

7.1. Consultation Strategy

7.1.1. The consultation strategy included sending the full draft to those organisations listed as statutory consultees including the Metropolitan Police, Transport for London, organisations representing disabled people and adjoining Boroughs. The statutory consultees for the SEA [English Heritage, English Nature, Countryside Agency, Environment Agency] were sent the draft LIP.

7.1.2. The draft was also been sent to the London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority, London Ambulance Service; Highways Agency; Network Rail and SRA; and representatives of business, local environment, transport and community groups.

7.1.3. Due to the difficulties in consulting effectively on a large document, it was not considered appropriate to prepare a summary leaflet for distribution to all residents in the Borough. Experience has suggested that there are very low responses to consultations on broad policy and programme documents due mainly to the difficulty in summarising an extensive document in an easily digestible format.

7.1.4. Therefore the following strategy was adopted:

7.1.5. A initial Stakeholder Forum was held on December 10th 2004. This was attended by officers, members of the Council and representatives of stakeholder groups. This early meeting allowed the broad policy parameters underpinning the Local Implementation Plan to be established before the writing of the document. A summary of the outcomes may be found below as Section 7.2

7.1.6. An all day workshop was held on Saturday April 23rd 2005 for organisations representing businesses, local environment and transport groups. The invitees will include those organisations invited to the Stakeholder Forum for the Scrutiny Review of Transport in December 2004 plus organisations and individuals expressing an interest in transport issues who participated in the Better Haringey workshop.

7.1.7. A summary of the workshop findings was included in the May edition of Haringey People with invitation to comment through a dedicated email address. The formal period for consultation was from June to July 2005. The draft LIP was included in the Haringey website with an opportunity for direct comment.

7.1.8. A CD-ROM of the draft LIP was made available on request.

Final Local Implementation Plan
Chapter 7 Consultation

7.2. Consultation Results

7.2.1 Table 7.1 summarises the responses from the general public on the consultation draft LIP. The priority areas are those in the MTS as below.

- Priority 1: Improving road safety
- Priority 2: Improving bus journey times and reliability
- Priority 3: Relieving traffic congestion and improving journey time reliability including through the use of travel demand measures
- Priority 4: Improving the working of parking and loading arrangements
- Priority 5: Improving accessibility and social inclusion on the transport network
- Priority 6: Encourage walking
- Priority 7: Encourage cycling
- Priority 8: Bringing transport infrastructure to a state of good repair.

Table 7.1 Summary of Consultation Results

How important do you think are the Mayor's priorities?	Mayor's Priority [%]							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Very important	54	70	32	25	37	62	60	71
Fairly important	37	21	27	30	38	16	21	14
Neither important or unimportant	5	5	16	21	13	8	8	8
Fairly unimportant	1	1	6	11	6	6	8	3
Very unimportant	0	0	0	11	1	5	8	0
No comment	3	3	3	1	5	3	3	3

7.2.2 Other written responses relate to the following broad areas.

- 1] Improvements to bus services
- 2] Improvements to train services
- 3] Improvements to road infrastructure
- 4] Improvements to cycle and pedestrian routes
- 5] Miscellaneous comments

<i>Improvements to Bus Services</i>	%	Council response
Better air ventilation on buses	13	This is an issue for bus companies and TfL. Raised at regular Public Transport Liaison meetings
More frequent bus services	35	This is an issue for TfL. Lobbying for improvements to bus services is frequently raised at regular Public Transport

Final Local Implementation Plan
Chapter 7 Consultation

		Liaison meetings
Training of bus drivers	19	This is an issue for bus companies and TfL. Raised at regular Public Transport Liaison meetings
Other improvements	32	

<i>Improvements to Train Services</i>	%	Council response
More reliable train services	75	This is an issue for rail operators. Raised at regular Public Transport Liaison meetings
Other improvements to train services	25	This is an issue for rail operators. Raised at regular Public Transport Liaison meetings

<i>Improvements to Road Infrastructure</i>	%	Council response
Reduce speeds on road/traffic calming measures	50	The Council has a programme for implementing 20mph zones and introducing other measures to improve road safety. Details provided in Section 5.2
Managing demand by private car users	12	The Council supports demand management measures. Our proposals and programmes to discourage car use are set out in Sections 5.3, 5.5, 5.7, 5.8, 5.11 Parking Plan, School Travel Plan
Other improvements to road infrastructure	38	The Council's proposals and programmes to improve infrastructure are set out in Section 5.4, 5.6, 5.9

