

Scrutiny Review Haringey Transport Strategy

5th April 2005

CONTENTS

Executive Summary and Recommendations	2
Summary of the Recommendations	
1. Introduction	5
Membership of the Review	
Aims and Objectives of the Review	
Evidence to the Review	
2. The Local Implementation Plan for Transport	9
Timetable for the Local Implementation Plan	
Content of the Local Implementation Plan	
The Borough's Transport Consultants	
The Role of the Scrutiny Review	13
3. Walking and Cycling	
Walking	
Street Design	
Cycling	
4. Public Transport	17
Bus Services	
Rail Services	
5. Roads	5
Traffic Growth	
Road Infrastructure	
Road Safety	
Parking and Enforcement	
6. Conclusions	28
List of Documentary Evidence	29
Appendix	
Appendix One – List of Key Stakeholders and Witnesses	30
Appendix Two – Killed and Seriously Injured Casualties in Haringey	31
Appendix Three – Review of 20 mph Zones in London Boroughs	32

Executive Summary and Recommendations

The Scrutiny Review of Haringey Transport Strategy has been established as the Member Steering Group to guide the development of the Local Implementation Plan for transport (LIP) in Haringey, which is being developed for submission to the Mayor of London and Transport for London (TfL). The Council is now preparing the first draft of the LIP for initial consideration by the Mayor. The interim recommendations of the Review, outlined in this report, have been submitted and agreed with the Executive Member Environment, before inclusion in the draft LIP.

TfL will comment on the initial draft LIP and the Member Steering Group (Scrutiny Review panel) will be re-convened to consider if any changes are necessary in the final draft of the LIP, which is due to be submitted in September 2005.

Summary of the Recommendations

The following recommendations have been agreed by the Review panel and are outlined further in the report:

Recommendation One - The final draft of the Local Implementation Plan should be entitled “The Haringey Transport Plan” so that it is easily identified by the general public as the plan to guide local transport initiatives.

Recommendation Two – The Council should engage on an extensive consultation strategy on the draft transport Local Implementation Plan.

Recommendation Three - The Local Implementation Plan should link clearly with other Council strategies and initiatives, especially the Unitary Development Plan, Better Haringey and other council services transport initiatives (e.g. the Walking Bus for schools).

Recommendation Four - The Council should outline a broad strategic document entitled “The Haringey Transport Strategy” to guide the co-ordination of transport initiatives across council services and with partner agencies. The strategy should clearly link to and reference other initiatives related to transport and particularly policies on planning, regeneration, community health and social services and education.

Recommendation Five - Pedestrian crossings should be installed that meet the needs of pedestrians who wish to cross the road with clear criteria on the type and location of crossings.

Recommendation Six – The Council should undertake an audit of street furniture, linked to a Geographic Information System (GIS) inventory.

Recommendation Seven - The Council should prioritise its street light improvement programme.

Recommendation Eight - Future expenditure on cycling facilities should aim to make all the Borough’s roads safe for cycling, whilst recognising the need for the appropriate use of dedicated continuous cycle lanes on some major routes.

Recommendation Nine - The Council should, where possible, support cycle lanes on a dedicated carriageway and provide a demarcated different level platform between the footway and the road.

Recommendation Ten – The Council should seek to increase the number of cycle parking spaces particularly in town centres.

Recommendation Eleven - Camera enforcement should be considered by the Director of Environmental Services as a possible strategy to improve enforcement on cycleways for cycling space and security against theft.

Recommendation Twelve - The Council should support greater investment in bus services that run East-West across the Borough.

Recommendation Thirteen - The Council should support the provision of properly enforced bus lanes on major routes and develop a plan for bus priority measures. -

Recommendation Fourteen - The Council should work with Transport for London to maintain high frequency bus services in the Borough and identify those routes where an upgrade to a high frequency service would be beneficial.

Recommendation Fifteen - The Council should work with relevant agencies for improved bus service safety.

Recommendation Sixteen - Haringey Council continue to make the case to all appropriate bodies to obtain further investment in the Borough's rail links.

Recommendation Seventeen - The Council should set a target of zero traffic growth, in line with the target set by Transport for London for limiting traffic growth throughout London.

Recommendation Eighteen - The Council should support major road infrastructure schemes for improving the North Circular Road and Tottenham Hale Gyratory and a new spine road within the Haringey Heartlands area.

Recommendation Nineteen - The Council target effective enforcement methods to reduce accidents on the main road network.

Recommendation Twenty - The Council should support educational initiatives on road safety.

Recommendation Twenty One - The Council should support the widespread introduction of 20mph zones and traffic calming in 'Residential Areas', with the longer-term aim of making all 'Residential Areas' and 'Mixed Priority Routes' 20mph zones in due course.

Recommendation Twenty Two - The Council should develop precise and transparent criteria to use in considering further Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs).

Recommendation Twenty Three - CPZs should have the minimum hours of operation that are necessary to meet the defined objectives of the zone.

Recommendation Twenty Four - The Council should maintain parking for business use in its town centres.

1. Introduction

- 1.1. The Regeneration and Partnerships Scrutiny Panel identified local transport in its work plan for 2004/2005 as a key regeneration issue for Haringey. It was decided to establish a Scrutiny Review when the Executive Member for the Environment indicated that he wished to establish a Member Steering Group to advise him on the Borough's Local Implementation Plan for transport (LIP). The Review includes members of the Environment Scrutiny Panel, the Regeneration and Partnerships Scrutiny Panel and other Members with a particular interest. The conclusions and recommendations of the Review, should guide the development of the transport LIP.
- 1.2. In 2001 the Mayor of London published the London Transport Strategy, one of eight London strategies prepared by the Mayor to guide the planning and development of the capital. To complement the Mayor's strategy, each London borough is required to prepare a Local Implementation Plan (LIP) in line with their local priorities and strategies for transport, but compatible with the Mayor's priorities. Transport for London has allocated £50,000 to each borough to assist in the process. The LIP should contain each borough's proposals for implementing the Mayor's Transport Strategy (MTS) at the local level.
- 1.3. The Mayor's Transport Strategy is set out in the context of some key challenges for the capital's development. The population of London is estimated to grow by more than 800,000 by 2016 and employment by 636,000. This will put pressures on London's infrastructure, but particularly upon transport infrastructure, which will need to adapt to meet the needs of the growing population and growing economy. In addition, the strategy aims to protect and improve London's environment, reducing traffic congestion, improving air quality and regenerating local communities.
- 1.4. A key task of this Review was to work as a Member steering group to direct the development of Haringey's transport LIP. The recommendations outlined in this report were agreed with the Executive Member so that it could direct the development of the draft LIP before it is sent to the Mayor of London for approval. The draft LIP will be submitted to the Mayor for consultation in March 2005, when the proposal will also go out for public consultation. The Borough will submit the final LIP for approval later this year.
- 1.5. The Mayor's Transport Strategy for London (MTS) provides guidance that the transport LIP should concentrate on local transport priorities and that the plan should be realistic and not aspirational. The strategic vision was provided by the MTS. Nevertheless the Scrutiny Panel decided that the regeneration needs of the Borough made it imperative that Haringey develop a wider plan to promote major transport improvements in our part of London. The final report will therefore inform the transport LIP but also set out the context for the borough's transport vision and strategy more generally.
- 1.6. The Scrutiny Review Panel/Member Steering Group took a broad look at the local transport issues from their perspective as local community representatives and from their personal experiences as pedestrians, cyclists, passengers and car drivers.

