

APPENDIX H: LIP Consultation comments and the Council’s responses

229 correspondences were received during the LIP consultation period. Of these responses 186 were related to a petition for the relocation of the W7 bus stop in Muswell Hill town centre and 18 similar correspondences were received objecting to the proposal to consider the partial or full closure of Wood Green High Road to general traffic, as part of the Wood Green Town Centre Major Scheme submission.

Table 1.1 summarises the key comments, made from statutory consultees and all other organisations and individuals, regarding the content of the draft LIP. The Council’s response in terms of amendments to the LIP document are summarised in the right hand column.

Table 1.1. Summary of comments made during the draft LIP consultation process and the Council’s responses.

Organisation / Individual	Comments made	Council response regarding the content of the draft LIP
Statutory consultees		
Transport For London	<p>Objectives section:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Each LIP objective needs to be timelined for delivery. 2. Objectives should link to Sustainable Community Strategy 3. The Mayor’s target is for a 60% reduction in CO2 across all sectors, rather than specifically from ground-based transport, by 2025 <p>Delivery Plan:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Delivery proposals need to be described for the duration of the MTS (up to 2031). 5. Re-organisation of text required to provide more detail on the type of interventions that will deliver the objectives. 6. Need to include detail regarding road safety interventions and bus priority. 7. Require inclusion of Risk Management section for delivery of LIP proposals. 8. Each type of intervention, including the list of schemes in the programme of investment needs to be time lined against the objectives and MTS. 9. Provide detail of Better Streets ‘High Profile Outputs’ and more detail required for all other High Priority Outputs in tabulated form. <p>Funding sources</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 10. Require inclusion of all sources of funding for the LIP delivery programme. <p>Prioritisation</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 11. More detail required on scheme prioritisation process including the decision making process and member involvement. <p>Performance Monitoring Plan</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 12. Include evidence that targets are realistic. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Borough transport objectives, table 2.3, has been updated to display the delivery timeframe for each objective, based on short term delivery (within next 3 year to 2014), medium term (within 10 years) and long term (within 20 years), to reflect the duration of the MTS up to 2031. 2. Table 2.3 identifies how the LIP objectives contribute to the priorities and outcomes of Haringey’s Sustainable Community Strategy. 3. For consistency with the MTS targets, the LIP objective referring to reducing CO2 emissions has been revised to include the MTS target for a 60% reduction in CO2 emissions by 2025, from a 1990 baseline. The Council’s 40% emission target by 2020 is based on the targets developed in Haringey Council’s 40:20 Carbon Management plan, from a 2005 baseline.

	<p>13. It should be noted that for both KSI's and road condition the borough will work with TfL to achieve our targets for all roads in the borough.</p> <p>14. Additional cycling monitoring information required.</p> <p>15. More detail required regarding the key actions to deliver the CO2 emission targets.</p> <p>16. Make reference to the '3 year Impact Report' for monitoring delivery.</p> <p>17. Targets should be set for the duration of the MTS, up to 2031. Mayors target for cycling is 2026.</p> <p>18. Target for means of travel other than car should be a local target. Walking target of 2% increase by 2013/14 is considered a little ambitious, Cycling target should be increased to 5% by 2026, given Haringey's location and high baseline cycling levels.</p> <p>19. Provide reference to why Council has a target for a 40% reduction in CO2 emissions by 2020. The indicative trajectory set out in TfL's guidance is for a 45.3% reduction from 2008 to 2025.</p> <p>20. Consider setting local targets for the monitoring indicators on accessible bus stops, car club bays and cycling training.</p>	<p>4. Delivery plan details for the duration of the MTS, from 2011 to 2031 are now described in section 3.3</p> <p>5. The text within the Delivery Plan section has been re-organised to provide more detail on the different types of interventions that will deliver the objectives.</p> <p>6. Details of road safety measures are contained within the local safety scheme programme (section 3.3). Bus priority details are also detailed in section 3.3.</p> <p>7. A risk management section has been included at Section 3.4. This details the risk analysis and mitigation measures for both the scheme and programme area level.</p> <p>8. A delivery timetable for implementing each of the proposed interventions is provided with the programme of investment in section 3.3 and table 3.6 of the LIP document. The delivery plan will be updated every 3 years, the next time by April 2014.</p> <p>9. A table detailing all 'High Profile Outputs' is inserted in Section 3.3.</p> <p>10. The programme of investment (table 3.2), has been updated to provide details of all sources of funding for the LIP delivery programme.</p> <p>11. Details of the prioritisation process for Corridors, Neighbourhoods and the Smart Travel programmes within these areas are detailed in section 3.2.1 and in Appendix F. The</p>
--	--	--