<i>Improvements to Cycle and Pedestrian Routes</i>	%	Council response
Better street furniture	11	The Council has adopted a Streetscape Manual which has the key principles:

Final Local Implementation Plan
Chapter 7 Consultation

		Reduce street clutter; Co-ordinate the different elements of the streetscape; Limit the range of materials; Protect and enhance the historic character; Enhance the identity of Haringey; Promote accessibility for all; Design streets as places for people.
More cycle lanes	22	The Council is supporting the implementation of LCN Plus and local cycle routes. Details are provided in Section 5.8.
More pelican crossings	22	The Council has identified a programme of pedestrian improvements in Section 5.7
Promote cycling and walking	22	The Council has adopted a Cycle Action Plan and a Walking Strategy. Details of the programme to encourage more walking and cycling are in Sections 5.7 and 5.8
Remove cyclists from pedestrian footways	22	The Council employs street wardens who enforce footway cycling

<i>Miscellaneous Comments</i>	%	Council response
Reduce air pollution	22	The Council has adopted an Air Quality Management Area: Action Plan setting out how it will reduce pollution from a number of key pollutants
More consultation	13	The Council will consult on the details of its proposals as part of the implementation

Final Local Implementation Plan
Chapter 7 Consultation

		programme
Better enforcement of parking zones	13	The Council undertakes regular enforcement through its own parking attendants. Motorcycles are used for a quick response to parking violations. A towing away scheme was introduced in 2004 which has aided enforcement
Higher tax for larger vehicles	9	This is something for central Government to address
Improving disability access for all modes of public transport	17	As Highway authority we have a programme for improving accessibility through drop kerbs and tactile paving. We have set up a Mobility Forum which provides the focus for issues to be raised with TfL and the public transport operators.
Measures to prevent anti-social behaviour	13	The Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership [CDRP] in Haringey has created a dedicated Anti-Social Behaviour Action Team to tackle anti-social behaviour and co-ordinate activity with the Police, Primary Car Trust, Crown Prosecution Service, Victim Support and many other organisations
Motorbikes should be accounted for in transport policies	9	The Council is supporting the provision of motorcycle parking in CPZs. However, the Council is not convinced motor cycles represent a sustainable

Final Local Implementation Plan
Chapter 7 Consultation

		mode of transport and consequently does not have a policy to promote more use of motorcycles in the Borough
Review and research the need for school buses	1	This is an issue to be considered as part of the Council's approach to community transport and its own vehicle fleet

Final Local Implementation Plan
Chapter 7 Consultation

7.2.3 Table 7.2 summarises the comments made from statutory consultees and other organisations and the Council's response

Organisation	Comments made	Council response
Statutory consultees		
Countryside Agency	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. General comments provided 2. Rights of way for pedestrian and cyclists – endorses focus on rights of way improvement plans 3. Access to the countryside and greenspace in and around London – recommends adoption of a policy to create and improve pedestrian and cyclist routes to the rural/urban fringe for recreation and to encourage transport providers to identify, create and promote affordable and sustainable means for Londoners to get to the countryside in and around the Borough and to other greenspaces in the Borough 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted 2. Rights of way improvement plans are not required for inner London boroughs 3. No specific policy but we are supporting the development of green cycleways within the borough. As Haringey is considered an inner London the rural/urban fringe is not relevant
English Heritage	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Overarching objective is to protect and enhance the built and natural environment 2. All programmes, and major schemes should be carefully considered for their potential impact on the historic environment. Careful consideration needs to be given to design and implementation stages. 3. Impact on archaeological remains needs to be considered in the identification and implementation of proposals 4. Commentary states “potential for perceptible change of 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted 2. The Council will set up a mechanism for an input from conservation staff into the development of highway and transport schemes 3. Noted 4. This means that a reduction in traffic levels or