Membership of the Review

1.7. There was a crosscutting Membership, combining the Regeneration and Partnerships Scrutiny Panel and members nominated by the Chair of the Environmental Services Scrutiny Panel plus a co-opted member.

1.8. The members of the Review are:

- ❖ Cllr Dawson (Chairman)
- ❖ Cllr Bax
- ❖ Cllr Bloch
- ❖ Cllr Jean Brown (co-opted)
- ❖ Cllr Hare
- ❖ Cllr Hillman
- ❖ Cllr Lister
- ❖ Cllr Patel
- ❖ Cllr Robertson
- ❖ Cllr Winskill

1.9. Members of the Review may be re-called in the new municipal year 2005/6 to consider the Mayor's response to Haringey's transport Local Implementation Plan submission and the response from local consultation.

Aim and Objectives of the Review

1.10. *Aim*

To consider how the Local Implementation Plan for transport in Haringey should be developed.

1.11. *Objectives*

- To consider the Council's Local Implementation Plan for transport and how this should be developed
- To consider the Mayor's Transport Strategy for London and what scope there is for local choice and direction in the development of Haringey's transport policy
- To consider the policies and best practice in other Councils in the development of local transport strategies
- To put forward proposals for the development of Haringey's Local Implementation Plan for transport for consideration by the Executive

Evidence to the Review

1.12. During the Review evidence was heard from key stakeholders in the local community, through both oral evidence and written statements. The Review heard evidence through interviews with particular individuals and organisations, including Haringey Federation of Residents Associations and Living Streets. The Review also received evidence through a Stakeholders Forum, which brought together a range of community stakeholders from different perspectives in a joint discussion

on key themes for the development of local transport initiatives and the preparation of the draft LIP. A full list of key stakeholders and witnesses is given in Appendix One.

- 1.13. The Review heard evidence from Haringey Forum for Older People. The Haringey Forum for Older People met in June 2004, when a large number of older people gave their views on the range of transport services in the borough. The Review received feedback from the Forum for Older Peoples' views expressed on transport in general and specifically on public transport, community transport, patient transport and roads and traffic congestion. The Review heard that good, reliable and appropriate transport really improves the quality of older people's lives. It helps them stay independent, allows them to stay in touch with friends, family and social activities and is essential to them using health and social care facilities.
- 1.14. The Forum questioned the reliability and accessibility of both public and community transport. They said that patient transport was seen by many older people as inflexible and hard to access. Older people have difficulty getting around busy, congested roads on public transport. The physical difficulties of using public transport are a particular problem. For example:
 - buses that can't or don't draw up to the kerbside making it hard to get on and off
 - buses that are packed tight with no seats available
 - special seats for elderly and disabled people being used by other passengers:
 - access constricted on buses by large numbers of prams and buggies
 - older people finding it physically difficult and uncomfortable to use buses because they travel very fast or stop suddenly.
- 1.15. The Review heard that older people want specialised community transport so that they can go to clubs and meetings and other social activities. There is a perceived need to have an escort and special assistance to cater for their particular disability. Getting access to the various community transport schemes is also problematic - getting through on the phone is particularly difficult for those whose first language isn't English.
- 1.16. It was commented that one organisation should be responsible for providing and booking community and patient transport so that older people could feel confident that they had access to appropriate transport for different occasions.
- 1.17. The Review heard evidence from Tony Vickers of the British Drivers Association. Mr Vickers outlined the key issues the British Drivers Association would like to be considered in the development of Haringey's local transport strategy and the Local Implementation Plan. These include:
 - Motorist attitudes will not change by oppressive regulations
 - Mitigation of extreme measures to prevent people using cars
 - TfL report on Congestion Charging did not identify any significant impact on environment as a result of the charging
 - Vehicle technology has reduced emissions significantly and the future looks better
 - Use of phasing traffic lights, which remain green if drivers keep to the speed limit
 - Less emphasis on bus lanes
 - Cycles lanes should be created in wide pavements, not on roads
 - More use of fly-overs and underpasses

1.18. Evidence was received from Richard Taylor of the Living Streets campaign. Mr Taylor gave an overview of the key concerns Living Streets would like to see taken up in the development of Haringey's local transport strategy and the development of the Local Implementation Plan (LIP). These include:

- The promotion of walking as a means of local transport
- "Walkability" of Haringey streets (a phrase that should be used in the strategy)
- Reduction in street clutter
- A more balanced distribution of road space between different users
- Making streets more attractive for pedestrians to use
- Improving access to streets through appropriate planning and signage
- Improving linkages between neighbourhoods through improved access to alleys and throughways
- Quick repairs of footpaths for safety and access
- Engaging with local residents in the design and traffic control of local neighbourhoods – guarding the public realm

1.19. The Review held a Stakeholder Forum on 10th December 2004 to listen to the views of some key community stakeholders on the development of local transport strategy and initiatives. Key themes for discussion were identified on:

- Bus journey times and reliability
- Parking
- Infrastructure improvements for walking and cycling
- Road Traffic Reduction
- Road Safety
- Home Zones and 20mph Zones

1.20. Discussion was held around each of these themes and the views of the participating organisations noted to inform the Review. The Stakeholder Forum not only provided valuable evidence to inform the Review, but also tested the areas for full consultation later on in the process.

1.21. Consultation will be carried out by the department on the draft LIP, when it has been submitted and agreed with Transport for London and will inform the development of the final draft. The Review has concluded that the full and comprehensive consultation on the draft LIP is very important, especially as the LIP contains such a broad range of issues and impacts upon many other areas of community life. The consultation should include the key statutory agencies such as the fire brigade, police services, education and schools, social services, the primary care trust, but also include a wide range of community stakeholders and the voluntary sector, include engagement with minority groups, women's groups, older people and disabled associations.

2. The Local Implementation Plan for Transport

- 2.1. The Local Implementation Plan for transport (LIP) is a statutory plan required to be submitted to the office of the Mayor of London and Transport for London and is currently being prepared by all London boroughs. It sets out how London boroughs will deliver the Mayor's Transport Strategy for London and within the scope of delivery, there is room for local choice on how local plans and strategies will implement the Mayor's priorities.
- 2.2. **Recommendation One - The final draft of the Local Implementation Plan should be entitled "The Haringey Transport Plan" so that it is easily identified by the general public as the plan to guide local transport initiatives.**

The Role of the Scrutiny Review

- 2.3. The Scrutiny Review Panel working as the Members Steering Group was constituted to consider the policy decisions to be incorporated into the transport LIP. Members have reached their conclusions from their perspective as local community representatives and also from their personal experiences as pedestrians, cyclists, passengers and car drivers, as well as listening carefully to evidence from residents, transport user groups and other stakeholders. The Review panel met eight times, including a stakeholders event, to consider a range of evidence, including interviews with policy makers, service managers and interest groups.