		<p>prioritisation process involved Cabinet approval following consultation with the Haringey Transport Forum.</p> <p>12. -20. These Performance Monitoring recommendations are incorporated into the revised Performance Monitoring Plan, Section 4, of the LIP document.</p>
Environment Agency	Standard checklist and advice provided for consideration in preparation of LIP and SEA.	Amendments made to SEA and LIP where necessary.
English Heritage	List of priorities and advice provided for consideration in preparation of LIP and SEA.	Amendments made to SEA and LIP where necessary
Natural England	List of priorities and advice provided for consideration in preparation of LIP and SEA.	Amendments made to SEA and LIP where necessary
London Fire Brigade	No response received.	
Metropolitan Police	<p>The Metropolitan Police North East Traffic Management (Partnership Unit) will support measures designed to reduce those killed and seriously injured on Haringey's transport network.</p> <p>Working in partnership we can assist in reducing the number of casualties among young and vulnerable road users.</p> <p>We aim to assist with the plans listed on the consultation summary through comments and observations regarding safety, enforcement & education.</p>	Comments noted
London Ambulance Service- Haringey	No response received.	
Road Haulage Association	No response received.	
London Boroughs	No responses received.	
Other consultation responses		
Haringey Living Streets and the Sustainable Haringey Network	1. Broadly in favour of the objectives but are anxious about the funds available for their implementation.	1. Haringey Council has allocated £1.325 million from it's LIP budget for cycling related investment between 2011-2014. The Council has to balance investment for specific modes of

	<p>2. To facilitate an increase in walking and cycling requires a number of specific commitments.</p> <p>3. Attention should be made to paving of footways and cycle routes. This is particularly important in busy areas and along routes which are already well used or which could be better used if better paved and indicated.</p> <p>4. Better signage giving indications of destinations and travel time are needed.</p> <p>5. Pinch points and other off-putting areas need attention. This might require such things as better lighting, widening of paths, the elimination of blind corners, clearing of debris and other unsightly detritus.</p> <p>6. Progress should be made in bridging gaps in the cycle network and establishing cycle priority at road junctions.</p> <p>7. A start should be made to the commitment contained in the borough's Rights of Way Improvement Plan to 'set up programmes to identify additional paths ... to add ... to the map'.</p> <p>8. There should be a greater commitment to increasing the number of roads with 20 mph limits, particularly now Islington has established this limit on all side streets. This speed limit should be established as a default, ie there should be a particular reason why the limit should not apply to any road.</p> <p>9. To encourage people to see that it is possible to use their cars less and to enjoy car-free environments there should be more car free days in various parts of the borough.</p> <p>10. There should be an extension of permanent car free schemes in shopping and residential areas, particularly making use of cheap methods as pioneered by Sustrans.</p> <p>11. There should be support for the concept of the 'London lorry', requiring supermarkets and other organisations to transfer loads to smaller lorries for local deliveries. We recognise that this would result in an increase in the number of vehicles but would reduce the congestion caused by the parking of very large vehicles for local deliveries.</p> <p>12. Would welcome more progress on measures to discourage car use such as the establishment of congestion charging zones. We also favour the extension of CPZs, particularly around railway</p>	<p>transport to best meet the LIP's objectives, performance monitoring targets and MTS outcomes. In addition, TfL is investing substantial funds for implementing the two cycling superhighways through Haringey</p> <p>2. Proposals in the biking borough strategy and several cycling and walking schemes are included in the LIP delivery plan.</p> <p>3. Specific funding is identified in the LIP delivery plan for the LCN cycle routes and greenways / pedestrian routes. The principles of TfL's Better Streets will be delivered to all corridor and neighbourhood schemes and the Wood Green Town Centre Major scheme to ensure footways and cycles are adequately paved to enhance accessibility.</p> <p>4. The provision of signage within the town centre and on key approaches will be installed to Legible London standards.</p> <p>5. Pinch points will be identified and redesigned through the principals of the better streets approach to the corridor and neighbourhood schemes</p> <p>6. The LIP delivery plan contains funded proposals for progressing the implementation of the cycling network through the LCN, Greenways and Biking Borough programmes.</p> <p>7. The Council will identify potential additional public rights of way in receipt of recommendations and evidence.</p> <p>8. The Council's Overview and Scrutiny</p>
--	--	--

	<p>stations to discourage commuters from driving to stations as near central London as possible, a potent cause of rush hour congestion.</p>	<p>Committee is undertaking a Scrutiny Review of the Council's policy regarding 20mph zones and 20mph speed limits. Outputs from this review are expected in March 2011 and will be considered in developing future 20mph zone and speed limit policy.</p> <p>9. The LIP delivery plan has a travel awareness funding allocation to deliver events to encourage residents and visitors to experience sustainable modes of travel in a car free environment.</p> <p>10. The Council has a programme of DIY streets initiatives to be implemented in the borough.</p> <p>11. The London Lorry scheme restricts the movement of HGVs weighing more than 18 tonnes in London at night and weekends. It aims to limit noise pollution in residential areas. Restrictions apply between:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 21:00 to 07:00, Monday to Saturday • 13:00 Saturdays to 07:00 Mondays <p>The expansion of local Freight quality partnerships and maximising opportunities for development by incorporating freight and servicing provision are being considered at the sub region level through the North London sub-regional transport plan.</p> <p>12. The Council currently has no proposal for a policy to introduce a congestion charge zone in the borough. Details of the borough's CPZ expansion programme are provided in the Delivery</p>
--	--	---

