years below:

Camden Square

Queen's Crescent

CAM8296

The following nine requests are made for information under the Freedom of Information Act provisions.

1. Information and documents, including meeting minutes, relating to the delineation of the area of the Dartmouth Park Healthy Neighbourhood, including:

- the reasons for exclusion of The Grove from the area
- the reasons for exclusion of Millfield Lane and Merton Lane
- the reasons for deciding to work with Islington
- the reasons for deciding not to work with Haringey

2. Information and documents, including meeting minutes covering consideration given to using other existing planning areas including particularly the Highgate Neighbourhood plan, Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood plan and Kentish Town Neighbourhood plan areas.

3. Information and documents, including meeting minutes, covering consideration given to using other existing defined areas for neighbourhoods including postal code areas, constituency or ward boundaries.

4. Information and documents, including minutes, covering the appointment of the Camden cabinet member responsible for the project at its inception and all changes in cabinet member responsibility since then, including the dates of changes and the names of the relevant individuals.

5. Information on how the choice of Commonplace as the consultation engagement provider was made, including alternative providers considered and the due diligence undertaken.

6. All detailed traffic count information that has been considered as part of designing the DPHN proposals. This may be for example on a daily or hourly basis for the whole period for which counts have been undertaken. Information in a spreadsheet format is acceptable.

7. Information, documents and minutes covering decisions on locations where traffic counts have been undertaken. Please ensure this covers decisions on the traffic counts in the Highgate village area, where there seems to have been little coverage.

8. Any and all other traffic survey data considered as part of designing the DPHN proposals.

9. Information and documents including minutes covering the aspects of health considered as part of designing the DPHN proposals.

The Council will not process your request as it falls under an exception in the EIR 2004 because the cost or burden of dealing with your request is manifestly unreasonable. See the refusal notice below.

Refusal Notice:

Under Regulation 12(4)(b) it would be considered manifestly unreasonable to provide a response to your request because the cost of compliance, and burden of dealing with your request, is excessive. The exception protects the Council's ability to carry out its public functions and provides a balance between transparency and the protection of resources.

For many questions you have asked for "information and documents, including minutes" which would involve searching for relevant emails in Officers mailboxes, as well as documents on network drives. Using the search criteria "Dartmouth Park" in the last 6 months for one officer's mailbox it shows around 3700 emails. If it was to take a minimum of 2 minutes per email to search for relevant information (although where emails contain attachments or are quite lengthy and detailed it would take longer) it would take over 123 hours.

In applying this exception the Council has also considered the balance of the public interest in line with the EIR 2004.

The public interest argument for releasing this information is:

- It would improve transparency to the general public of the Council.
- The presumption in favour of disclosure in the regulations.

The public interest arguments for withholding the information are:

- Processing this request would be a large burden in terms of Officer time and cost to the Council.
- This request would necessarily constitute a significant diversion of resources away from the Council's core business activities.
- It would consequently have a proportionally detrimental impact on the provision of services to the public.
- It is not in the public interest that the Council neglect its provision of services to the public to focus on one information request.

It is felt that in all the circumstances of the case, the public interest in maintaining the exception outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

Advice and Assistance:

As advice and assistance, we have had many requests on the Dartmouth Park Healthy Neighbourhood scheme and have published a FAQ of the responses here.

For example there are already requests relating to traffic count data publicly available in the FAQs.

Alternatively if you wish to ask further questions on this scheme, we advise you to ask direct questions not requesting documents, which take a lot of time searching for, and potentially redacting time too.

CAM8315

Regarding the Dartmouth Park Area Healthy Neighbourhood plan, could you tell me what other options were considered by the planners before they agreed to present a single plan to the community

The Dartmouth Park Area Healthy Neighbourhood project is a holistic package of measures including: a Traffic management plan, bus priority, improved walking and cycling and street improvements in the area. Previously developed four roads project options and Dartmouth Park Area project options in the process of developing the three proposals are available to view here when you search for CAM8315 in the FOI Search box.

CAM8359

The council holds some of the information requested.

May we therefore be given the following additional information please, so we 'objectors' can prepare our strategy:

1. The total cost of the scheme thus far (feasibility studies, topographical surveys, preparation of drawings, traffic volume measuring, air quality monitoring etc)

Total cost of the scheme thus far is £155,000

2. Details of alternative schemes you considered before settling on this one

Please find attached previously developed four roads project options and Dartmouth Park Area project options in the process of developing the three proposals now shared.

3. The Assumptions Page(s) of your feasibility study (including the breakdown of traffic flows by category such as school-runs, local deliveries, vans going to/from The A1/M1, plus anticipated attitudes to car/van usage, expected numbers of electric vehicles over the next decade etc etc)

ATC information that answers this question has already been provided in CAM8525 which you can download from the Camden FOI response portal [here](#) by entering CAM8525 into the 2nd search box.

As the information requested is already reasonably accessible elsewhere it is excepted under Regulation 6(1).

4. All Council emails and minutes which relate to the inevitable worsening of air quality to The North of Dartmouth Park and the claims for ill-health which seem sure to follow. (You may not be aware that at least three of the objections to the scheme have come from Doctors of Medicine. At least one of them, an asthma sufferer, will be monitoring air quality regularly in coming months/years should this scheme go ahead

Information is not held in relation to 'worsening of air quality'.