Timetable for the Local Implementation Plan

- 2.4. Transport for London [TfL] has provided guidance to the boroughs to assist in preparation of the Local Implementation Plan (LIP). This includes a draft timetable for preparing the LIP, in response to which Haringey Council has submitted a timetable to TfL that was accepted by TfL:

Stage 1 - Borough to prepare draft LIP	September to December 2004
Stage 2 - Stakeholder Forum	early December 2004
Stage 3 - Report to Chief Executive Management Board	24 February 2005
Stage 4 - Report to the Executive	22 March 2005
Stage 5 - Borough issues consultation draft LIP	April 2005
Stage 6 – Public and statutory consultation	April to May 2005
Stage 7 - Borough finalises LIP	June to August 2005
Stage 8 - Borough submits final LIP for approval	September to December 2005

- 2.5. The Transport Scrutiny Review panel was asked to work as the Member Steering Group and has produced an interim report that outlines its conclusions and recommendations and submitted these to the Executive Member for the Environment for consideration. The Transport Scrutiny Review panel will be

recalled to assist with Stage 7, following the outcome of public consultation and TfL's initial response.

- 2.6. The Review has received a range of evidence from key stakeholders, including policy managers. The Panel also arranged a Stakeholder Forum on 10th December 2004, where it received evidence from a wide range of key stakeholders.
- 2.7. Consultants JMP have also been assisting the Council in Stage 1 of the process. JMP were asked to develop a range of local transport plans and programmes. These include the review of road safety around schools, the development of projects to improve accessibility to rail stations (such as improved street lighting), the development of a bus priority programme, the development of a bus stop accessibility programme and the preparation of a Parking and Enforcement Plan (including pricing and allocation policies and CPZ strategies to control parking).

Content of Local Implementation Plan

- 2.8. The transport LIP should contain the borough's proposals for implementing the Mayor's Transport Strategy (MTS) for London at a local level. The MTS has 8 priorities:
 1. Improving road safety
 2. Improving bus journey times
 3. Relieving traffic congestion and improving journey time reliability
 4. Improving the working of parking and loading arrangements
 5. Improving accessibility and social inclusion
 6. Encourage walking
 7. Encourage cycling
 8. Bringing transport infrastructure to a state of good repair
- 2.9. Guidance issued by Transport for London (TfL) emphasises that transport LIPs must be based on realistic planning assumptions and should not be used as aspirational bidding documents. The transport LIP should cover the period of the Mayor's Transport Strategy, 2001 to 2011 and should relate to the first 4 years in detail, (ie 2005/6 to 2008/9), with indicative projects and programmes for 2009/10 and 2010/11. Haringey has already submitted its Borough Spending Plan for 2005/6 to the Mayor, which sets out its projects and programmes for that year.
- 2.10. TfL guidance states that only schemes of over £100,000 will need to be separately identified in a LIP unless the scheme or project is the sole component of a programme or likely to be of major importance in transport terms.
- 2.11. The annual Borough Spending Plan (BSP) process by which the Council seeks funds from TfL for implementing transport will be continuing. TfL are considering the role of BSPs in the context of LIP production. The BSP will be the vehicle for subsequent bids for new schemes not in the LIP.
- 2.12. Local Implementation Plans for transport must outline:
 - Clear links between LIP proposals and the Mayor's Transport Strategy for London policies
 - A timetable for implementing the different proposals in the LIP and the date by which these will be completed

- Clear proposals for delivery of Mayoral targets
- An assessment of the funding and resources needed to deliver the LIP
- Assumptions about sources of funding

2.13. The Local Implementation Plans for transport must include:

- The development of a plan for red route type measures, catering for longer distance traffic movements such as restricting waiting and loading
- Identification of congestion bottlenecks and implementation programme
- The development of a street maintenance plan
- The development of a pedestrian improvement plan, e.g. pedestrian phases at traffic signals

The Borough's Transport Consultants

2.14. Haringey Council has appointed consultants JMP to develop proposals for particular work areas. These are:

- Review of road safety around schools
- Development of projects to improve accessibility to rail stations
- Develop bus priority programme
- Develop bus stop accessibility programme
- Prepare parking and enforcement plan
- Develop a plan for red routes and similar measures
- Identify congestion bottlenecks
- Develop street maintenance plan
- Develop pedestrian improvement plan
- Develop local cycle route programme
- Develop taxicard, community transport and door-to-door initiatives

Consultation on the Local Implementation Plan

2.15. Public and statutory consultation planned as stage 6 of the LIP development process (outlined above).

2.16. The Review interviewed various stakeholders. It also organised a major stakeholder event, which was held on 10th December 2004. Feeding into the work of the Review through these meetings were:

- Age Concern Haringey
- Association of British Drivers
- Federation of Haringey Residents Associations
- Friends of the Earth – Tottenham and Wood Green
- Haringey Cycling Campaign
- Haringey Transport Action Group
- Living Streets (the campaign of the Pedestrian's Association)
- London Transport Users Committee
- Muswell Hill Metro Group
- Haringey Phoenix Group (for blind and partially sighted)

2.17. **Recommendation Two – The Council should engage on an extensive consultation strategy on the draft transport Local Implementation Plan.**

- 2.18. Public engagement is vital in producing a realistic transport plan. The use of current channels of communication, such as Haringey People and schools (in order to engage young people) will boost the profile of the transport LIP. However, consultation must be inclusive and should avoid jargon.

Haringey Transport Strategies

- 2.19. The Review has considered how the Local Implementation Plan links with other council strategies and initiatives, particularly the council's regeneration strategies and the Unitary Development Plan (UDP). There are a number of other areas where there are specific transport initiatives and needs related to particular service areas and sections of the community, but there does not appear to be an overarching approach to link these initiatives or to identify gaps in provision.
- 2.20. **Recommendation Three - The Local Implementation Plan should link clearly with other Council strategies and initiatives, especially the Unitary Development Plan, Better Haringey and other council services transport initiatives (e.g. the Walking Bus for schools).**
- 2.21. The Review concluded that it is important that the final draft of the LIP make clear linkages to other areas of council policy and strategy where transport is relevant. This should make sure that the implementation of the LIP takes account of the needs of other relevant service areas.
- 2.22. **Recommendation Four - The department should outline a broad strategic document entitled "The Haringey Transport Strategy" to guide the co-ordination of transport initiatives across council services and with partner agencies. The strategy should clearly link and reference other initiatives related to transport and particularly policies on planning, regeneration, community health and social services and education.**
- 2.23. In order to join up the strategic approach to transport in the borough with the key strategic agenda and projects for the council elsewhere, a broad strategic document should be produced to guide the corporate approach. It should specifically link with the borough's regeneration vision and strategy and planning (the UDP), but also with other transport initiatives across other services and partner agencies. The Haringey Transport Strategy should accord with the Local Implementation Plan and the Mayor's Transport Strategy, but set out the local strategic agenda for the borough.
- 2.24. It is not envisaged that the Haringey Transport Strategy should be a lengthy document, but probably one that sets out the broad strategic agenda and references key linkages to other strategies, plans, projects and agencies. It is envisaged that this document can be used as an aspirational bidding document, a function that the LIP could not fulfil, setting out both the boroughs approach and the direction for the future, enabling the council to work with partner agencies, Transport for London and the Government.