<p>Avenue Gardens Residents Association</p>	<p>Management of Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs) 1. LIP does not address impact of heavy lorries in residential streets. Controlling and limiting traffic noise, vibration and emissions from HGV's are a major concern for local residents. Vibration can cause physical damage to houses. 24 hours HGV movements disrupts sleep. Noise and emissions damage health. Streets trees removed and pavement park imposed to facilitate HGV movement. The London Lorry ban has failed to control night time HGV nuisance. A borough wide 20mph zone speed limit should be considered for all HGV's. Restrictions on HGV movements between 8:30pm and 6:30am on all but trunk roads should be considered.</p> <p>2. Borough characteristics Suggest rewording of LIP paragraph 2.2.2 relating to the description of the borough characteristics. Should change wording to be compliant with London Plan description, as follows, ' Haringey has an overall outer borough suburban character. The borough is of predominately suburban Character comprising low rise (2-3 Storey) residential development and 3-4 storey development in its town centres.'</p> <p>3. CO2 emission statistics Error in CO2 emission statistics quoted per population head.</p> <p>4. Encouraging cycling and walking Issue of cycling on pavements is mentioned as an issue for pedestrians but this is not addressed in the LIP. 5. Improved cycle lanes should be designed to encourage on road cycling to avoid conflicts with pedestrians. 6. Suggested changes to LIP should be: 'Policy and projects are needed to make it safer for cyclists to use the road space rather than pavements and footpaths. 7. Projects that envisage cyclists and pedestrians sharing the same space in the public realm should be discouraged in future; they do not work well in practice.</p> <p>8. Wood Green Town Centre Major Scheme submission Objection to any partial or complete closure of Wood Green High Road or reduction in traffic capacity along the High Road will be opposed. The UDP (2006) show the High Road as a London Distributor Route, to link centres to each other and serve traffic crossing the borough. These roads should attract commercial traffic away from Local Distributor Routes and local access roads...' The High Road is a major route North-South through the borough. It passes high volumes of traffic and HGV's. Attempts to close the High Road would cause serious environmental degradation in surrounding residential areas, and local residential roads will ineffectively become a by pass for the High Road and be subject to increased levels of traffic. Pedestrianisation would make the Town Centre more</p>	<p>Plan Section 3.3.</p> <p>1. The London Lorry scheme is enforced by London Councils and the Council will raise the issue of improving enforcement of the scheme and mitigating the impact of HGV movement with London Councils. Further HGV restrictions in residential roads will be considered through the North London Sub regional Plan through the expansion of local Freight quality partnerships.</p> <p>2. Text will be amended as recommend.</p> <p>3. Text will be amended to correct error.</p> <p>4. Cycling on the pavement is an offence where it is not on a designated shared path, and is enforced by the Council's Street enforcement officers and the Police.</p> <p>5-7. Proposals for cycling network improvements will incorporate route infrastructure designs to encourage cyclists to avoid conflict with pedestrians.</p> <p>8. A feasibility study was undertaken to consider the impact of a partial and full closure of Wood Green High Road. The study identified that potential traffic rerouting for this closure would adversely impact on some of the surrounding residential roads. Consequential this proposal will not be progressed and has been excluded from</p>
--	---	--

	<p>difficult to move in and police. The result would be to the detriment of public safety. Remove proposal from LIP.</p> <p>9. Identification of Corridors Amend map of Neighbourhoods in Appendix E. The boundary of Area 14, Hornsey Park, is incorrect and should be redrawn to properly follow the boundary of the Woodside ward, which runs along the north side of Nightingale Gardens, to include Park Avenue.</p>	<p>the Wood Green Town Centre Major Scheme submission.</p> <p>9. The Corridor boundaries are based on A road network in borough and the Neighbourhood boundaries are the areas in between these corridors and as a result do not necessarily follow the ward boundaries.</p>
<p>West Green Residents Association</p>	<p>Measures to discourage, or at least reduce, private car ownership are vital if the Borough is to achieve its targets as set out in the Greenest Borough Strategy.</p> <p>The improvement in public transport provision, especially on radial routes, is essential.</p> <p><u>Congestion.</u> 1. Not enough emphasis is being placed on the reduction of commercial vehicle numbers both passing through and delivering within the Borough. Proposals should be included in the LIP to re-direct traffic of this nature onto more suitable roads. This will also have the effect of increasing road safety as well as easing traffic flow.</p> <p><u>Road Safety.</u> 2. The implementation of 20 m.p.h. zones should be considered on a Borough-wide basis. Additional efforts should be made to discourage the use of some residential streets as 'rat-runs'. 3. In paragraph 3.3.9.9 sub-paras 2 and 3 proposals are made to provide un-signalised crossings on the Roundway, Park Road and Priory Avenue. We question the advisability of not controlling these crossings with pedestrian (or cyclist) activated signals. Crossings of this nature are dangerous for both these groups of users. We would, therefore, urge the Council to revise these proposals and make these crossings signalised.</p> <p>4. Many controlled crossings in the Borough do not allow enough time for elderly or infirm pedestrians and those with young children to cross the carriageway. A survey of all crossings of this nature must be undertaken on an urgent basis and, where appropriate, timings revised.</p> <p><u>5. Smarter Travel.</u> Smarter Travel is an important factor in the encouragement of modal change therefore any efforts to promote travel planning in relation to Schools, Workplaces or Individuals must be vigorously pursued.</p>	<p>1. Local commercial and freight movement will be considered through the expansion of local freight quality partnerships within the North London sub region. Maximising opportunities for development by incorporating freight and servicing provision are being considered at the sub region level through the North London sub-regional transport plan.</p> <p>2. The Council's Overview and Scrutiny Committee is undertaking a Scrutiny Review of the Council's policy regarding 20mph zones and 20mph speed limits. Outputs from this review are expected in March 2011 and will be considered in developing future 20mph zone and speed limit policy.</p> <p>3. Comment noted. These are proposals and are subject to consultation and revision.</p> <p>4. TfL is responsible for managing the signal network. This issue will be raised through TfL through the regular traffic liaison meeting attended by TfL and the</p>