Final Local Implementation Plan
Chapter 7 Consultation

	<p>overall motor vehicle traffic changes or sensitive settings avoided” – what does this mean and where is the qualitative value in this comment?</p> <p>5. Mitigation – no reference has been made to the potential of seeking good design which respects the historic environment and local context as a mitigation measure</p> <p>6. Strongly advise that the Council’s own conservation staff are closely involved throughout on the preparation and implementation of the draft strategy.</p>	<p>transport measures avoiding sensitive locations would provide benefits</p> <p>5. This is being addressed as part of the Environmental Statement</p> <p>6. Noted</p>
Environment Agency	1. Standard checklist provided	1. Amendments made where necessary
Haringey Mobility Forum stakeholders [Haringey Consortium for Disabled People and Carers, Haringey Phoenix Group, Age Concern, Haringey Forum for Older People]	<p>1. Priorities for funding are hazardous street environment and Haringey’s Walking Plan</p> <p>2. Tottenham Hale and Northumberland Park stations should be fully accessible</p> <p>3. Agree that use of public transport, cycling and walking should be encouraged</p> <p>4. Agree that transport can reduce social exclusion</p> <p>5. Agree to policy to locate developments in locations well-served by public transport and that development should be required to consider the needs of public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. Should be consultation on location decisions.</p> <p>6. Pleased that the needs of people with mobility difficulties are being recognised</p> <p>7. Support ComCab/Capital Call scheme</p> <p>8. Agree Taxicard and Dial-a-ride are hard to book</p> <p>9. Agree a Community Transport Champion is a good idea</p>	<p>1. Haringey has adopted a Streetscape Manual which includes the key priorities to reduce street clutter; the proposals in the Walking Plan are being progressed through this LIP</p> <p>2. Northumberland Park station is accessible to wheelchair users; the Council is currently working with partners develop a masterplan for Tottenham Hale which includes redevelopment of the interchange which</p>

	<p>10. Bus stop accessibility programme supported but seeking audio description as well; bus stops need to be clear of rubbish bins etc</p> <p>11. Multiple bus stops cause problems</p> <p>12. Bus driver training/awareness needed at local level</p> <p>13. Pleased to read Walking Plan and agree to the objectives but funding needs to be ring fenced</p> <p>14. Agree with Safe Movement policy</p> <p>15. Agree with Pedestrian Routes policy and pedestrian phase at traffic signals</p> <p>16. More pedestrian crossings needed</p> <p>17. Lengthen time for audio signals at crossings</p> <p>18. Fit rotating cones to all crossings</p> <p>19. Central pedestrian reservations should be raised</p> <p>20. Street lighting on pavements rather than just roads</p> <p>21. Prompt cutting back of overhanging hedges and trees</p> <p>22. Stop charging for taking away large items; recognise that recently few items on the streets</p> <p>23. Shop external displays, A boards and unnecessary poles hazardous to pedestrians – want no adverse affect on pedestrian flow and safety</p> <p>24. Yellow bands on benches, bollards etc to assist partially sighted pedestrians</p> <p>25. Agree traffic calming measures in residential areas</p> <p>26. Improve pedestrian routes to bus stops</p> <p>27. Support measures to reduce cycling on footways</p> <p>28. More road space to pedestrians and cyclists</p> <p>29. Support more cycle parking</p>	<p>would make the station fully DDA compliant</p> <p>3. Noted</p> <p>4. Noted</p> <p>5. Noted; decisions on locations are made within the planning policy context</p> <p>6. Noted</p> <p>7. Noted</p> <p>8. Noted</p> <p>9. Noted</p> <p>10. This is an issue for TfL Buses and will be raised at regular liaison meetings</p> <p>11. This is an issue for TfL Buses and will be raised at regular liaison meetings</p> <p>12. This is an issue for TfL Buses and will be raised at regular liaison meetings</p> <p>13. Noted</p> <p>14. Noted</p> <p>15. Noted</p> <p>16. Additional pedestrian</p>
--	--	--