3. Walking and Cycling

- 3.1. The Mayor's Transport Strategy vigorously promotes walking and cycling and contains proposals to make walking and cycling safer and strategies to encourage these as alternative ways of getting around the city. Walking and cycling have been considered during the Review and evidence received from key interest groups such as the Haringey Cycling Campaign and Living Streets. Members also considered the draft Walking Plan and the Cycling Plan currently being prepared by the Transport Planning department.

Walking

- 3.2. During the Review Richard Tayler was interviewed from Living Streets campaign group. He outlined some specific measures that Living Streets would like to see taken up, where appropriate:
- 20mph speed limits in busy pedestrian areas
 - "Home Zones" – greater pedestrianisation of residential neighbourhoods
 - more appropriate planning of obstacles to pathways, eg street lights, street furniture, litter bins (eg commercial waste bins)
 - More planned passageways and footpaths between neighbourhoods and centres
 - More pedestrian signposts
- 3.3. A Pedestrian Improvement Plan has been developed by JMP. The borough has also liaised with Living Streets over ways to improve walking. Indeed, Living Streets point out that part of every journey is on foot.
- 3.4. **Recommendation Five - Pedestrian crossings should be installed that meet the needs of pedestrians who wish to cross the road with clear criteria on the type and location of crossings.**
- 3.5. There is an accepted priority of favouring pedestrian movement over vehicle traffic. However, this prioritisation does not always address the difficulty faced by pedestrians in crossing many of the borough's roads. Underpasses or footbridges are for the most part not an acceptable solution and do not necessarily instil confidence in pedestrians. Pedestrian crossings should facilitate safe crossing for people on foot, but are not intended to create undue disruption to traffic flow. The zebra crossing has long been used and should continue to be the first option. However, in many locations traffic light operated crossings, commonly known as 'pelican crossings' will be necessary.
- 3.6. Nevertheless, a more responsive traffic light system may be considered, the so called 'puffin crossings'. The modern equipment can detect whether there is a pedestrian who wishes to cross the road. Traffic lights for vehicles turn to red promptly when requested by a pedestrian. However, this must be balanced by returning to green if no one is crossing and should have a time-lag before it can be used again. Pedestrian traffic should generally have priority but schemes need to allow reasonably easy movement for buses and cyclists.
- 3.7. The design of crossings should aim to facilitate pedestrians crossing the road directly and without interruption. Breaking crossings at traffic islands should be avoided. Diagonal crossings should be considered at many major road junctions.

Street Design

- 3.8. The Review considered the planning of street furniture in public spaces. Inappropriate street furniture can clutter public highways, civic spaces and footpaths. Richard Tayler of Living Streets said; “We want the balance of street design redressed so that for example footways are continuous and the carriageway built up to cross them. We want for example guard-rails, which we call sheep pens designed out. They give the message that the street is a ‘motor-way’ for vehicles and not a living space for pedestrians. We prefer bollards to protect pedestrians from vehicles where appropriate, but street furniture kept to the minimal”.
- 3.9. **Recommendation Six – The Council should undertake an audit of street furniture, linked to a Geographic Information System (GIS) inventory.**
- 3.10. There should be a presumption in favour of minimising street furniture. An audit of street furniture should be undertaken prioritising town centres but later extending to the whole of the public realm for which the Council is responsible. The information provided should be used to ensure that superfluous and unnecessary items are removed or phased out. Pedestrian signposts are important in helping people to get around on foot. The Council should ensure that there is consistent and comprehensive provision of pedestrian signposts. Street furniture should be rationalised and minimised as much as possible to improve the appearance and safety of the pavement. Unnecessary advertising boards should be removed, e.g. on Seven Sisters Road.
- 3.11. This Review supports the development of a design guide to be used as a planning tool for the appropriate use and design of street furniture and railings on public highways. The guide should provide for a more attractive and well-designed pedestrian environment. It must also include the design of pedestrian signposts.
- 3.12. **Recommendation Seven - The Council should prioritise its street light improvement programme.**
- 3.13. Street lighting emerged as a major issue in relation to crime and public safety. There is a need for improved street lighting in some streets and alleyways to create a safe and pleasant passageway for pedestrians. The Council programme for updating streetlamps must be prioritised and kept under review.
- 3.14. The Review has noted that the design of streets has an impact on safety. Improved street lighting from shop frontages reduced the fear and incidents of crime. Planning guidance should encourage shop front designs to provide lighting and discourage solid metal shutters.

Cycling

- 3.15. During the Review, evidence was received from Stephen Taylor of the Haringey Cycling Campaign (HCC), which promotes cycling and the interests of cyclists in the borough. He welcomed initiatives undertaken by Haringey Council to promote and facilitate cycling, including the Cycling Action Plan, which he commended for its holistic approach and because it looks at the whole cycle network including all roads in the borough. He said that all roads should be safe for cyclists rather than

an approach that provided special routes for cycling. He said that cycling should be seen as a mainstream transport activity.

- 3.16. Stephen Taylor said that we need to take measures to encourage all people to stop using private cars and take alternative transport. Safety was a key issue for cyclists in the borough, and it was important to make roads generally safe as a priority, rather than emphasising specific schemes for cyclists. Enforcement was an important way in which to maintain access for cyclists on roads, eg making sure that dangerous obstacles are removed.
- 3.17. He said that the HCC wanted to see more measures taken for cycling promotion, as well as promotion of sustainable transport more generally. It is important though to avoid measures that can put cyclists into conflict with pedestrians, eg unclear rights of way on cycle paths and footpaths.
- 3.18. The draft Cycling Action Plan does not to make any distinction between the road network and the cycleway network, acknowledging cyclists wish to use all roads. Stephen Taylor was asked his views about the possibilities of extending pavements to accommodate cyclists. He said that this is good where appropriate but that it is better to focus on making roads safer and more accessible for cycling. He was asked about the possibilities of providing special priority throughways for cyclists and traffic lights, but he urged against this as it might encourage people to jump red lights, which is especially dangerous for cyclists.
- 3.19. He said that the Council seemed to be doing a lot at the moment to erect cycle stands where people actually need them, but he suggested that better signage to encourage use might help.
- 3.20. **Recommendation Eight - Future expenditure on cycling aims to make all the Borough's roads safe for cycling, whilst recognising the need for the appropriate use of dedicated continuous cycle lanes on some major routes.**
- 3.21. In general the policy should be to improve safety for cyclists on all the boroughs roads within the context of road maintenance and traffic reduction.
- 3.22. However, there are locations where segregated cycle facilities are appropriate and represent a good use of resources, in particular the Borough's major roads. There is a need to improve the continuity of cycle lanes available on these routes. Breaks in marked cycle lanes do not create confidence amongst cyclists and are of limited usefulness.
- 3.23. Facilities for cyclists at major junctions should focus on improved traffic management rather than separate provision for cyclists. Where cycle lanes exist there should be regular and consistent enforcement of them and they should form an integral part of the traffic management scheme at junctions.
- 3.24. **Recommendation Nine - The Council should, where possible, support cycle lanes on a dedicated carriageway and provides a demarcated different level platform between the footway and the road.**
- 3.25. The most favourable design for cycle lanes is for the lane to be raised above the roadway, so that there is a separate level between the carriageway and the pavement. This layout keeps cyclists and pedestrians safe and ensures that cycle

lanes do not interfere with roadside parking, et cetera. The Review noted the best practice for cycle lanes adopted in Germany and the Netherlands.