	<p>Individual or personalised Travel Planning should also be given more attention. Whilst Mosaic research can help to target intervention at those most likely to change their travel behaviour the opportunity for a more widespread campaign should not be missed - leafleting in the main shopping areas is a possible method of raising awareness. It is also suggested that community groups and/or residents' associations could be used as a channel of communication. This should initially take place through liaison with the Haringey Federation of Residents' Associations.</p> <p>6. One aspect of Haringey's proposals that it is felt needs greater attention is the provision of Car Club vehicles. At present these cars are petrol driven and it is suggested that there should be a move towards the use of Electric or, at least, Hybrid vehicles.</p> <p><u>7. Walking /Cycling.</u> Focus is on cycling, however, the provision of shared-use routes can send out the wrong signal to cyclists. Greenways, where pathways are wide enough to accommodate both the cyclist and the pedestrian are to be encouraged. However, the bulk of the footways in the Borough are not appropriate for this use. An adult cycling on the pavement is a breach of the law. Cycle Training must ensure that the cyclist is made aware of their responsibility in this respect and the potential consequences of their actions.</p> <p>Disappointing to note that little or no action seems to be proposed to provide safer walking routes. Many of the Borough's footways require urgent and comprehensive maintenance to ensure that trip hazards are eliminated, that sightlines are kept clear and that crossing points at junctions are fit for purpose. Signage is also an essential factor in encouraging people to make more of their journeys, especially to local shopping areas, on foot.</p> <p><u>8. Definitions.</u> Terminology is used throughout the document, the meaning of which is unclear to the lay reader. Quasi-scientific terms such as kilo tonne on page 27 is an example of this. The use of 'short-hand' of this nature fails to meet the requirement of transparency and should be rectified.</p> <p><u>9. Abbreviations.</u> It is necessary to provide the reader with a Glossary of Terms and Abbreviations. At present the reader has to refer back to check meanings. Such a provision will both save time and increase transparency.</p> <p><u>10. References.</u></p>	<p>Council.</p> <p>5. The Smarter Travel programme is detailed in the delivery plan (section 3.3) and contains travel behaviour changes measures to encourage modal change through the Workplace and school travel planning, travel awareness and personalised travel planning, which will be coordinated to complement measures delivered through the Neighbourhoods and corridors programme. Details of the car club expansion are contained in Section 3.3 of the delivery plan. Agree that Community groups and residents associations are an excellent channel for communicating travel behaviour initiatives.</p> <p>6. Car club expansion details are contained within section 3.3.14. which states the Council are in continuing discussions with the current on car club operator for the borough, Zipcar, to introduce electric and hybrid cars to the fleet. For the operational requirements of the car club, this is dependent on a suitable electric/hybrid vehicle becoming available with adequate battery range and quick charging potential.</p> <p>7. Cycling on the pavement is an offence where it is not on a designated shared path, and is enforced by the Council's Street enforcement officers</p>
--	---	--

	<p>Statements of facts and statistics must be fully referenced to allow the reader to refer back to the source documents.</p>	<p>and the Police. The Cycling training programme, currently contracted to Cycling Training UK does raise awareness of this issue.</p> <p>The principles of TfL's Better Streets programme will be applied to improve accessibility for all corridor and neighbourhood schemes. The Wood Green Town Centre Major scheme to ensure footways and cycles are adequately paved to enhance accessibility. The boroughs footway maintenance programme, (section 3.3.44) is focussed on improving the quality of pavement surfaces to eliminate trip hazards.</p> <p>The provision of signage within the town centre and on key approaches will be installed to Legible London standards.</p> <p>8. Comment noted. Terminology will be amended where necessary.</p> <p>9. Comment noted. A Glossary of Terms and Abbreviations will be provided for the final LIP document.</p> <p>10. Comment noted. Referencing will be reviewed and updated.</p>
<p>Haringey Cycling Campaign</p>	<p>1. An analysis of the Draft LIP, suggests there may be a mismatch between objectives and projected investment. The analysis suggests there is an under funding in excess of £700,000 in cycle related projects. In view of the recent Spending Review and cutbacks required in Council spending, HCC suggest that it is vital that there should be no cut in the budgets for these projects, which appear to be already under funded. There is also no estimate or funding shown for Cycle Superhighways. If one is to be completed and one commenced before 2014, as intended, funding</p>	<p>1. Haringey Council has allocated £1.325 million from it's LIP budget for cycling related investment between 2011-2014. The Council has to balance investment for specific modes of transport to best meet the LIP's</p>