5. A detailed costing of the scheme should it 'go live' - broken down road-by-road, pavement-by-pavement, sign-by-sign, camera-by-camera. Such costings must exist - they would in any well-managed organisation

At present Phase 2 co-design stage of the project has just finished. Cost estimates are not developed currently and hence we do not hold this information.

6. Details of consultations you have held with The Police (since it is they who will have to track down and prosecute law breakers). Are they in favour?

Consultation with the police will take place during phase 3 (public consultation phase).

Are they aware that two cars were badly damaged on Pond Square within ten minutes of each other on 30.07.24?

The Council do not hold this information. You can make an information request to the Metropolitan Police [here](#).

7. Your assessment of The Council's likely costs, including 'management time', legal fees, possible PR costs etc should this scheme go to law (Judicial Review etc)

At present Phase 2 co-design stage of the project has just finished. Cost estimates are not developed currently and hence we do not hold this information.

8. The 'sudden death cost' of dismantling the scheme if/when it is shown to have worsened traffic flows/accident rates/air quality etc in x months (or if a 'Judicial Review' finds against it at some point)

At present Phase 2 co-design stage of the project has just finished. Cost estimates are not developed currently and hence we do not hold this information.

9. The environmental cost of abandoning the scheme should that come to pass - eg. how much diesel will be used to alter road markings, remove new signage, take down air quality monitors, the cameras etc. And what is the cost of scrapping site-specific signage, take pavements back to their original width etc etc

At present Phase 2 co-design stage of the project has just finished. Cost estimates are not developed currently and hence we do not hold this information.

10. A copy of your 'vested interests' policy. Several of our 'members' believe that some of Camden's decision-makers are based in, or near, the (few?) streets which will benefit most from this scheme. Having already asked for the (approximate) home addresses of all relevant Council personnel, could this be treated as a priority please?

We are not sure what you mean by “vested interests” however we have interpreted this as follows:

Regarding employees: The Gifts and Hospitality Conflicts of Interest Policy and Procedure is attached.

Regarding Councillors the Code of Conduct including information on interests, as well as the Gifts and Hospitality Protocol can be found in the Constitution:

[PART 53 Councillor Code of Conduct.pdf \(camden.gov.uk\)](#)

11. Details of any meetings you have already held with local schools/delivery companies etc with a view to reducing traffic volumes before the scheme goes any further. Now is surely the time to have those meetings, when 'management' has more free time due to the school holidays etc

As outlined in project background online engagement has been ongoing with Schools in the area. We have moved ahead with two healthy school streets around Brookfield Primary School and Acland Burghley. Schools in the area were part of the letter drop asking local people to be involved in Phase 2 Engagement and we are currently analysing phase 2 Engagement.

12. Your 'damage limitation plan' if any.

Clarified:

Thank you for your email and for handling my FOI request so promptly.

Damage limitation (DL) is a standard management term for a documented policy/strategy created to reduce/negate the harm (be that financial and/or reputational and/or to 'the person') which might befall an organisation and its stake-holders.

As an extreme example, HMG will have various DL strategies should there be a serious terrorist attack. And both HMG and Westminster Council will have a documented Damage Limitation Policy should the level of The Thames rise over coming years through global warming.

In this case, it is clear that one or more of say ten Residents' Associations (or an umbrella organisation representing all of them) will do everything legally possible to stop the proposed D'mouth Park Scheme. Such action should already have been anticipated by Camden Council, resulting in a full DL policy . If not, the drivers of this scheme are not doing their job. Voters should know of that.

Camden Council might embark on the early stages of this scheme only to discover that the LA Ombudsman or a Judicial Review (or a mix of those) obliges The Council to abandon or significantly modify its plans. That is where a 'damage limitation' policy is useful. With such a far-reaching/expensive scheme, there must be a document covering Camden Council's worst fears.

Were I to be preparing such a DL document, 'off the top of my head' it would examine how best to:

- Show clearly that the project had considered the well-being of all stakeholders**
- Protect Camden's Council's reputation as an efficient spender of tax payers' money**
- Cancel/put on 'hold' any contracts under way should the project be modified (leading to a possible snow-balling of claims for compensation of contractors)**
- Advise The Police and other emergency services that a road which was to be have been closed will now remain open**
- Dispose of all the redundant signage (detailng green policies, scrap values etc etc)**
- Establish the best way (if there is one) to challenge any legal victories various Residents' Assns launch or win**
- Formulate specific PR actions to explain to Council Tax Payers (many/most of whom vote Labour) why the project makes sense. (The implication of The ULEZ-linked Uxbridge election result might be covered here)**