- 3.26. The street furniture audit and design guide must reflect the need to improve cycling safety. At present railings near many cycle lanes are felt to pose an potential danger to cyclists. Tony Vickers from the Association of British Drivers commented on this proposal, "I support this as long as the dedicated cycle carriageway is taken from the pavements whenever possible and not the already overstretched roads".
- 3.27. **Recommendation Ten – The Council should seek to increase the number of cycle parking spaces particularly in town centres.**
- 3.28. Cycle parking spaces should be increased including the use of cycle lockers and supervised cycle parks. Locations should be highly visible in order to deter theft and vandalism.
- 3.29. One of the reasons why cyclists do not use cycle parking facilities is because of fear of theft. It is felt that this needs to be given consideration when cycle parking facilities are being planned and that the visibility of the bicycle helps to improve its security. The Review also considered the possible use of camera enforcement around cycle parking areas to deter crime.
- 3.30. **Recommendation Eleven - Camera enforcement should be considered by the Director of Environmental Services as a possible strategy to improve enforcement on cycleways for cycling space and security against theft.**
- 3.31. The Review has referred the suggestion of using camera enforcement to aid the securing of parked bicycles for consideration by the department. The Director of Environmental Services is asked to provide a brief evaluation of the costs and benefits of this strategy to improve facilities for cyclists to test the viability of this scheme.

4. Public Transport

- 4.1. The Review has considered the provision of public transport networks across the borough, and bus, rail and tube services in particular. There was widespread recognition both within the Review and across the key stakeholders interviewed that the improvement of public transport was an essential strategy in the provision of a diversified and responsive local transport system. Tony Vickers from the Association of British Drivers told the Review; "In general, I support the improvement of public transport and the encouragement of the public to use it. The only proviso is that the methods employed should be positive ones which enhance the public network and not negative methods aimed at devaluing private car use in order to make a poor public transport service seem more attractive".

Bus Services

- 4.2. The Review considered Haringey's bus network. Richard Taylor from Living Streets (LS) commented; "We have a generally excellent provision of buses in Haringey; however comments that frequently arise when I talk to LS Haringey members and supporters, including those with disabilities, are that bus stops are too often not conveniently located and some routes should be lengthened".
- 4.3. **Recommendation Twelve - The Council should support greater investment in bus services that run East-West across the Borough.**
- 4.4. The priority should be for improved East-West links, which run orbitally in relation to central London. The Council is able to play a strong role in promoting local bus services and investigating the need for new routes, especially those penetrating areas currently unserved. This should be done in co-ordination with other boroughs where necessary. Specific routes might include:
- An extra bus service to serve White Hart Lane School
 - An extra bus service to serve Broadwater Farm
 - An additional bus service to serve Crouch End through to Highgate
- Narrowing the gap between the East and West of the Borough is one of Haringey's priorities and bus links would make a major contribution to this objective. However, current radial bus routes, i.e. those to and from Central London are important and should not be reduced to provide improved East-West services.
- 4.5. The Borough target for improving bus journey times has not yet been set by Transport for London. The Review considered whether shortened journey times or improved reliability of the existing timetable should be the priority.
- 4.6. Haringey Friends of the Earth supported more bus lanes. They said, "Ideally services should run every few minutes on the busier routes, but where passenger numbers can only justify fewer buses, they should be timetabled. Both reliability and speed are important if bus services are to offer an alternative to the car".
- 4.7. Tony Vickers from the Association of British Drivers said that bus services are better not timetabled, reliability rather than pure speed should be the aim. He said that too many bus lanes can cause congestion which also delays buses, as well as other road users.
- 4.8. Richard Taylor from Living Streets favoured more bus lanes. He said that they make buses more effective. Waiting for the bus is an unpleasant part of any

journey. He said that there was a need for more stops in convenient places and for new bus routes, especially orbital routes.

- 4.9. Pamela Moffatt from Age Concern Haringey said that we need to make sure that older people are considered in bus planning. There was a need to assess peoples' travel objectives. High-speed busses can be a problem for older people. Reliability is more important than journey speed for older people.
- 4.10. Rob Barnett from Haringey Youth Service said that local transport was very important to youth. East-West trips are often more difficult to navigate through the borough. Safety is the biggest issue, for example, assaults on the top deck of buses. Independent Travel Training students were advised to travel downstairs.
- 4.11. **Recommendation Thirteen - The Council should support the provision of properly enforced bus lanes on major routes and develop a plan for bus priority measures.**
- 4.12. Bus lanes make a contribution to improved bus operation, but need to be effectively managed. Where bus lanes exist there needs to be an effective enforcement programme to ensure that they are useful. The Council should support bus lanes on main roads, where appropriate, but a case needs to be made where bus lanes are to be introduced, concentrating on their usefulness for improving bus reliability and the effect on overall traffic flow. The hours of operation of bus lanes should be carefully considered and clearly marked. There is also a balance to be struck with the needs of property frontages. There should be a clear method for defining when and where bus routes need to be provided.:-
- 4.13. **Recommendation Fourteen - The Council should work with TfL to maintain high frequency bus services in the Borough and identify those routes where an upgrade to a high frequency service would be beneficial.**
- 4.14. High frequency bus services are those that operate with a frequency of 4 or more buses an hour. This provides a bus every few minutes with a flexible timetable. The public can rely on having only a short wait when they arrive at a bus stop. During the Review, evidence from bus service users and stakeholders suggested that minimisation of waiting time at stops and predictability of journey times is preferred over reducing the running times per se. The system whereby different types of service are identified at bus stops (e.g. a yellow background for 'pay before you board' services) could be adapted to indicate high frequency services.
- 4.15. The number of services operating to a high frequency has been increased by TfL in recent years. Currently 32 of the 41 bus services in borough operate to nominal frequencies rather than timetables. Increasing bus use may lead to some of the remaining 9 low frequency routes becoming high frequency routes. The Council can play a significant role in identifying where services should be upgraded. It is also important to ensure resident consultation on the need for high frequency bus services in their area.
- 4.16. However there are a number of areas of concern. Buses operating to a frequency rather than a set timetable can be more prone to bunching. Whilst this is in the first instance a management issue for the bus companies it is felt that there is room to develop the client side role of TfL in ensuring that services run effectively.