	<p>must be allocated</p> <p><u>Detailed LIP document comments</u></p> <p>2. Sections 2.2.7 and 2.3.3.5 give the impression all planned Greenways have been completed. This is misleading and section 3.3.9.8 gives a more accurate picture.</p> <p>3. The heading to section 3.3.9.7 is LCN and Greenways route development, but Greenways are dealt with under section 3.3.9.8. This is confusing.</p> <p>4. Should the Tottenham Hale gyratory complementary work include the Tottenham High Rd cycling Hub? It would seem logical to include this in the same scheme.</p> <p>5. Will the local safety scheme programme address the points highlighted by HCC in our 2009 Safety Issues report?</p> <p>6. Could the Green Lanes Corridor, section 3.3.2, include a Northbound advisory cycle lane, to operate 5-7pm?</p> <p>7. Could the Seven Sisters corridor, section 3.3.5, include cycle lanes between Seven Sisters and Finsbury Park, to augment existing bus lanes?</p> <p>8. Will the parameters for new and existing Controlled parking zones (CPZs), section 3.3.10, take in to account cycle safety? For example the width of Durnsford Road (B106) is inadequate for cars and commercial vehicles to overtake safely and there is no alternative route West from Bounds Green. The South side of Durnsford Road, from house nos 11-89 has only seven CPZ spaces for 39 houses. Removal of these spaces would greatly improve cycle safety.</p>	<p>objectives, performance monitoring targets and MTS outcomes.</p> <p>TfL is investing substantial funds, external to the borough's LIP funding allocation, for the implementing the two cycling superhighways through Haringey. These schemes are currently in the design stage and specific costs have not as yet been stated by TfL. The cycling superhighways schemes are not funded through the boroughs LIP programme.</p> <p>2 & 3. Text editing comments noted and amendments made.</p> <p>4. The Tottenham cycle hub will be considered as an additional scheme to complement the Tottenham Hale gyratory measures from 2014. The biking borough funding up until 2014 is to develop the Wood Green cycle hub.</p> <p>5. The HCC safety issues report will be considered through the development of Local Safety Scheme programme of works. Locations will be prioritised on reducing road accidents, particularly focusing on vulnerable road users, in areas with the highest road casualty incidents.</p> <p>6. Will consider as part of proposed study being undertaken for Green Lanes corridor and adjacent neighbourhoods in 2010/11.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>7. The Seven Sisters Road is TfL managed. The presence of the bus lanes provides adequate protection for cyclists.</p> <p>8. As part of the design of CPZ schemes, the safety of all road users, including cyclists is taken into consideration.</p>
The Palace Gates Residents' Association	Strongly urges Council to introduce a policy of a 20mph zone covering the whole borough.	The Council's Overview and Scrutiny Committee is undertaking a Scrutiny Review of the Council's policy regarding 20mph zones and 20mph speed limits. This will include consideration of a borough wide 20 mph on residential roads. Outputs from this review are expected in March 2011 and will be considered in developing future 20mph zone and speed limit policy.
PARKSIDE MALVERN RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Residents object to any proposal that would result in the partial or complete closure of Wood Green High Road. Closure, reduction of through traffic capacity or displacement of traffic in any form from the High Road will have a seriously detrimental effect on the PMRA area and its residents, who are already under a high degree of stress from traffic congestion and resulting air pollution, noise, vibration and anti-social behaviour from drivers who treat our roads as a bypass to the High Road. Any measures likely to increase traffic in our area will be vigorously opposed by PMRA. PMRA provided details of further improvements which are required to encouraging sustainable transport in improve the local neighbourhood in the Hornsey Park Road area. <p>Concerns raised regarding absence of proposals in LIP for Hornsey Park Road area.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> A feasibility study was undertaken to consider the impact of a partial and full closure of Wood Green High Road. The study identified that potential traffic rerouting for this closure would adversely impact on some of the surrounding residential roads. Consequently this proposal will not be progressed and has been excluded from the Wood Green Town Centre Major Scheme submission, and removed from the LIP document. Issues identified for the PMRA will be considered as part of future scheme development of which the Haringey Heartlands development will provide potential for future investment in these

		<p>neighbourhoods.</p> <p>Please note that the Hornsey Park and Avenue Gardens areas have been given top priority for 2010/11 and, as such, have been allocated £150,000 investment from our LIP allocation. The Hornsey Park area also benefited from funding in 2008/09 and 2009/10. There are many areas in the borough which experience traffic and transport problems, and as resources will become more limited in the coming years, it will be necessary for the LIP to initially concentrate on those areas that experience the worst problems, rather than those that have already had significant expenditure to alleviate existing conditions.</p>
<p>Tottenham & Wood Green Friends of the Earth</p>	<p>1. CO2 emissions. More could be done to spell out how this might be achieved, i.e what contribution might be made by switching to low carbon vehicles, what by reducing the need to travel, and what by encouraging modal shift from cars and vans to walking, cycling and public transport.</p> <p>Comments on specific LIP sections:</p> <p>2. LIP section 2.2.7. This (and 2.3.3.5) refers to the Greenways as if they are completed projects, which is misleading.</p> <p>3. (2.3.2.3 Box) - Haringey challenge (and 3.3.46). This calls for enhanced capacity on the West Anglia main line. Is this a reference to the 4-track proposal, or are there other capacity enhancements that could be achieved without that? Concerns about 4-tracking south of Tottenham Hale – its possible impact on the Walthamstow Reservoirs and Walthamstow Marshes SSSIs.</p> <p>4. (Section 2.3.3.2) Has there been analysis of what proportion of PM10s and NOx is emitted by cars, vans, lorries and buses so we can assess what impact reduction of car traffic is likely to have?</p>	<p>1. Haringey Council is one of 9 local authorities in England to have been selected by the Government to take part in the Department of Energy and Climate Change's Local Carbon Frameworks (LCF) Pilot. Through the Council's participation there is scope to develop a study to measure the potential carbon savings from introducing low carbon travel alternatives. The Council has submitted a bid to DfT to fund this pilot, based on the low carbon travel initiatives being introduced by the DIY street scheme, in partnership with Sustrans.</p> <p>2. Comments noted. Text amended.</p>