- Deal with protests from militant organisations such as Just Stop Oil should it become apparent that overall air quality (ie across The Borough) will actually be worsened by the scheme
- Deal with media reports of increased road accidents, the impact of increased transit times for emergency vehicles etc. (At its worst, how would any fatality - be that a child, an invalid or someone elderly, be handled?)
- Establish what, if anything, can be learned from recently cancelled schemes which are very similar to this (A DL policy would normally be refreshed regularly, such that Camden's may, by now, be updated to reflect the recent Hackney scheme reversal)
- Deal with (worried) comments from Central Government when/if they learn of mistakes made thus far
- Assess the power and resistance of private individuals. For instance, of our ten or more Residents' Assns, one of the smaller groupings encompasses individuals with experience of direct contact with Downing Street, a Barrister, three Doctors of medicine, two PR Company owners, several lawyers/architects/accountants, the ex-Chair of BAFTA, the Deputy Chair of The Electrical Vehicle Assn etc. The amalgam of such talents across say 1500 households (ie enough to create a petition with 3000 signatures) is huge. Getting to grips with it will require large amounts of senior management time, across an x year timescale should the project go ahead

Your Damage Limitation Paper probably has headings roughly along the above lines. Then, typically, headings like these might be followed by say 50-100 words showing what actions would follow to 'limit damage to Camden and its citizens'.

Thank you again for your contact. It is a lovely sign of a democratic nation.

The information requested i.e., a damage limitation policy/plan, is not held by the department. When dealing with schemes such as the present scheme, the Dartmouth Park Area Healthy Neighbourhood, the Council assesses risk through various measures such as Road Safety Audits, Strategic and Policy Alignments, public consultation and engagement, consideration of key impacts and risks and where appropriate design changes.

Given the current depth of feeling, it seems possible that there will be duplication between some of the above list and other FOI requests. If so, within each 'general category', can the most demanding request be the one you answer please, with the simpler request receiving more detail than might otherwise have been expected.

Finally, unless you tell us/have told us that our FOI requests are improperly worded or addressed, we will assume that they are viable and will be answered. And those answers need to come to us in a time-frame which allows appropriate reaction to what is seen as an ill-conceived scheme and an undemocratic consultation process.

CAM8375

The total amount spent to date on the Dartmouth Park Area Neighbourhood Scheme

Amount spent on Dartmouth Park Area Neighbourhood Scheme is £155,000.

CAM8410

I write to make the following FOI request. Please let me know if any further information is needed.

1) Number of days over the past 12 months that Dartmouth Park Hill has experienced roadworks.

2) Number of recorded traffic accidents over the past 12 months on Dartmouth Park Hill.

Dartmouth Park Hill is on the Borough Boundary and is maintained by Islington. You can make an information request to Islington Council [here](#).

I write to make the following FOI request. Please let me know if you require any further information.

1) Number of days over the past 12 months that Swain's Lane (in particular between Chester Road and Bishop Gardens) has experienced roadworks.

3 on the road and 1 on the footpath.

Works location	Works location description	Promoter	Proposed start date
Footway	outside 79	CADENT GAS LIMITED	25/08/2024
Carriageway	Side of 100	London Borough of Camden	22/08/2024
Carriageway	Side of 85	London Borough of Camden	22/05/2024
Carriageway	near junction Bisham Gardens	London Borough of Camden	22/05/2024

2) Number of recorded traffic accidents over the past 12 months on Swain's Lane (in particular between Chester Road and Bishop Gardens).

As per latest available data for the most recent 12-month period from [TfLs Road Danger Reduction Dashboard](#) (May 1, 2023 to Apr 30, 2024), there were no recorded collisions between Chester Road and Bisham Gardens on Swain's Lane.

On Swain's Lane as a whole, however, there were 2 reported collisions, both of which were slight. One occurred at the junction of Swain's Lane and Highgate and the other occurred at the junction of Swain's Lane and South Grove.

CAM8490

1. What is the scope of the work agreed by LB Camden and Islington with Smart Traffic Hub for the Dartmouth Park Healthy Neighbourhood Scheme (DPHN)?

Smart Transport Hub was engaged by Camden and Islington council to facilitate the process, engagement events, and business visits undertaken for Phase 2 Engagement for Dartmouth Park Area Healthy Neighbourhood.

2. Has any cost benefit analysis been undertaken with respect to the DPHN, and if so what are the results, listing each category of costs, income and benefit?

Information relating to cost benefit analysis has already been covered in the request CAM8292.

You can find this information either on the [Dartmouth Park Healthy Neighbourhood FAQ](#) or the [Council's Open Data Portal](#).

3. Have any traffic simulations been undertaken for the DPHN to estimate the capability of the road system, what subsequent revisions have been made after pinpointing necessary adjustments, and how have the initial designs been refined as a result to improve the function of the road network.

Information relating to cost benefit analysis has already been covered in the request CAM8263.

You can find this information either on the [Dartmouth Park Healthy Neighbourhood FAQ](#) or the [Council's Open Data Portal](#).

4. Has any estimate been made of the income to the London Boroughs of Islington and Camden that is likely to be generated by these proposals?

Information relating to income has been answered in the request CAM8179.

You can find this information either on the [Dartmouth Park Healthy Neighbourhood FAQ](#) or the [Council's Open Data Portal](#).

5. To what extent has the income from other LTN schemes been taken into account in making these proposals?

Project background is shared on project website details resident engagement which has led to the Dartmouth Park Area Healthy Neighbourhood project.