- 4.17. The bus stop 'Countdown' facility system is not working as well as it could do. A wholly reliable Countdown would do much to instil public confidence in the bus service and encourage usage.
- 4.18. For low frequency bus services, it is recognised that buses need to operate predictably and reliably, so a rigid timetable should be retained and displayed at all stops. Regular reviews should be undertaken so that adjustments can be made to reflect changing passenger demand and traffic conditions.
- 4.19. **Recommendation Fifteen - The Council should work with relevant agencies for improved bus service safety.**
- 4.20. The Council should work with relevant agencies for improved bus service safety for crew members, passengers and those waiting at stops. Older and disabled people in particular require a safe and comfortable journey experience. In particular it was felt that an emphasis on faster running could compromise safety. For all users crime is a concern. Careful thought must be given to the design and location of bus stops and safety measures on buses. There should be a bus stop safety audit carried out to identify the potential problems caused by:
- The new "bendy" busses
 - Passenger congestion at bus queues
 - The location of bus stops in terms of passenger interchange and traffic congestion.

Rail Services

- 4.21. **Recommendation Sixteen - The Council should continue to make the case to all appropriate bodies to obtain further investment in the Borough's rail links.**
- 4.22. Investment in improvements and *expansion* of the borough's rail connections is essential both for regeneration of the East of the borough and to accommodate expected population growth and economic development. Investment in transport links in north-east London are also vital to economic development proposals for the whole of Greater London. Haringey Council needs to make the case for essential rail developments and to demonstrate how the plans would fit with the borough's strategic plan and wider TfL objectives. The Council needs a properly resourced team to consider rail improvements and rail linkages for the Borough. Specific priority projects that have been identified so far include:
- Seven Sisters and Tottenham Hale station improvements. These are major rail-underground-bus interchanges. They require improvements to make them more user friendly, free from crime and fully Disability Discrimination Act compliant. There is potential for the use of both stations as gateways for the regeneration of Tottenham.
 - Extension of the Victoria Line to Northumberland Park. This scheme, which could take advantage of an existing link to the London Underground depot, is a fundamental project for the Borough. A properly designed extension would be able to complement the West Anglia Route Modernisation scheme (WARME). It would provide more passenger options. Northumberland Park could become a major interchange. We do not feel that there needs to be a choice between the extension of the Victoria Line and WARME; with careful planning it is feasible to build both.

- West Anglia Route Modernisation - Enhancement (WARME) and the Lee Valley Line (Tottenham Hale to Stratford). WARME, which would increase the number of tracks running north from Tottenham Hale, would allow for improved frequency and journey times and facilitate both fast and stopping services on dedicated tracks. It would improve journey times from London to Stansted Airport. The Lee Valley Line running south from Tottenham Hale would complement WARME. Track already exists and without it there would be a bottleneck between Tottenham Hale and Hackney Downs. The link to Stratford has great potential in terms of access to jobs at the proposed 2012 Olympic site and connections to the Channel Tunnel Rail Link. There is also potential for a Stansted Airport-Tottenham Hale-Stratford route to form part of the proposed Crossrail (Liverpool Street-Paddington) scheme, and the Council must ensure that this is properly considered.
- Greater frequency on the Gospel Oak to Barking line. This branch line co-exists with heavy freight, which has been seen as preventing it from becoming a light rail/tram route. Nevertheless it has strategic importance and should be upgraded to accommodate more frequent passenger services. Consideration should also be given to its interchange with other rail routes.

5. Roads

- 5.1. The Review considered road transport and safety across the borough, including strategies to reduce congestion, improve road safety and the integration of road transport with the needs of sustainable local communities.

Traffic Growth

- 5.2. The Mayor's Transport Strategy for London requires inner London Boroughs (Haringey is defined as inner London) to contribute to a target of zero traffic growth between 2001 and 2011. A target of zero traffic growth also applies to Metropolitan Centres such as Wood Green. We are required to publish our own target in the transport LIP.
- 5.3. **Recommendation Seventeen - The Council should set a target of zero traffic growth, in line with the target set by Transport for London for limiting traffic growth throughout London.**
- 5.4. The Review recommends that the Council subscribes to the target for zero traffic growth overall in the borough. There will be a need for a positive reduction in some areas to achieve the overall zero growth. The strategy should aim at reducing car usage, whilst recognising that many people will still want to retain car ownership; people should be encouraged to use their car less and more appropriately. Traffic generation should be controlled by the recommendations outlined in this report, as well as through appropriate use of planning measures and other transport policies.
- 5.5. Witnesses to the Review expressed a divergence of opinion on the feasibility and desirability of a zero traffic growth target. Tony Vickers from the Association of British Drivers told the Review "Zero traffic growth is a fantasy. It could only be achieved by such draconian measures that the commerce and vitality of Haringey would be severely damaged. The measures necessary would be socially and politically unacceptable. People do not aspire to car ownership, they aspire to car use. If Haringey and other inner London boroughs choose to make the use of cars difficult and expensive, car owners (who tend to be more affluent) will simply move away to areas where they are not persecuted".
- 5.6. Haringey Friends of the Earth said that the Council should comply with the Mayor's target for zero traffic growth, but go beyond the Mayor's targets and aim for overall traffic *reduction*. They would like to do this by rolling out more CPZs, reducing road capacity, traffic calming measures, requiring tough green travel plans from employers and other measures.
- 5.7. The Review has concluded that although Haringey is an area of projected economic and population growth and the zero traffic growth target is ambitious, it is important to achieve traffic control, especially in areas where town centres and local communities already suffer from high congestion, to maintain and improve the living environment.
- 5.8. The strategy to reduce traffic growth should focus on the development of a diverse pattern of local transport infrastructure and usage, which recognises that Haringey is an area of growth and development where car ownership may very likely increase, but where the provision of high frequency public transport and alternative

transport options will be key to reducing the overall amount of traffic and congestion on the roads.

Road Infrastructure

- 5.9. Tony Vickers from Association of British Drivers suggested that there should be car parking infrastructure improvements:
- Car parking be provided around train stations so people can switch between transport;
 - Parking be provided around shopping centres;
 - Designated and secure parking should be provided in residential areas so people do not have to park in roads.
- 5.10. Haringey Friends of the Earth did not support widespread road infrastructure developments. They said that there should be no infrastructure proposals apart from the 4-lane TfL proposal for the North Circular, and associated traffic calming and rat-running measures.
- 5.11. **Recommendation Eighteen - The Council should support major road infrastructure schemes for improving the North Circular Road and Tottenham Hale Gyratory and a new spine road within the Haringey Heartlands area.**
- 5.12. Within the borough the road network should be regarded as essentially complete and the emphasis should be on managing the network. However, there are a few schemes that should attract investment:
- North Circular Road. The A406 road should be widened on the section between Green Lanes and Bounds Green Road. The junction between the North Circular Road and the A10 Great Cambridge Road is also a priority. Haringey must work closely with Enfield Council on these plans.
 - Tottenham Hale gyratory. A fundamental redesign of the road network around Monument Way, Ferry Lane, Broad Lane and Tottenham High Road is required.
 - Haringey Heartlands spine road. The redevelopment plan for Haringey Heartlands requires a major access road, the precise route of which requires careful planning and consultation.

