

Public and Statutory Consultation

Cranley Gardens Speed Humps Final analysis 10 February .

This consultation ran from 14 December 2022 – 18 January 2023. Postal service disruption resulted in a delay to compiling this final consultation report

1a Total Support / Objections

		Count	%
Support or object	Support	45	31%
	Object	78	53%
	Other view	23	16%
	Total	146	100%

1b Support by Road

		Support or object					
		Support		Object		Other view	
		Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %
Road	Cranley Gardens	44	48%	41	45%	7	8%
	Etheldene Avenue	0	0%	10	50%	10	50%
	Connaught Gardens	1	14%	6	86%	0	0%
	Rookfield Avenue / Close	0	0%	2	40%	3	60%
	Woodland Gardens	0	0%	5	100%	0	0%
	Cranmore Way	0	0%	2	67%	1	33%
	Cascade Ave / The Chine	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%
	Ellington Rd	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%
	Priory Gdns	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%
	Shepherds Hill	0	0%	4	100%	0	0%
	Not stated	0	0%	6	100%	0	0%
	Total	45	31%	78	53%	23	16%

See comments section for detailed information.

Comments – by Road

Road	Support or object	Comments
Cranley Gardens	Object	Re - plans to install speed humps in Cranley Gardens. There isn't a problem with speeding in Cranley Gardens. Surely, in these difficult times, there are better things to spend the money on.
Cranley Gardens	Object	I am opposed to your current proposals for speed humps . I believe them to be an unnecessary expense, unpopular with many if not most residents, and unlikely to promote road safety. In the nearly 25 years I have lived at this address I have not been aware of an accident other than at the junction of Muswell Hill Rd., and Cranley Gdns., Speed humps won't prevent that. There is also the issue of access for emergency vehicles which do use Cranley Gdns and should be able to do so unimpeded.
Cranley Gardens	Object	<p>You have already done this consultation only one or two years ago, and the residents rejected it. Have you heard about democracy? You cannot keep asking the question, hoping that enough people will be away or not notice it. The traffic generally moves slowly on this street. The signs that light up if you exceed 20mph do the job. This idea would cause vehicles, including trucks, to slow down, changing the engine noise, then accelerating, waking us at night, with the accelerating increasing the pollution for people living here. So you want to disturb our sleep, increase our pollution, and make us pay for it. Why are you so keen to waste money when the poor of Haringey need so much help?. Please kill this stupid idea permanently. Cranley Gardens is used often by ambulances. If you put humps in the road, they will be unable to use it, taking longer to get people to hospital. Ambulances do not have soft suspensions. If you are a young mother, rushing to hospital to give birth, can you imagine the pain and fear of banging into high bumps. Or someone with broken limbs, suffering the pain of being thrown up in the air? . Are you just so desperate to spend our money on projects that we do not want? I thought that Haringey, like other councils was short of money. You could spend it on helping poor families, rather than these stupid ideas which will keep us awake at night. I will explain, as I did last time, why this is a dumb idea, and why we don't want it.</p>
Cranley Gardens	Support	I am a local resident and am in favour of both of these schemes. Proposed Road Safety Improvements on Shepherds Hill and Wolseley Road; and Proposed Road Safety Improvements on Cranley Gardens, N10.
Cranley Gardens	Support	I think they sound great, look forward to all the speed restrictions.