	<p>5. (Section 2.3.6) says transport is responsible for 16% of CO2 emissions equating to 0.7 kilotonnes per resident per year. This should be 0.7 tonnes?</p> <p>6. 2.3.7.4 - 2.3.7.7 should include the use of CPZs to reduce traffic by making commuting and some local journeys less convenient. This played a major part in reducing traffic in Camden, the best example so far of traffic reduction.</p> <p>7. P38 – what is an ETP?</p> <p>8. (Section 3.3.2) – Green Lanes corridor. This is an area that many cyclists find frightening. A segregated bike lane would be helpful, if possible. Failing that, a north-bound advisory cycle lane with parking enforcement especially during the evening rush hours would be beneficial.</p> <p>9. (Section 3.3.3) Support measures to reduce traffic on Wood Green High Road, including rationalising buses. Currently much of the delay is caused by buses, many of them quite empty, a bit like Oxford Street.</p> <p>Other borough-wide measures</p> <p>10. Enforcement against illegal drivers and vehicles. Illegally driven vehicles which are poorly maintained could make up 10-20% of vehicles in Tottenham. Enforcement campaigns often discover people with outstanding arrest warrants. A consistent enforcement campaign should be developed in liaison with the police, using fines, associated costs and revenue from seized vehicles to fund the operation. This would make streets safer and reduce traffic and the number of parked cars on our streets.</p> <p>11. Controlled Parking Zones A strategic approach should be developed to extend CPZs (and estate parking schemes) across the whole borough. There should be much stronger measures to discourage gas-guzzlers, ie higher charges, and much higher charges for 2nd and additional vehicles. The income derived can be used to fund short-falls in LIP funding from the TfL.</p> <p>12. Congestion Charge or Workplace Parking levy We would like to see Haringey working with adjacent boroughs to develop a congestion charge zone. This combined with CPZs will be a highly effective tool to reduce unnecessary car journeys</p>	<p>3. Yes, 4 tracking is one of the options for increasing capacity on this line. Other capacity enhancements include longer trains and frequency improvements. The Strategic Environmental Assessment covers the possible risks and mitigation measures regarding rail enhancement proposals.</p> <p>4. There is currently no specific emission data split by mode. This will be raised with the Council’s Air Quality Officer.</p> <p>5. Comments noted. Figure amended.</p> <p>6. Agree with comment. Benefits of CPZ expansion detailed in Section 3.3</p> <p>7. ETP is Education, Training and Publicity.</p> <p>8. A study of Green Lanes is being undertaken in 2010/11 and the safety and accessibility of cyclists is being considered as part of this study.</p> <p>9. The Wood Green Town Centre Major Scheme submission includes liaison with TfL regarding changes to bus service provision to reduce unnecessary bus volumes on the High Road, including possible additional bus standing space in the town centre area.</p> <p>10. Enforcement will be considered as part of the Air Quality Strategy for Haringey and will link into partnership</p>
--	---	--

	<p>and should generate a surplus which can fund other measures. Failing that, the borough should introduce workplace parking levies to discourage use of private non-residential parking.</p> <p>13. Freight traffic There is little or no mention of reducing freight traffic or its impacts. There should be a clear strategy, linked into the LDF, to get local deliveries of goods done by bicycle trailers (for smaller items) and electric vehicles for larger items; and use freight hubs to reduce the movement of large lorries in Haringey (and indeed in London); and use planning policies to require developers to service new developments using the lowest-carbon and cleanest vehicles.</p>	<p>work with Street environment officer and the Police.</p> <p>11. Agree with comment. See CPZ expansion details in Section 3.3.</p> <p>12. The Council currently has no proposals for a policy to introduce a congestion charge zone or work place parking levies in the borough. The Council has introduced parking charges for Council employees as part of the Council's travel plan measures.</p> <p>13. Local commercial and freight movement will be considered through the expansion of local freight quality partnerships within the North London sub region. Maximising opportunities for development by incorporating freight and servicing provision are being considered at the sub region level through the North London sub-regional transport plan.</p>
<p>18 separate correspondences from individual residents and Associations</p>	<p>1. Proposal for the partial closure of Wood Green High Road</p> <p>18 separate correspondences objecting to proposals for the closure or partial closure of Wood Green High Road.</p> <p>Strong concerns expressed about traffic being displaced on to surrounding residential roads, which are completely unsuitable for bearing the volume of traffic this will entail. The LIP has made no provision of relief traffic schemes or alternatives for dealing with the displaced traffic. Whilst the LIP may well improve the environment of Wood Green High Road this proposals will cause serious environmental degradation in surrounding residential areas.</p> <p>Several correspondences comment that improving the unpleasant pedestrian conditions on Wood Green High is a priority and this could be improved for pedestrians by enforcing the hierarchy of: 1.</p>	<p>1. A feasibility study was undertaken to consider the impact of a partial and full closure of Wood Green High Road. The study identified that potential traffic rerouting for this closure would adversely impact on some of the surrounding residential roads. Consequently this proposal will not be progressed and has been excluded from the Wood Green Town Centre Major Scheme submission, and removed from the LIP document.</p>