Road Safety

- 5.13. The Review noted concern at the level of accidents on roads in Haringey and received extensive evidence on this from Haringey Federation of Residents Associations. The draft Road Safety Plan was submitted to Transport for London with the 2005/6 Borough Spending Plan. The Plan proposes a speed management plan in which all roads may be categorised as Traffic Routes, Mixed Priority Routes and Residential Areas. Each type has a target speed and an indication of the measures that could be used to reduce crash casualties.
- 5.14. The Borough is expected to meet the following targets from a 1994-8 base by 2010:
- 40% reduction in people Killed and Seriously Injured (KSI)
 - 40% reduction in pedestrians KSI
 - 40% reduction in cyclist KSI
 - 40% reduction in powered two wheeler casualties

- 50% reduction in child KSI
 - 10% reduction in slight casualties
 - School road safety: review road safety around all schools
- 5.15. The speed of traffic was identified as a key means of reducing the number of people killed and seriously injured in road accidents. Slower speeds give drivers more time to react to road conditions. Analysis shows that people involved in accidents at less than 30mph have a greater chance of survival and suffer less serious injuries in general.
- 5.16. The Mayor, alongside local councils, should lobby to give local authorities powers to manage and enforce speed limits locally.
- 5.17. Tony Vickers gave some specific measures he would like to see introduced to improve road safety:
- Replace some speed cameras with interactive speed signs. These signs have the benefit of being cheaper, higher level of driver acceptance and two and half more times successful in slowing down speed;
 - Education of all road users in responsibility for their own and others safety. Advice and training in road skills and hazard perception;
 - Encouragement and incentives for motorists to take up the Advance Drivers Course;
 - Engineering to improve identified accident black spots and eliminate the danger whenever possible. The segregation, wherever possible of vulnerable road users from cars and trucks;
 - Enforcement of the rules of the road by trained, discretionary police traffic patrols who will target the aggressive, reckless and incompetent road users who are the main factor in accident causation;
 - Remove unnecessary road humps which are disliked by residents and abused by joy riders;
 - Introduce a system of positive points for safe drivers which can be exchanged for any penalty points.
- 5.18. **Recommendation Nineteen - The Council should target effective enforcement methods to reduce accidents on the main road network.**
- 5.19. Evidence considered during the Review on the incidents of road accidents that resulted in people being killed or seriously injured (KSI) in the borough shows that most accidents occur in main roads (see Appendix Two). The Review considered what might be the most effective means of achieving the target reduction in KSI accidents, but has concluded that there is no one single best method. Safety improvements are maximised where a range of both hard and soft measures are employed in co-ordination.
- 5.20. The Review considered comparative accident statistics where 20mph have been introduced (see Transport for London Fact Sheet in Appendix Three). Richard Tayler from Living Streets campaign group commented; “we want 20mph to be the ‘default’ speed limit, by which I mean that up to 20mph will become the norm for driving, and people living and walking on the streets will not experience anything that spoils the street environment moving at more than the speed a healthy young adult can run”.

- 5.21. Haringey Friends of the Earth support the widespread introduction of 20mph zones. They said there should be 20mph in areas where there have been large numbers of accidents. This might include Wood Green and Tottenham High Roads. Some “long” stretches of main roads should be 20mph, such as through shopping areas and other pedestrian-busy areas.
- 5.22. Effective enforcement of traffic control will reduce the number of people killed or seriously injured on the road by making drivers more aware when they are driving illegally or hazardously. Interactive signs can also be used on main roads. These signs advise drivers about their driving, flashing up a warning message to specific drivers, but since they are not primarily concerned with penalties have a greater degree of acceptance from drivers. Generally interactive signs should be preferred to speed cameras on main roads. Where speed cameras are used on main roads, they should be used as a deterrent, being apparent and visible to oncoming traffic. Cameras may be more appropriately placed following interactive signs to ensure continuing observance of speed limits. Furthermore speed cameras should be used, where appropriate to re-enforce 20mph speed limits in residential areas and to supplement physical measures (eg speed humps).
- 5.23. In terms of physical measures on mixed priority routes, the Review was more impressed with the scheme in operation on Wood Green High Road than with the traffic cushions used elsewhere (such as Lansdowne Road, N17). Raised paved areas across the carriageway as on Wood Green High Road and road narrowing in places should be used as a traffic calming measure on these mixed priority routes.
- 5.24. **Recommendation Twenty - The Council should support educational initiatives on road safety.**
- 5.25. A campaign promoting driving at safe speeds in the Borough and the highlighting of accident trouble spots would help change public attitudes to speeding. As stated, the Panel was shocked by the preponderance of deaths and injuries on our arterial routes. Interactive signs would have a role in any campaign.
- 5.26. The Council should support the development of school travel plans in all the Borough’s schools. Teaching of a cycling proficiency course would also be important.

Residential Areas

- 5.27. The Review considered the control of traffic in residential areas and the effect of road traffic on local communities. The effect of traffic through residential areas was considered and in particular the effect of speed on the liveability of an area and on the incidents of road accidents.
- 5.28. **Recommendation Twenty One - The Council should support the widespread introduction of 20mph zones and traffic calming in ‘Residential Areas’, with the longer-term aim of making all ‘Residential Areas’ and ‘Mixed Priority Routes’ 20mph zones in due course.**
- 5.29. Local residential areas need to be protected from through traffic. Traffic management measures can reduce through traffic, but have disadvantages for residents in terms of reducing access. Nevertheless local traffic calming schemes on residential roads can play a vital role and often have strong support from the

residents concerned. There is scope for selective road closures to provide benefits although these need to be carefully designed to minimise redirection of traffic to adjoining areas. The strategy should employ a range of traffic calming measures in residential areas and reduce the possibilities for 'rat runs', steering through traffic back onto the main roads.

- 5.30. 'Home Zones', which give the priority of road space to pedestrians, cyclists and children, are an enhanced version of local traffic calming schemes. Home Zones could contribute to road safety but are expensive to implement because of higher levels of physical work. The Council should identify residential areas that can benefit from this level of support.

Parking and Enforcement

- 5.31. The Parking Enforcement Plan (PEP) has been prepared by consultants JMP. TfL expect the PEP to include a strategy statement setting out the aims of the borough's parking policies and its role in overall transport and planning strategy. It is expected that the PEP will also contain a statement of how the PEP will reduce long stay parking, bring about improvements to bus services and enhance the viability of businesses and town centres.
- 5.32. **Recommendation Twenty Two - The Council should develop precise and transparent criteria to use in considering further Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs).**
- 5.33. The general approach should be a presumption against the introduction of Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs), unless there is a clearly proven case that the introduction of a new zone will improve the environment and transport within the neighbourhood or where there is strong demand from local residents.
- 5.34. In broad terms, further CPZs should only be considered where there is expressed demand from residents, local businesses or other stakeholders such as the emergency services. Zones could also be considered where there is parking stress or where there are safety issues arising from inconsiderate or dangerous parking, as evidenced by professional parking surveys.
- 5.35. Commuter parking has been identified as a problem in the borough. The provision of appropriate car parks in outer London and the Home Counties for commuter use could address this issue. Such commuter interchange could be provided at key sites on a park and ride basis. This would provide relief to inner London boroughs.
- 5.36. Where new high-density housing developments could foreseeably add to parking stress, section 106 monies from the planning process should be sought for funding consultation on whether a CPZ schemes should be introduced.
- 5.37. **Recommendation Twenty Three - CPZs should have the minimum hours of operation that are necessary to meet the defined objectives of the zone.**
- 5.38. CPZ strategy should be aimed at enforcing a street parking regime that favours local residents and local businesses rather than commuters. Where CPZs are to be introduced, the objectives of the particular CPZ scheme should be clearly identified and the scheme structured to meet those particular objectives.

