

Subject:

FW: Response to Wood Green Local Plan

From: Daniel Jaeggi

Sent: 31 March 2017 10:20

To: LDF

Subject: Response to Wood Green Local Plan

Dear sir or madam,

I am writing to give my feedback on the Wood Green Local Plan. My comments relate primarily to transport in general, so felt it was more appropriate to give my comments in an email, as they relate to a number of sections in the plan.

First, I am encouraged that Haringey is taking serious steps to improving the local area. Wood Green has a lot of potential and redevelopment is long overdue. However, I'm extremely concerned about the lack of a coherent transport policy in the plan. Transport, from my perspective as a local resident, is the biggest local issue. Traffic is extremely bad, pollution (as a father of a young child) is a major concern, and "road violence" (i.e. aggressive and dangerous driving with the serious risk of injury or death) is my primary safety concern. I believe, also, that this directly relates to the poor quality of the urban environment. Turnpike Lane will never be an attractive shopping street while there is bumper to bumper traffic, 2 lanes of parked cars, and noticeable pollution. Similarly Wood Green High Street is blighted by the same problems.

My big concern is that the plan seeks to increase available housing and business, thus significantly increasing the demand for local transport, without any serious consideration of how to achieve this. I worry that poor transport planning decisions at this stage will cement a long-lasting traffic problem in the area, and this is counter to all the aims of the plan - shoppers and businesses will not be attracted to the area. I'm also a director of a small business - I currently travel to Kings Cross to use shared office space but would love to be able to walk to an office in Wood Green; many people I work with cycle, and transport links in general are a key consideration in deciding where to locate.

What is lacking is the acknowledgement of a basic fact - in the future, far more people will need to use active modes of transport (walking or cycling). On a strategic level, I can't see how a transport plan works without significantly fewer car journeys; tube travel is not relevant for the vast majority of local travel; local buses are already extremely busy and carry significant pollution consequences. A world where walking and cycling account for a far greater proportion of journeys has many other positive benefits; health & obesity; mental well-being; economic (bus fares/petrol money are able to be spent with local businesses); public space improvements (pedestrian areas and roads designed to be sympathetic to people on bikes are always more attractive, the two go hand in hand); improved road safety.

Having acknowledged this, the plan, as currently stands, is extremely weak on the provision for both walking and cycling. I see only vague commitments to provide improvements, no explicit KPIs regarding modal share. Motorised traffic still seems to dominate.

On cycling specifically, I see almost no thought or planning. While the plan shows a desire to create "cycling hubs" no consideration is given to enabling people to reach those hubs - the biggest impediment to cycling locally is the dangerous road conditions, which will only be solved by including protected cycling lanes on the major routes in the area. Enfield and Waltham Forest have extremely ambitious and positive Mini-Holland plans in place, and in Waltham Forest in particular, these have lead to dramatic improvements in road conditions (I would encourage you to visit Orford Road to see the transformation potential). As a case in point, since moving to Haringey last year from Holloway (where both Camden and Islington have quite pro-active cycling approaches) by wife's bike has sat in the shed unused. She would love to cycle but

currently can't because she is faced with dangerous road conditions literally straight out of the front door (she drives or takes the bus instead, exacerbating the local traffic problem).

The only specific cycling route improvements in the plan are the Quietways (which I believe were already planned). I would like to point out that Quietways are a monumental waste of time and resource. They do not provide the benefit they purport, namely to provide safe routes for less confident people; as non-direct routes they still leave you take main routes to your final destination. I would encourage you to see the difference in practice between a Quietway and a protected cycle lane. Please, if you haven't done so already, travel along Quietway 1 (between Greenwich and Waterloo) and compare this to the protected cycleway on Blackfriars Bridge and Embankment. It is only on the latter where you'll see "ordinary people" (including young children and older people) using the facility. These are the people Wood Green needs to cycle (or walk) if we are going to see a change in people's transport choices, and a reduction in motorised travel.

I would strongly urge you to re-consider the transport aspects of the plan. I believe active travel needs to have a far stronger and integrated place in the plan. Please help us, as local residents, to get around the area without using our cars or buses, and don't condemn us to 15 or more years of traffic and pollution.

Yours,

Daniel Jaeggi