<https://dartmouthpark.commonplace.is/en-GB/proposals/sample-content-walkingcycling-scheme/step1>

6. What were LB Camden and Islington's incomes from LTNs (or LTNs and School Streets if not separately calculated) in the most recent year for which figures are available?

London Borough of Camden figures for 2023/24:

Scheme Category	Sum of Issued PCNs	Sum of Operation Record of Income (Issue Date)
Healthy Schools	31,096	£1,993,167

Low Traffic Neighbourhood	4,609	£239,234
Safe and Healthy Streets	11,754	£648,331
Grand Total	47,459	£2,880,732

As some of the information requested is already reasonably accessible elsewhere it is exempt under Regulation 6(1).

CAM8525

The council holds some of the information requested.

Revised FOIA request

1. The principal documents showing how the decision was made to define the area of the proposed Dartmouth Park Healthy Neighbourhood (DPHN), and if the following matters were considered showing why

a. The Grove was excluded

b. Millfield Lane and Merton Lane were excluded

Information is not held on the reasons for exclusion of The Grove, Millfield Lane and Merton Lane. The project area has been developed based on the road network and stakeholder engagement in the area documented in the project background online:

<https://dartmouthpark.commonplace.is/en-GB/proposals/sample-content-walkingcyclingscheme/step1>

c. LB Haringey was not involved in drafting the DPHN proposals.

LB Haringey have been engaged as a stakeholder in Phase 1 of the project and again we shared the proposals with them as part of Phase 2 of the project.

2. The principal documents showing how the existing planning areas and their plans were taken into account (that is to say, the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan, the Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Plan and the Kentish Town Neighbourhood Plan).

Please refer to project background online:

<https://dartmouthpark.commonplace.is/enGB/proposals/sample-content-walkingcycling-scheme/step1>

and Phase 1 video: <https://dartmouthpark.commonplace.is/en-GB/proposals/frequently-askedquestions/step1> discussing existing plans of the area.

3. Any minutes of meetings in which consideration was given to using defined Neighbourhood Plan areas, post code areas, constituency or ward boundaries to set the area of the DPHN

See section 4f of the [Camden Transport Strategy](#) for prioritisation of this area based project. Please also see road use hierarchy in the Camden Transport Strategy in relation to consideration given to project area and Camden's Road Use Hierarchy. Please also refer to Phase 1 video: <https://dartmouthpark.commonplace.is/en-GB/proposals/frequently-asked-questions/step1>

4. The document(s) covering the appointment of the Camden cabinet member responsible for the project at its inception and covering any change to the Cabinet member responsible. Councillor Richard Olszewski Cabinet Member for Finance and Cost of Living became cabinet member for Dartmouth Park Area HN in March 2023. The decision paper is available [here](#).

5. The document showing which providers were considered before Commonplace was chosen as consultation engagement provider. Commonplace is an online engagement tool being used to collect resident feedback and input on these proposals.

Commonplace was not solely chosen for Dartmouth Park Area project, rather Camden Council have a licence to use the Commonplace platform and its features. Digital engagement/consultation platform is listed on Camden's Opendata platform (use search field) https://opendata.camden.gov.uk/Finance/Camden-Contracts-Register/q52e-brxc/data_preview

The council has had a contract with Commonplace to deliver consultation and engagement since 2019. If you are interested in documentation around the process followed for that you can make a new freedom of information request for the information; but from reading your request we do not think that this is what you were requesting, more than you were interested in why commonplace was used as the medium for this particular case.

6. The spreadsheet(s) showing all traffic count information used to provide the traffic count figures included in the DPHN proposal.

See the attached ATCs. **Please note** – as this attachment is too big to copy to this document, please visit our FOI responses site at the link given at the start of this document.

7. The principal documents showing how the decision as to where traffic counts would be done was made.

Traffic count data has been taken over a range of street types in the area based on experience gained from previous delivery of monitoring of proposals, such as those contained in the Phase 2 engagement.

8. Any and all other traffic survey data relating to the area which was taken into account in preparing the DPHN proposal.

See attachments for question 6 as well as the attached traffic study undertaken by the consultant for Dartmouth Park Area.

9. Any document showing how health was explicitly taken into account in designing the DPHN proposal.

This information is publicly available on the [Council's Open Data Portal](#) by searching for CAM8176 or viewing the Dartmouth Park Healthy Neighbourhood Scheme [FAQs](#).

As the information requested is already reasonably accessible elsewhere it is exempt under Regulation 6(1).

CAM8996

The council holds some of the information requested and some of it is withheld.

A. Documents, for example the agreement with Airscape for the erection and collection of data using the pollution monitoring network, at the outset before the pollution monitors were installed in 2022.

See the attached service agreement between Camden Council and Airscape, signed in July 2021.

B. Documents showing how the decision was taken to not continue the Airscape contract after April this year, including a reference to the officers report to Council about its termination and decisions not to extend it.

This information is not held as a decision has not been taken to terminate the Airscape contract. Airscape contacted the Council mid-contract seeking to change the terms of the existing contract and the Council has not agreed to the proposed changes. Discussions are ongoing.