	<p>Pedestrians, 2. Cyclists, 3. Public transport, 4. Essential services (e.g deliveries to shops), 5. Private motors and motorcycles (these last being exceedingly pedestrian-unfriendly). Pedestrians would have right of way, vehicles restricted to around 10mph.</p> <p>The proposal should be removed from the LIP and replace with proposals to bring relief to residential roads either side of the High Road.</p>	
Wightman Road N4 Residents' Group	<p>The 'Green Lanes corridor' is not clearly defined in the LIP document. Since a corridor implies movement of traffic, and since significant volumes of traffic move throughout the Harringay Ladder neighbourhood, both north-south and east-west, it would seem reasonable to regard the plan for the Green Lanes corridor as inclusive of all traffic movement in the area. Indeed, if it fails in this regard then it neglects the following issues for Harringay Ladder residents:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To improve air quality 2. To promote healthier lifestyles by encouraging walking and cycling 3. To reduce noise disturbance from transport 4. To continue to reduce all types of road traffic accidents and improve road safety 	<p>The text for the Green Lane's scheme refers to corridors and neighbourhoods and its inclusion of all traffic management issues.</p> <p>A study of the Green Lanes corridor and surrounding neighbourhoods is being undertaken in 2010/11 and residents in the Harringay neighbourhood will be consulted on the issues raised by the Wightman Road, N4 residents group.</p>
British waterways	Standard checklist and advice provided for consideration in preparation of LIP	Comments noted.
Lynne Featherstone MP petition with 186 letter of support.	<p>Relocating W7/144 bus stop in Muswell Hill</p> <p>Petition from Lynne Featherstone MP with 186 letters of support regarding the location of the W7 bus stop on Muswell Hill, serving Hornsey Central Neighbourhood Health Centre. Concern that elderly and less mobile residents have problems getting to the bus stop, and as the bus stop is used by people from all over Western Haringey who want to get to Hornsey Central, it should be accessible for all. Require bus stop to be relocated to current taxi rank outside Boots, on the Muswell Hill roundabout. This would make the bus stop much more accessible. This should be included within the LIP transport priorities.</p>	<p>The Council and Transport for London have looked at the possible relocation of this stop over many years. It is acknowledged the stop may be difficult to access for certain groups, though the alternatives are equally challenging. TfL are responsible for decisions on the location of bus stops. The Council put forward a proposal to allow passengers commencing their journey to board a terminating bus at the last northbound stop on Muswell Hill. This would need an additional loop of Muswell Hill roundabout. TfL has not supported this suggestion due to the lack of capacity of this stop.</p> <p>In response to another Council suggestion TfL has also looked at</p>

		<p>extending the route beyond Muswell Hill to allow passengers to board or alight at the bus stops on Muswell Hill Broadway. TfL consider such an extension would be expensive to implement.</p> <p>We have also considered with TfL the feasibility of converting the taxi rank on the roundabout for use as a bus stop. Following a site visit TfL has advised the location is not suitable as it would not meet their criteria for the creation of a fully accessible bus stop and it was also found to have road safety implications.</p> <p>TfL are to write a formal response on the options considered for Muswell Hill bus stops by mid December.</p>
Secretary Friends of Priory Park N8	Request a 20 mph speed limit in Priory Park area to protect residents and those who use Priory Park: The following streets should have this limit: Priory Road N8; Ashford Avenue N8; Park Road N8	The Council's Overview and Scrutiny Committee is undertaking a Scrutiny Review of the Council's policy regarding 20mph zones and 20mph speed limits. This will include consideration of a borough wide 20 mph on residential roads. Outputs from this review are expected in March 2011 and will be considered in developing future 20mph zone and speed limit policy.
Resident Springfield Cottages 169, North Hill N6	<p>Incorporate North Hill fully into LIP proposals, as all improvements are to the centre and the east of the borough with Highgate getting nothing.</p> <p>North Hill issues highlighted include dangers of speeding traffic, rat running, traffic congestion, noise, air quality and poor road surface.</p>	The North Hill area is not identified as highest priority in the LIP delivery plan up to 2014 but will be considered for future Corridor and Neighbourhood funding after 2014/15.
Cllr Rachel Allison	There is a great deal of heavy traffic on North Hill, that it is noisy, often travelling too fast and dangerous to pedestrians. There is little in the way of a psychological break when travelling from the A1 - 40mph and dual carriageway, into North Hill, which is a B road and essentially residential.	In regard to the petition sent in December from the office of Lynne Featherstone (MP). The council

