MINUTES OF THE CABINET MEMBER SIGNING MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY 18 NOVEMBER 2026, 9:45AM – 10:05AM

PRESENT: Councillor Gio Iozzi, Cabinet Member for Climate Action and Transport

In attendance: Councillor Mark Grosskopf, Simi Shah, Head of Highways and Traffic, Tim Walker, Parking Transformation Project Job and Nazyer Choudhury, Principal Committee Co-Ordinator

1. FILMING AT MEETINGS

The Cabinet Member referred to the notice of filming at meetings and this information was noted.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were none.

4. URGENT BUSINESS

There was no urgent business.

5. DEPUTATIONS / PETITIONS / QUESTIONS

There were none.

6. SCHOOL STREETS PHASE 7 (STAGE A)

The report considered the outcome of an informal consultation on eight proposed School Streets and determined whether such schemes progressed to the traffic management order and statutory consultation stage.

The meeting noted correspondence sent to Councillor Gio Iozzi on 7 August 2026:

“Dear Gio,

Thank you for your e-mail below concerning the School Streets proposal in Muswell Hill.

First can we say that Liberal Democrat councillors have fully backed the council’s ‘school streets’ programme.

However, the proposals in the first round consultation for Muswell Hill and Fortis Green were moving to encompass schools which are themselves on relatively main roads which are extensively used during the day and in particular the morning ‘rush hour’.

This is leading to concerns that traffic - which will often be totally unrelated to the school - may be displaced onto the smaller residential roads which children walk along to get to School and also create bottlenecks of standing traffic on these same streets as traffic navigates around the closed streets.

Indeed we have had a live demonstration of what happens when Dukes Avenue is closed off – as earlier this year it was closed for a month while a new pedestrian crossing was laid at the top – at exactly the point that the school street would close off Dukes Avenue. The result was traffic chaos as residents and traders no longer able to use Dukes Avenue to filter onto or from the roundabout looked for alternatives. This chaos did not dissipate until Dukes Avenue was re-opened.

We are also concerned that it is not just displaced traffic within Muswell Hill, but also traffic coming from Fortis Green where further similar relatively main roads (Creighton Avenue and Pages Lane) would be closed compounding the potential problems of both congestion and idling traffic on streets used by children and parents walking to school.

Further, from earlier discussions with Norfolk House we understand that a sizeable number of the pupils live some distance from the school, including outside the Ward or Borough in some cases. These parents are not going to stop the drive to school in the morning, but will continue to do so then try and park in nearby streets to walk the final leg to Norfolk House. This in itself will add further to congestion on the streets remaining open.

Given this situation we would like to propose that a full traffic impact assessment is carried out considering all of the proposed school streets before moving ahead with school streets in Muswell Hill and Fortis Green covering all of the following schools and streets:

· Muswell Hill Primary School: (Dukes Avenue (between Methuen and Wellfield Ave) and all of Elms Avenue).
· Norfolk House School: (Muswell Avenue (between Alexandra Park Road and Muswell Road).
· Our Lady of Muswell Catholic Primary School: (Pages Lane).
· Tetherdown Primary School: (Collingwood Avenue and Grand Avenue).
· Eden Primary & Fortismere School: (Creighton Avenue).

As a side question, as new Councillors we have been trying, so far without success, to see the results of the original consultation, and have not been able to locate them, including seeking Officer help. Do you have access to the full original responses and any summary of the responses that we could see as they may help inform our thinking on this matter.

Obviously there is much more that we could say on this subject, so if you would like to meet us to discuss we would be delighted to do.

We look forward to your thoughts, and assistance in getting access to the results of the first round consultation,

Best wishes,

Tony Powell & Karolina Braun

Lib Dem Councillors Muswell Hill"

The Cabinet Member noted that meetings could be held with ward councillors regarding school streets.

The Cabinet Member RESOLVED

1. To note all feedback received as part of the informal consultations in Appendix A of the report - Consultation Report.

2. To approve that the following School Street projects are progressed to Stage B (statutory traffic order consultation) pursuant to the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (RTRA) and in accordance with the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 (1996 Regulations), as per the plans in Appendix B of the report; SS57: Hornsey School for Girls, SS58: Norfolk House School and SS60: Tetherdown Primary School

3. To approve the deferral of the decision on whether to progress to Stage B (statutory traffic order consultation) and, instead, carry out further work and engagement, the outcome of which would be considered at a later date; SS05: Crowland Primary and Gladesmore Community, SS51: Muswell Hill Primary School, SS56: Highgate Wood Secondary School, SS59: Our Lady of Muswell Catholic Primary School and SS68: Eden Primary and Fortismere School (Creighton Ave)

4. To authorise the Head of Highways and Traffic Service to give notice of the intention to make the necessary traffic management orders to give effect to resolution 2.

5. To note that the decision whether to make such orders with or without modification would be reported to Cabinet or Cabinet Member having due regard to any representations received during the statutory consultation.

Reasons for decision

School Streets were a key priority for the Council, as set out within the School Street Plan, the Walking and Cycling Action Plan and the Corporate Delivery Plan 2024-2026.

The reasons for resolution 2 was to improve the health of children by increasing active travel, and to reduce road danger and improve air quality near the school gate. The schools were supportive of the plans set out in Appendix B of the report and the proposals contributed towards the strategic objectives of the Council.

Alternative options considered

Do nothing:

This option was rejected as not consulting upon or delivering School Streets would not align with the objectives set out in the Corporate Delivery Plan, the Transport Strategy, the Climate Change Action Plan, the Walking and Cycling Action Plan the School Street Plan or the funding made available from Transport for London.

Progress all projects to Stage B:

This option was considered but rejected. While progressing all schemes would demonstrate commitment to borough-wide delivery, consultation feedback highlighted significant concerns for several proposals. These included potential cumulative traffic displacement in Muswell Hill, access concerns for faith-based schools and communities and perceived lack of evidence for some schemes.

Selective progression based on consultation feedback:

Any combination of projects could in principle be progressed however the report recommended progressing three projects (SS57, SS58, SS60) to Stage B, on the basis that feedback for the schemes was more balanced or concerns were manageable through design refinements. These schemes generally affected fewer strategic roads, received lower volumes of opposition and presented clear opportunities for road danger reduction and air quality improvements.

The remaining five projects (SS05, SS51, SS56, SS59, SS68) were recommended to have their decision deferred to allow for further work. The consultation responses for the schemes included substantial lack of support compared to the schemes recommended to progress, including some coordinated responses. It also included questions about traffic displacement and access especially for disabled and elderly residents that officers consider require further work before a Stage B decision was taken. In the case of SS56, issues of congestion on Montenotte Road have all but been resolved through the opening of two new school gates and therefore further discussion with the school was required.

CABINET MEMBER: Councillor Gio Iozzi

Signed by Cabinet Member ……..

Date ……18 November 2026……