Final Local Implementation Plan
Chapter 7 Consultation

	<p>30. Limit speed of motorised buggies to 4mph 31. Agree road safety around schools should be prioritised and include school catchment area 32. No further footway parking should be provided and existing schemes removed 33. Opposed to proposal to restrict blue badges to only one car registration number 34. Companion badge scheme commendable 35. Support funding for Freedom Pass 36. Mobility Forum supported</p>	<p>crossings would be identified as appropriate 17. This is an issue for TfL signals section 18. This would be done as part of new signal schemes; subject to funding cones could be fitted to existing signals 19. This will be considered as part of scheme design 20. Street lighting covers footways as well as carriageways 21. Regular cutting back is undertaken 22. The charge is made to cover the costs of removal 23. Enforcement of footway obstructions is carried out 24. This will be considered 25. Noted 26. Agreed; the focus is on addressing the issue in town centres 27. Noted; street wardens will enforce as part of</p>
--	--	---

Final Local Implementation Plan
Chapter 7 Consultation

		<p>their responsibilities</p> <p>28. Noted</p> <p>29. Noted; there is a programme for more cycle parking</p> <p>30. This is not the responsibility of the Council</p> <p>31. Noted; our school travel plan programme considers issues on the way to school</p> <p>32. Footway parking can have a role in supporting bus priority. A minimum footway width is maintained for all footway parking schemes to allow passage of buggies and wheelchairs</p> <p>33. This issue will be considered as part of the Parking Plan implementation</p> <p>34. Noted</p> <p>35. Noted</p> <p>36. Noted</p>
Transport for London	1. Numerous comments which are being addressed separately	

Final Local Implementation Plan
Chapter 7 Consultation

	throughout the final LIP	
Other organisations		
British Motorcyclists Federation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Haringey should take into account the needs of motorcyclists and scooter riders in design of traffic management schemes 2. Concerned that Haringey is discouraging the provision of road space to P2W on local access roads and requests info on how this will occur 3. Request to use IHIE guidelines in design of 20mph zones 4. BMF should be consulted in determining road hierarchy 5. Info needed on provision of sufficient, secure P2W parking 6. Supports initiatives to improve road conditions 7. Support provision of P2W parking in town centres 8. National Motorcycling Strategy and IHIE guidelines need to be taken into account in the national policy framework 9. P2W should be considered vulnerable road users; measures needed to reduce accidents; access to bus lanes and ASLs would improve road safety; Haringey should conduct experiments to obtain data 10. Locations for parking can be suggested by BMF 11. Smaller P2W are cheap to run and socially inclusive 12. Haringey should continue policy of not displaying visitor parking vouchers 13. P2W are an alternative to public transport and can alleviate pressure on the system 14. BMF would welcome opportunity to work with Haringey 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All road users are considered in scheme designs 2. Local access roads do not carry a traffic function and should be primarily suitable for pedestrians and cyclists rather than motor vehicles. 3. Noted 4. The BMF have been consulted as part of the LIP process 5. Parking provided within controlled parking zones 6. Noted 7. Noted 8. National policy framework prepared by the Government and is not a Haringey issue 9. It is acknowledged that P2W have high accident records. The use of bus lanes by P2W is still experimental. The

Final Local Implementation Plan
Chapter 7 Consultation

	<p>to identify areas for free, secure P2W bays</p> <p>15. BMF seeking to be part of formal consultation on traffic schemes</p> <p>16. Haringey should consider producing its own P2W strategy</p> <p>17. Haringey should investigate provision of P2W at stations and interchanges</p>	<p>Council will await the results of the experiment prior to any decision on this issue. The use of ASLs by P2W may deter their use by cyclists.</p> <p>10. Noted</p> <p>11. Noted</p> <p>12. Agreed</p> <p>13. Noted but P2W may not be as environmentally friendly as well used public transport services</p> <p>14. Noted</p> <p>15. The Council will consider BMF as part of formal consultation processes</p> <p>16. The Council does not consider it appropriate to develop a strategy for P2W as issues can be considered as part of other plans eg Road Safety Plan and Parking and Enforcement Plan</p> <p>17. This is an issue for public transport operators</p>
--	--	---