	<p>The North Road/North Hill corridor has a number of traffic problems and should be included in the Transport Strategy Document.</p> <p>A petition with over 400 signatures was sent from the office of Lynne Featherstone (MP) in December 2009 requesting a pedestrian phase in the lights at the junction of North Hill, View Road and Church Road.</p>	<p>response stated that the accident record for this junction showed that no pedestrian's had been involved in an accident in the 3 year period up to early 2010. As this provided an indicator that the junction is operating safely for pedestrians, the junction was not considered a high priority, compared to other signalised junctions across the borough that do not yet have the benefit of a pedestrian phase.</p>
The Ramblers. Hertfordshire and N Middx Area.	List of priorities and advice provided for consideration in preparation of LIP.	Amendments made to SEA and LIP where necessary.
Resident	<p>1. To reduce the number of people killed and seriously injured on the road support the introduction of a 20 mph zones for all side roads in Haringey.</p> <p>2. Introduce a Family Zone in the network of roads North of Priory Road and leading to Alexander Palace where there are many families and there is a route linking the extensively used recreational facilities of Alexandra Palace and Priory Park.</p> <p>3. Improve Accessibility - Connectivity Should consider improving step free access to Hornsey train station. to continue to implement the electrification and improvement of the Over ground service with more frequent trains between Gospel Oak and Barking line via Crouch Hill.</p> <p>4. Crouch End CPZ Strongly object to the creeping extension of the Crouch End N8 CPZ as it has proven to merely shift congestion by a few streets and not improve it in general. Either introduce a total borough wide CPZ with the smallest possible time limit in the middle of the day to allow it to be controlled for revenue purposes and prevent extended unauthorised stay or else call a halt to the extension for at least 5 years and then review it again.</p>	<p>1. The Council's Overview and Scrutiny Committee is undertaking a Scrutiny Review of the Council's policy regarding 20mph zones and 20mph speed limits. This will include consideration of a borough wide 20 mph on residential roads. Outputs from this review are expected in March 2011 and will be considered in developing future 20mph zone and speed limit policy.</p> <p>2. This proposals will be considered as part of the DIY Streets programme, as detail in Section 3.3 of the LIP. Funding is already committed to other DIY scheme up to 2014.</p> <p>3. Hornsey Station accessibility is an issue for Network rail and the operator. This will be raised with them at the regular public transport liaison meeting in which they and the Council attend.</p>

		4. Section 3.3.of the LIP states the Council are reviewing its approach for identifying new CPZs to develop a strategic overview of parking policy and traffic management across the borough in order to deliver broad transport objectives to reduce traffic congestion and encourage sustainable transport usage. These comments will be considered as part of that review.
Hillfield-St.James Residents Association	<p>Concerns regarding over-use of St James's Lane as a cut-through between Muswell Hill (the Hill) and Muswell Hill Rd and the habitual use of this narrow road (with cars parked either side) by HGVs.</p> <p>They would like to see:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * more efficient use made of this road, St James's Lane N10, * relief of the traffic congestion caused by two way traffic being unable pass each other * discouragement of HGVs which spoil the environmental quality for residents and * improved safety for pedestrians and road-users. <p>These aims could and should be achieved by restrictions and controls on traffic using St James's Lane, imposed as part of the Local Implementation Plan 2011-2031.</p>	These recommendations will be considered as part of future corridor and neighbourhoods proposals, however there is currently no funding available to develop these proposals before 2014/15.
Resident	<p>1.Required improved pedestrian road crossing facilities at Alroy Road.</p> <p>2. There needs to be more consultation which is "grass roots" level, at the initial stages, so that residents can influence the priorities rather than ask them to comment on the final proposals which have been drafted for them to comment.</p>	<p>1. The Alroy Road crossing facilities will be considered through the Local Safety Scheme programme of works. Locations will be prioritised on reducing road accidents, particularly focusing on vulnerable road users, in areas with the highest road casualty incidents.</p> <p>2. The consultation process for developing the LIP is detailed in section 2.3.8 and Appendix H.</p>
Cromwell Area Residents Association	Supportive of local 20mph zone covering the Cromwell's residential area. As a residential street with numerous children we feel that a reduced speed limit would reduce the likelihood of accidents, reduce pollution, cut down on rat running, promote more sustainable means of transport, and make the area feel more of a cohesive community.	The Council's Overview and Scrutiny Committee is undertaking a Scrutiny Review of the Council's policy regarding 20mph zones and 20mph speed limits.

		<p>This will include consideration of a borough wide 20 mph on residential roads. Outputs from this review are expected in March 2011 and will be considered in developing future 20mph zone and speed limit policy.</p>
<p>Haringey Disability First Consortium & Age Concern Haringey</p>	<p>HDFC Comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Put people at the centre of plans and involve them from the beginning by using Haringey residents to develop plans. 2. Develop user-led accessibility schemes and invest in Shopmobility scheme. 3. Use the services already in place more effectively e.g. giving frontline staff use of parking permits, car clubs and electric vehicles in order to carry out visits to vulnerable people. 4. Issue a carers pass for residential areas covered CPZs. 5. Educate the public, the police and drivers about disability by providing training on disabled parking bays and penalties, the responsibilities under equalities legislation that statutory service providers have. 6. The consideration of an overall strategy to improve transport around the borough instead of concentrating on schemes in specific areas. The response states “This strategy should include improved public transport, simplified inter-changes, better pavements, reducing car use and parking”. 7. Appreciate that people and cars travel across borough boundaries by implementing a congestion charging zone for the borough of Haringey. 8. Consider the distance and access to public transport. More strategic thinking about the placement of bus routes, bus stops, transport hubs, improve step free access and pavement repairs. 9. Penalise illegal behaviours e.g. bus drivers not using ramps and parking too far from curbs, enforcement of parking offences and drivers not stopping at signalised crossings. 	<p>HDFC comments are noted and will be incorporated into the final LIP where possible.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The LIP process does allow for resident participation from the initial development stage, as detailed in the consultation section 2.3.8 and appendix H. 2. The Sustainable Transport Commission is considering the issue of accessibility and the Council is awaiting its report. The future of shopmobility provision in the borough is being reviewed by the Council in December 2010, in order to identify a strategy to deliver improved shopmobility services than currently exists. This needs to be assessed against demand and other funding commitments. <p>Comments 3-5 are noted and will be pasted to the Parking services department. Comments 6-9 are noted, and the Council’s response to similar remarks are provided in the sections above.</p>