- 5.39. The hours of operation should be limited to the particular times when street congestion is a problem and focused specifically on discouraging commuter parking. A '2 hour' restriction can have an effective role in tackling commuter parking, although the wider environmental and safety benefits of CPZ schemes can sometimes be lost. Careful consideration needs to be given to the appropriate span of hours for CPZ, according to the particular parking problems identified. It is felt that the presumption should be for limited hours of operation, Monday to Friday, unless there is strong evidence in favour of extended periods, such as evening or weekend restrictions. In summary, the Council must carefully design a proposed CPZ according to local circumstances and with full consultation with all stakeholder groups.
- 5.40. Tony Vickers from the Association of British Drivers told the Review "I agree that CPZs should be used as sparingly as possible. However they cannot deal with the lack of parking spaces. As a consequence some drivers will be forced to circulate the area looking for a place to park, adding to congestion and increasing driver stress levels".
- 5.41. Haringey Friends of the Earth told the Review that CPZ criteria should be based on levels of commuter parking, and other stress on residents' ability to park or have other vehicle access to their homes eg deliveries. They said that CPZ hours should be based on the problem - eg if it is mainly commuter parking, then a 10am - 12noon enforcement period may be sufficient. There is no "one-size-fits-all", and residents and businesses should be consulted on the details of each scheme. Larger town centres such as Wood Green need some short-term parking for business use, but more local centres where many local customers would be able to walk to shops do not need as much provision.
- 5.42. **Recommendation Twenty Four - The Council maintain parking for business use in its town centres.**
- 5.43. Parking for customers and staff in the Borough's town centres is vital for their continued viability. The focus should be on customers, although business parking also needs to facilitate the operational needs, such as loading. Parking needs should be met through better use of off-street car parking facilities. Where the Council is the provider of car parks, management of these sites needs to be made effective, specifically, car parks need to be accessible, signposted and safe. The Shopping City car park in Wood Green is a good example of a well-managed car park, though its neighbour in Bury Road has been noted during the Review as a cause of concern and consequently little used. Security was one problem identified at Bury Road. Lessons should be drawn from the observed good practice and implemented in the provision and management of car parks consistently.

6. Conclusion

- 6.1. During the Review Members have considered some key issues relevant to the development of local transport plans and strategies and have also considered some of the implications for regeneration. The recommendations outlined in this report, if agreed by the Executive Member for Environment, will inform the development of the Local Implementation Plan for transport and also impact upon the wider strategic objectives of the council.
- 6.2. Transport is a large and important issue for the borough and ultimately, the Review has had to focus on some key issues which it considers to be important and where there is scope for local choice within the statutory and regulatory framework provided by Government and the Mayor of London. The Review was not intended as a totally comprehensive process and there is much to be continued elsewhere, not least in consultation with key stakeholders and local community groups. The Review has however provided a steer in the development of local plans and enabled input from elected Members of the Council as representatives of the community as a whole.
- 6.3. During the Review, Members have spoken to some key local interest groups and community stakeholders, although it recognises that wider and inclusive consultation should be an important part of the process of the development of local transport plans later on. The interviews conducted as part of the Review have served as a preliminary testing out of the consultation process, as well as providing valuable evidence from different perspectives. The Stakeholder Forum in particular provided a useful discussion with and between some key local community representatives.
- 6.4. The recommendations and conclusions outlined within the report have tried to balance the different and sometimes conflicting viewpoints of the development of local transport initiatives. It has also tried to balance the need to protect and enhance local communities with the demands of a growing economy and population. The vision it sets out is one of a diversified and integrated local transport network, where improved quality and increased capacity provide real choice alternatives and a sustainable pattern of transport use.
- 6.5. In particular, the needs and aspirations of private car users is recognised and counterbalanced against the liveability of Haringey streets and local residential areas in particular. This Review is by no means anti-car however, and recognises that private car use is a key means of local transport and for many people, the only feasible option. The focus is that of a sustainable transport network and encouragement of the use of different modes of transport through positive incentives and choice and not an emphasis on prohibitive regulations and charges. The provision of a more integrated and joined up transport network will be key to improving this vision on the ground.
- 6.6. The Review has by no means concluded that Haringey's local transport infrastructure and strategies are not working and we have identified some areas of good practice. There are however some enduring problems, common with many other metropolitan centres, significantly congestion in some parts of the borough and the high incidents of serious road accidents. It is hoped that the measures outlined in this report will go some way to alleviating these problems.

List of Documentary Evidence

1. Haringey Federation of Residents Associations Presentation to the Stakeholders Forum 11th February 2004 - Haringey Federation of Residents Associations, c/o 42 Falmer Road, N15 5BA
2. Transport in Haringey, Views from the Focus Meeting on 23 June 04 - Haringey Forum for Older People
3. The Interim Local Implementation Plan 2002, London Borough of Haringey.
4. The Local Transport Plan for Greater Nottingham, Joint Strategy – Nottingham City Council, The Guildhall, South Sherwood Street, Nottingham, NG1 4BT.
5. The London Borough of Croydon Transport Strategy - The London Borough of Croydon, Taberner House, Park Lane, Croydon, CR9 3JS.
6. The Mayor's Transport Strategy – The greater London Authority, Romney House, Marsham Street, London SW1P 3PY
7. A Manifesto for Living Streets 2001-05 – Living Streets campaign group, 31 – 33 Bondway, London SW8 1SJ
8. Manifesto for Livability 2005 - Living Streets campaign group, 31 – 33 Bondway, London SW8 1SJ
9. Review of 20 mph Zones in London Boroughs, Transport for London Street Management, London Road Safety Unit: Safety Research Report No. 2 - Transport for London Windsor 42-50 Victoria Street, London SW1H OTL

Appendix One - List of Key Stakeholders and Witnesses.

Pamala	Moffat	Age Concern Haringey
Tony	Vickers	Association of British Drivers
Quentin	Given	Friends of the Earth Tottenham
Paul	Hamblin	Friends of the Earth Wood Green
Teresa	McCrone	Haringey Cycling Campaign
Dave	Morris	Haringey Federation of Residents Associations
Henrietta	Doyle	Haringey Transport Action Group
Paul	Barnett	Haringey Youth Service
Richard	Taylor	Living Streets Haringey
Paul	Mackay	Living Streets Haringey
Paul	Simpson	London Transport Users Committee
Paul	Canty	Metro Group
Huw	Jones	North London Chamber of Commerce
Terry	White	Phoenix Group
		RAC Foundation
Richard	Bourne	Transport 2000

Appendix Two – Killed & Seriously Injured Casualties in Haringey

Appendix Three - Review of 20 mph Zones in London Boroughs, Transport for London Street Management, London Road Safety Unit: Safety Research Report No. 2