C. Documents relating to the ownership of the data collected over the two years of the Airscape contract 2022 to 2024. Does Camden have a continuing legal right to access the data collected?

As per the service agreement between both parties, Airscape own all data collected by the sensor network, with the provision that Camden Council be provided access to data upon request to use internally.

D. Information about how members of the public can access the data collected over the two year period of operation.

When active, the Airscape platform provides members of the public with access to real-time data for a period of up to 30 days, which is not available for download. Whilst discussions are ongoing between both parties, the platform has not been made available for public consumption by Airscape.

Camden Council maintain a comprehensive and reference-grade air quality monitoring network across the borough, with all data collected made available to the public via Camden's Annual Status Reports (<https://www.camden.gov.uk/air-quality#mczc>) and Open

data platform <https://opendata.camden.gov.uk/stories/s/Camden-Air-Quality-Monitoring/bmrm-k7pv/>.

The data collected by Airscape has not achieved this standard and so is not included in Camden's statutory air quality reporting.

E. In the light of the officer's report to the Culture and Environment Scrutiny Committee on 11.11.24 that the Dartmouth Park Healthy Neighbourhood project "has been funded by Transport for London" please

1. Provide the documents making this funding provision, omitting any financial information which may be commercially sensitive, and

2. In particular, provide any and all documents which show conditions attached to this funding provision.

The Dartmouth Park scheme has received a total of £155k from TfL and DfT since the 2021/22 funding year with the breakdown as follows:

Funding Year	Amount allocated from TfL/DfT	Amount claimed
2021/22	£233,945	£60,000
2022/23	£25,000	£25,000
2023/24	£70,000	£70,000
TOTAL	£328,945	£155,000

Please note that whilst the table shows the amount of funds allocated, due to programming issues we were only able to spend & claim the figure listed in the "Amount Claimed" column.

The documents making this funding provision are attached. The funding for 2021/22 was from the DfT Active Travel Fund and was managed by Transport for London (TfL), the funding notification we received was via an email, which has been attached as a pdf. We do not have any written conditions related to this funding provision.

The funding allocations for 2022/23 and 2023/24 were from TfL's LIP funding process. Please see attached the funding letters detailing the allocations. The amounts for Dartmouth Park will be included in the "Safer Corridors and Neighbourhoods" funding programmes.

Although the individual amounts for the scheme are not listed in the letters, the amounts allocated to individual schemes, such as Dartmouth Park, were agreed separately with TfL and amended in-year depending on the progress of each scheme. The funding of our implementation programme and wider intentions have been published on Camden's Cabinet decisions page, at the time each Programme of Investment was approved. The links to these reports are below:

<https://democracy.camden.gov.uk/ieDecisionDetails.aspx?ID=3822>

<https://democracy.camden.gov.uk/ieDecisionDetails.aspx?ID=3404>

Personal information has been redacted under Regulation 12(3). See the refusal notice below.

Regulation 12(3)

The council considers that to disclose the personal data requested would not be in accordance with data protection legislation and therefore we have withheld some/all of the information under the absolute exemption in Regulation 12(3).

The exemption states that personal data requested may be withheld when to release it would be a breach of the requirements of data protection law which is the UK General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and the Data Protection Act 2018. The information withheld is personal information because it allows living individuals to be identified.

The council considers that it would be a breach of the General Data Protection Regulation article 5 requirements of fairness and proportionality to publish this personal information in a FOI request. In doing this we have considered the legitimate public interest in disclosure against the interests of the data subject/s and concluded that in the circumstances disclosure would contravene the data protection requirements of fairness and proportionality particularly considering that Freedom of Information responses are public documents and published to the world and not provided just to the requester.

The council's redaction policy states that junior staff member names, (those below Assistant Director level) unless in public facing positions, would not be released in a FOI response. Therefore, the names of junior staff members have been redacted from the request details as they would have no expectation that their details would be released into the public domain, and especially given the content of the request as we consider that to include them would be a breach of the requirements to act fairly and proportionately.

CAM8999

The council holds some of the information requested. In the summer Camden Council announced a consultation regarding the proposed creation of the Dartmouth Park Healthy Neighbourhood and invited comments from the public. At a recent meeting it was announced that over 2500 responses were received. Can you please advise.

a) Total number of responses received

Please see the attached committee report which confirms 2,308 signatures.

b) Number in favour

c) Of those in favour, number of those who lived in the area.

The data has not yet been analysed so this information is not held.

CAM9025

I'm a resident of Kentish Town, within the proposed zone for the Dartmouth Park Healthy Neighbourhood

> Please provide all information relating to:

> 1. The proposals as they apply to Burghley Road and Lady Somerset Road.

Please see [proposals overview document](#) outlining Burghley Road and Lady Somerset Road proposals.

> 2. Consideration given as to any measures which could be implemented on Burghley Road and Lady Somerset Road as part of the scheme, including any proposals which were considered and not included in the current plan.

Please refer to FOI CAM8359 which has options developed in the process of developing the three proposals now shared. To view the previous response, please click on the following link and enter 'CAM8359' in the search field to view it.