Final Local Implementation Plan
Chapter 7 Consultation

<p>Friends of the Earth: Tottenham and Wood Green</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Council's transport strategy should have the highest priority to reduce greenhouse gas emissions 2. High priority should be given to health and safety particularly reducing the inequality in children's road safety across the Borough 3. A target of at least 10% traffic reduction by 2011 4. The Council should support road user charging in principle 5. The Council should encourage more carbon-efficient vehicles in particular the use of biodiesel for its own vehicles, the use of electric vehicles, the use of hybrids. It can also encourage more fuel efficient vehicles in the wider community through conditions on its contracts and differential residents' parking charges according to fuel efficiency of the vehicle 6. The Council should support TfL's scheme and reject major road widening on the North Circular Road. Bring forward traffic calming measures to prevent rat-running on residential roads 7. Implement cycle training for all schools by 2008 8. 20mph to be the default speed limit for residential roads in Haringey by 2010 9. Road Danger Reduction should be made a priority 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We are establishing a Climate Change Group within the Council to provide a focus for work to reduce greenhouse emissions. In general our policies to reduce traffic levels support this objective. 2. The local safety scheme programme and 20mph zone programme focus initially on the east of the Borough where there are disproportionately high levels of road casualties. 3. Our target for road traffic has to take into account the pressures for more employment and housing. The target of zero growth in traffic by 2011 and plus 1% for Wood Green are considered demanding within this context. To seek to achieve a reduction of 10% is considered unrealistic
---	--	--

		<ol style="list-style-type: none">4. The Council already supports road user charging in principle5. The Council has few vehicles of its own. Most of the vehicles for Council services are provided through private contractors. Requiring the use of alternative fuels would be considered as part of future contracts. The operation of differing parking charges according to fuel efficiency would be difficult in practice and to enforce.6. This is not a direct issue for the LIP. However, the Council considers the proposed TfL scheme inadequate to address the issues on the NCR. The Council is implementing a programme of traffic management measures
--	--	--

		<p>in residential road adjoining the NCR to reduce rat running.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">7. The Council is providing cycle training at schools linked to the development of school travel plans. Sufficient funding would need to be provided by TfL to allow all schools to benefit by 2008 and also require the widespread adoption of school travel plans8. The Council has an extensive programme of 20mph zones with the aim of making all residential areas subject to a 20mph speed limit9. The Council is a member of the Road Danger Reduction Forum and supports its objectives
--	--	--

Final Local Implementation Plan
Chapter 7 Consultation

Highways Agency	1. No comments to make on the LIP	1. Noted
London Transport Users Committee	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. One-way systems and roads – want a policy statement and programmes to remove these. Committee supports proposals to convert the one-way Tottenham gyratory to two-way working 2. Managing demand – unspecified objection to some aspects of managing demand; parking plan policies should recognise the need to lock in benefits of controlled parking zones. Seeking policies recognising the contribution of road user charging to tackle traffic growth in medium to long term. 3. Streets for people – seeking this as an overarching agenda. Seeking wider footways, better pedestrian crossings, slower speeds, removing obstacles from footways and selective streetscape improvements. Opposing parking on footways. Welcomes concept of “walkability” in the Walking Plan. 4. Road safety, access – seeking wider junction protection at all road junctions through the use of yellow lines 5. Bus stop accessibility – seeking the in-fill of bus stop laybys as part of the bus stop accessibility programme 6. New bus services – the LIP should identify new or extended bus services such as a night time route to mirror route 102 7. Consultation – seeking a strategy to consult all street users including those that pass through and to give due weight to the wider public interest and those that do not 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Council is supporting the removal of the Tottenham gyratory one-way system. However, there are circumstances in which one-way roads can provide traffic and environmental and other benefits 2. The Council is supporting road user charging in principle. The Parking Plan recognises that the benefits of CPZs need to be locked in. 3. The Council supports the streets for people agenda and has submitted and received support for such schemes in the Borough 4. This would be considered as part of the detailed designs for traffic schemes 5. This is supported in principle and would be

Final Local Implementation Plan
Chapter 7 Consultation

	<p>respond to formal consultation</p>	<p>implemented where appropriate</p> <p>6. TfL are responsible for bus route planning. The Council has regular liaison meetings with TfL to discuss bus route issues. The LIP is not considered the appropriate mechanism for these issues</p> <p>7. It is not considered feasible to seek to consult with those passing through the borough or attempt to assess the views of non-respondes to consultations. Groups with special interests are consulted on schemes.</p>
<p>Transport 2000</p>	<p>1. Generic checklist provided for LIPs</p>	<p>1. Comments noted.</p>