[Camden Freedom Of Information Response Search](#)

> 3. The anticipated impact of the proposals to traffic volumes on Burghley Road and Lady Somerset Road.

At present we undertook Phase 2 co-design stage of the project, where we shared initial proposals for feedback. No traffic modelling has been produced for the individual streets.

> 4. When the residents of Burghley Road and Lady Somerset Road were first consulted about the proposals.

All residents of Dartmouth Park were engaged first in September 2023 during Phase 1 engagement and then again in July 2024 during Phase 2 engagement. Engagement map can be reviewed here: [Dartmouth Park | Commonplace](#)

> I would like to receive the information in the form of underlying documents relating to the above points, for example plans, consultations and studies undertaken by or provided to the council, and minutes of meetings considering the above points; and responses to the above questions.

CAM9066

The council holds some of the information requested.

In my FOI (ref CAM8999) I requested a breakdown of the approx 2,500 responses Camden received about the Dartmouth Park Healthy Neighbourhood scheme. Councillor Matthew Kirk referred to this at the Culture & Environment Scrutiny Committee meeting of 11-Nov-24 (approx at 1hr 20min 20sec of the recording). The response I got relates to the support the Highgate Society received for its petition to extend the consultation period

The Transport Planning team did not refer to the support of the Highgate Society in the response to CAM8999. The response still stands that Section 2.16 of the committee report shows a table of the Phase 2 engagement responses and where they were coming from.

It still stands that the Transport Planning team are analysing all responses received and do not hold this information currently.

CAM9124

The council holds the information requested. However we are withholding all of the information because it is exempt as explained below. We have explained where we are withholding information and what exemptions apply. Please see the refusal notices at the end of the answers which explain how and why they apply.

I am writing to request information relating to the proposed Dartmouth Park Healthy Neighbourhood scheme.

Could you please confirm whether or not any individuals involved in planning/decision making in relation to the Dartmouth Park Healthy Neighbourhood scheme (including but not limited to councillors) live on roads that - as a result of the proposals - will either:

(A) see new/additional traffic prevention and/or reduction measures, including but not limited to, filters; and/or

(B) are expected to see reduced traffic as a result of the proposal in its current form.

If the answer to either of the above questions is yes, please explain what steps: (A) have been taken; and / or

(B) will be taken to manage any conflict of interest arising from this position.

Could you please also explain what role any such individuals:

(A) have played in the process to date (eg involved in drafting the proposed traffic plan which has been presented for consideration/decision making that such a plan should be put forward); and

(B) are anticipated to play going forward with the proposed scheme.

For avoidance of doubt, I am not requesting the names, addresses, and/or any other such personal information or data of any such individuals. Therefore there should be no data protection issues as a result. I simply would like to receive confirmation (either positive or negative) of any such position, and an explanation of the steps taken to manage it.

Your request is refused under Section 40(2) of the Freedom of Information Act. See the refusal notice below.

Refusal Notice:

Section 40(2)

The council considers that to disclose the personal data requested would not be in accordance with data protection legislation and therefore we have withheld all of the information under the absolute exemption in Section 40(2).

The exemption states that personal data requested may be withheld when to release it would be a breach of the requirements of data protection law which is the UK General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and the Data Protection Act 2018. The information withheld is personal information because it allows living individuals to be identified.

The council considers that it would be a breach of the General Data Protection Regulation article 5 requirements of fairness and proportionality to publish this personal information in a FOI request. In doing this we have considered the legitimate public interest in disclosure against the interests of the data subject/s and concluded that in the circumstances disclosure would contravene the data protection requirements of fairness and proportionality particularly considering that Freedom of Information responses are public documents and published to the world and not provided just to the requester.

Although you have stated that you are not requesting names and addresses, the Information Commissioner's Office (ICO) considers "personal data" about a person includes the following "an identifiable natural person is one who can be identified, directly or indirectly, in particular by reference to an identifier such as a name, an identification number, location data, an online identifier..."

As there are websites, including the council's own website, that could include names and/or job titles of employees it could be possible to identify employees of specific teams by the fact that their job title could be displayed online or that by reading various documents online it could be possible to identify their names by cross referencing job titles or content of websites or published reports online.

The ICO further states that "If you can distinguish an individual from other individuals, then that person is 'identified' or is 'identifiable'. Often an individual's name together with some other information will be sufficient to identify them." So even if an employee had a common name, an identifier such as their job title could reveal the specific person.

Although we are not questioning your reason for asking for this information, it should be noted that the ICO requires public bodies to have a publication scheme and so all of our Freedom of Information (FOI/EIR) responses are available for anyone to view on the Council's Open Data Portal and so it is important that the council protects its employees welfare.

Although we are not saying if any employee or councillor does live in the areas affected, it should also be noted that the council has robust conflict of interest policies, published online as follows:

[Code of conduct](#) and [Conflict of interest for members](#)

CAM9145

Dartmouth Park Area Healthy Neighbourhood

1. Why the intention is to continue to allow traffic on Burghley Road (including two way traffic on the lower part of Burghley Road).

The project's aim would be to reduce the ability for motor vehicle drivers to cut through the Healthy Neighbourhood area. Changes to reduce northbound, southbound and eastbound through traffic through the healthy neighbourhood area are proposed. Westbound motor traffic movements would remain possible through the area.

Burghley Road would be made one-way westbound for motor vehicles between Dartmouth Park Hill and Oakford Road. This would prevent this street being used as an eastbound motor vehicle route through the area. Cycling would be possible in both directions. The timed school street measures on this street would remain in operation. Please see details [here](#).

2. What studies have been conducted or estimates made of the increased traffic on Burghley Road as a result of the current proposals.

Please refer to previous FOI **CAM8176** point 13 for answer. Please refer to FOI **CAM8269** in regard to how the scheme will be monitored during a trial phase.

Please click on the following link and enter the CAM reference in the search field to view them.

[Camden Freedom Of Information Response Search](#)

3. What is the effect of the physical traffic filter mentioned on Lady Somerset Road? Will it entirely prevent traffic from entering, or does it actually just mean the type of traffic mechanism which is already in place on Lady Somerset Road (which merely means that traffic has to slow down to fit through the narrowed gap).

A physical traffic filter at Lady Somerset Road would prevent any east-west and west-east vehicle movement. Please see details here on the proposals overview document [here](#).

It is clear that the emphasis of the scheme is on reducing traffic on roads to the north of ours, including York Rise and Chetwynd Road. The residents of those roads may well want some measures to reduce traffic on their roads, but the solution cannot fairly be to implement a scheme which increases traffic on Burghley Road and surrounding roads. It would be irrational and illogical to proceed on that basis, particularly as both York Rise and Chetwynd Road are mixed use roads with a variety of businesses and restaurants / pubs, whilst Burghley Road is 100% residential, other than a large school. How is it in any way sensible to suggest a scheme which increases traffic on our road, particularly in light of those features, and when we are supposed to be included as a part of the healthy neighbourhood?

We are interpreting this to be an explanation of the reasoning for the following question 4.

4. Please could you explain why a scheme has been proposed which would have that effect?

This is not a valid request as it is not asking for recorded information held by the council but for opinion.

The reasons why the scheme is being proposed and the aims of the project can be seen:

- On project background online: [Have Your Say Today - Project background - Dartmouth Park](#)
- Here are the videos of Phase 1 and 2 online meeting going through project aims and objectives [Have Your Say Today - Online public meeting and in person event - Dartmouth Park](#)
- And here is our CTS delivery plan please refer to figure on page 6 highlighting upcoming schemes (includes Dartmouth Park) and explains priority of scheme in the borough: [Appendix B1 - Plan for 2025-26 and 2027-28.pdf](#)
- Aims of the initial proposals shared can be seen on page 6 [here](#) .

I also have a question about how the proposal to make Burghley Road one way interacts with comments made in the attached 2018 report which covered the implementation of restrictions around Acland Burghley school. That report noted that making Burghley Road one way would necessitate removing the width restriction which is currently in place and which “discourage large vehicles from using the residential street of Burghley Road, Oakford Road and Lady Somerset Road as through routes, with the road narrowing also acting as traffic calming features, reducing speeds of permitted traffic and making this route less attractive”.

We are interpreting this to be an explanation of the reasoning for the following question 5.

5. How does the proposal in the new scheme sit alongside this analysis, please?

Phase 2 of the project which closed in August 2024 shared initial proposals for the scheme. These are not the final proposals, and this was not the final engagement. Local people can email their feedback regarding the proposals and a public consultation will be undertaken for Dartmouth Park Healthy Neighbourhood. The project proposals are areawide proposals which look at the whole area of Dartmouth Park and through a combination of different improvements/interventions looks to reduce overall traffic and make the area greener, healthier and more pleasant to spend time in. The timed school street measures on this street would remain in operation. Regarding large vehicles, there is an area wide 7.5t weight restriction in Dartmouth Park to restrict HGV movement.

6. Additionally, has a traffic count been carried out on Burghley Road recently, and could you please provide the data from that if so?

This information can be found in the proposals overview document page 5 [here](#) .

CAM9185

The council holds the information requested. However we are withholding some or all of the information because it is excepted as explained below. We have explained where we are withholding information and what exceptions apply. Please see the refusal notices at the end of the answers which explain how and why they apply.

We write to request the following information. We will also contact Islington concerning our request for Dartmouth Park Hill.

1) How many movement orders were issued by Camden Council to HGVs allowing them to use Highgate West Hill as a through way (ie its destination was not this weight restricted street) in 2024, 2023, 2022, 2021, 2020 and 2019?

2) How many movement orders were issued by Camden Council to HGVs allowing them to use Dartmouth Park Hill as a through way (ie its destination was not this street) in 2024, 2023, 2022, 2021, 2020 and 2019?

The Council will not process your request as it falls under an exception in the EIR 2004 because the cost or burden of dealing with your request is manifestly unreasonable. See the refusal notice below.

Refusal Notice:

Under Regulation 12(4)(b) it would be considered manifestly unreasonable to provide a response to your request because the cost of compliance, and burden of dealing with your request, is excessive. The exception protects the Council's ability to carry out its public functions and provides a balance between transparency and the protection of resources.

Our Structures Team process abnormal loads requests. They "approve," "approve with conditions" or "reject" abnormal loads notices depending on which Camden owned structures the vehicle passes over. They do not check routes against Environmental restrictions, and they would expect Hauliers to comply with existing highway signage unless they seek specific permission to do otherwise, usually involving the police.

Searching through their MS Outlook system they have found 822 returns. In order to answer your question, the Structures team would need to check each return manually. If it took at least 5 minutes to check each return, then it would take over 68 hours.

It should be noted that search results do not account for multiple entries for the same journey (e.g. a journey route may be altered, requiring authorisation each time).

Also, this would not necessarily reflect the actual approvals which we do not keep in any systematic fashion.

However, it should be noted, unless authorities state otherwise, Hauliers assume routes are approved and as there are no structures that Camden owns on these roads, we would not have rejected based on using that road.

In applying this exception, the Council has also considered the balance of the public interest in line with the EIR 2004.

The public interest argument for releasing this information is:

- It would improve transparency to the general public of the Council.
- The presumption in favour of disclosure in the regulations.

The public interest arguments for withholding the information are:

- Processing this request would be a large burden in terms of Officer time and cost to the council.
- This request would necessarily constitute a significant diversion of resources away from the Council's core business activities.
- It would consequently have a proportionally detrimental impact on the provision of services to the public.
- It is not in the public interest that the Council neglect its provision of services to the public to focus on one information request.

It is felt that in all the circumstances of the case, the public interest in maintaining the exception outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

Advice and Assistance:

As advice and assistance, we could carry out a sample of approximately 6 months data searching for relevant email returns and checking that the vehicle travelled down Highgate West Hill or Dartmouth Park Hill, and further to determine whether the route was accepted or rejected.

Carrying out the initial search, the following information was gathered:

Highgate West Hill – 371 returns

Highgate W Hill – 272 returns (please note that there may be overlap in these 2 separate searches)

Dartmouth Park Hill – 179 returns

CAM9261

Thank you for your response to CAM9145. I have the following questions arising from it:

1. In relation to your response to question 2, you referred me to CAM8269. However no such FOI response exists on the Camden website. Please could you send the correct reference?

There was a slight lag in the publication of the CAM8269 response, however this is now published and can be accessed at the following link by entering 'CAM8269' in the search field.

[Camden Freedom Of Information Response Search](#)

The response to CAM8269 can also be viewed on our [Freedom Of Information FAQs](#) page in the Dartmouth Park Healthy Neighbourhood Scheme FOIFAQ document.

2. In response to question 2, you also referred to “how the scheme will be monitored during a trial period”. I thought that the scheme was still supposed to be subject to a formal consultation period and therefore that no decision should yet have been made regarding whether the proposal is to be taken forward. Please could you confirm the position?

This is correct. The scheme will undergo a public consultation, and no decision has been made yet. If and when a decision is made the scheme would, if approved, undergo a trial.

3. In response to question 5, you stated that there is a 7.5t weight restriction in Dartmouth Park. Is part of the proposed plan for this scheme to remove the width restriction at the top of Burghley Road?

No.

4. My request for an explanation as to why a scheme has been proposed which would in fact increase traffic on Burghley Road and surrounding roads, which are 100% residential roads with a large school, is in fact a request for information. The question is what consideration has been given to the fact that the scheme would lead to increased traffic on our roads, when they are supposed to be part of the proposed “healthy neighbourhood”; and why has it been considered reasonable to put forward a scheme which would have that effect, particularly in light of the characteristics of our roads (including the presence of a school of almost 1,000 pupils)? Information should be held as to the consideration given to this question as part of this process, and the rationale for proposing the scheme in this form when it would have this effect. Alternatively if no such consideration was given to this issue, please confirm if that is the case.

Data collected on Burghley Road, north of Lady Somerset Road shows that there were 527 north bound vehicle movements (in 2023) and 463 north bound in (2024). These vehicles will no longer be able to access Dartmouth Park Hill via Burghley Road, therefore this volume would likely reduce. Equally the proposed restriction on Lady Somerset Road at the junction with Fortress Road would reduce the traffic volumes on this street which currently are in

excess of 1500 per day (in 2023 and 2024). Evidence from previous schemes shows that restrictions such as this reduce traffic volumes across the area.

Advice and Assistance:

We have received 2 previous requests on the same subject from you and the service have informed us that they are also corresponding with you by email about the same subject. Please note that processing FOI requests at the same time as responding to general emails on the same subject increases the workload on our services and so decreases efficiency. It is also slower to communicate via FOI due to the formal nature of the process and the internal checks and clearances required. Our advice is to not make FOI requests as well as being in direct communication with the service area, but to correspond directly with the service over this matter.

You can also check our Portal at [Camden Open Data Portal](#) to browse our many useful and interesting datasets.

We do not give our consent for any names and contact details provided in this response to be sent marketing material. Any such use will be reported to the ICO as a breach of General Data Protection Regulations and the Privacy and Electronic Communication Regulations.

London Borough of Camden

Information and Records Management

Judd Street

London.

WC1H 9JE

e-mail: foi@camden.gov.uk