Cranley Gardens	Support	I am broadly supportive of measures to reduce speed on local roads and Cranley Gardens is a road with significant traffic as it is often used as a through route across the borough. My own of this road is as a pedestrian, cyclist and driver. I think measures to reduce speed on the road would be valuable as this is a road where I frequently encounter vehicles doing well over 30mph. Personally I would prefer to see cameras in addition to the speed bumps, but I am mostly disappointed to see no proposed improvements for cycling on this road. Of all the routes up to Muswell Hill, Cranley Gardens is the least steep and therefore the easiest to cycle up, yet the only proposed provision here is some painted cycling signs on the road which provide no protection at all to cyclists. I would much rather see some proper dedicated cycle lanes on the road to allow good separation between road users. The speed bumps will help reduce traffic speed but in my view will provide limited help for cyclists. Please can you ask to repaint the carriageway markings between the up/down lanes! These have been missing for years and road traffic frequently drifts into the middle due to parked cars on both sides and ever wider cars.
Cranley Gardens	Support	As a resident who lives on Cranley Gdns for many years, I'm very much in favour of any traffic calming measures that can take place on this road. Cars drive at reckless speeds up and down Cranley Gdns and I've had our door ripped off our car by a passing speeding driver. The speed on this road is dangerous and will cause serious injury or death if it is left as it is.
Cranley Gardens	Support	I received the notice about proposed speed humps on Cranley Gardens. I am a resident on Cranley Gardens and would just like to say that I strongly support the proposed safety improvements. There is a lot of traffic on the road, and it generally travels very fast, way in excess of the 20mph speed limit, sometimes as fast as 40mph. This makes crossing the road very dangerous, especially with our young children. Speed humps would be a very welcome measure - the existing traffic calming measures seem not to have had any impact.
Cranley Gardens	Object	This is the worst possible idea. This has been tried out a few years ago, it caused a lot more problems than benefits. You are forgetting that if there is a problem in using Muswell Hill all the traffic is diverted to Granley Gardens. Furthermore the Police and Fire Engines use Granley Gardens as a short cut to get to the emergency. No one is speeding in Granley Gardens, as for cyclists, 'where are they', the number of cyclists is almost non-existent. This is a waste of tax payers money that can be better used for people living in the borough requiring financial help or social services, or schools that are crying out for money. Complete waste of funds
Cranley Gardens	Object	I don't think speeding / accessibility are such a big problem that bumps are required.

Cranley Gardens	Object	<p>I am aware from your correspondence that you are currently proposing to introduce speed humps or bumps in Cranley Gardens for the following key reasons: 1.Cranley Gardens is the main route take by Ambulances for access to local hospitals and their journey should not be impeded in such a long route by these means. Similarly the fire station is nearby and the fire engines use this route also for speedy access. Traffic can be slowed down in the road with other effective measures. 2.Humps or bumps in the road affects parking ease and will cause congestion of parking for local residents. 3.Drivers sometimes speed up and slow down to go over bumps and humps. This causes more harmful fumes to be emitted. The houses are close to the road and consideration should be given to the possible harmful impact this will have. 4.Will there be electric charging pods in the future required in the street? Where will there be space for such consideration if the road is littered with humps and bumps. There are already traffic calming measures implemented in the road. If these are insufficient speed cameras could be introduced with effect. I want to lodge these as strong objections and ask that further thought is given to other alternatives that will work for the long term.</p>
Cranley Gardens	Object	<p>I am writing to register my strong objection to your proposed provision of new speed humps on Cranley Gardens, N10 3AA. It is beyond all comprehension that the Council should be considering implementing 'sleeping policemen'/speed bumps, which have already been discredited by a significant proportion of drivers as an outdated and destructive approach to traffic calming measures both for vehicles as well as surrounding dwellings. On top of all that above, is that they can cause inconvenience and frustration for drivers, who may have to slow down significantly and then accelerate as they pass over the bump.</p>

Cranley Gardens	Object	<p>I strongly object to the proposed measures. Objections are detailed below.</p> <p>1.The road already has a 20 mph speed limit. What evidence do you have that the 20 mph signage and current carriage way surfacing / road safety measures in place is insufficient to meet current needs? 2.Does Cranley Gardens have a significantly higher number of fatalities on the road than the average Haringey Street to warrant these new speed bumps? Living on the street, I don't believe I have seen any accident on Cranley Gardens to believe that it is not safer than any other street. 3.Excessive amount of proposed speed humps. What evidence do you have to support the need for further improvements to safety in the provision of an additional FIFTEEN new speed humps. This appears an excessive amount for the road in question. 4.Creation of significant level of noise pollution - noise levels caused by the rapid deacceleration and acceleration of vehicles going over the bumps. How do you propose to deal with this issue? Noise pollution caused by 15 speed humps with an average a car every 15 second travelling down Cranley Gardens . 5.Creation of longer response times for emergency vehicles - resulting in loss of lives. It takes emergency vehicles an additional 20 to 30 seconds to get through each speed hump. This time is crucial when dealing with life or death situations. Having 15 speed humps will result in an additional 7.5 minutes for an emergency vehicle in response time to travel down Cranley Gardens. 6.What evidence do we have that speed humps actually are effective in slowing traffic? Over and above existing measures in place (Slow signage and displays of vehicle speeds)? 7.Speed humps are particularly unsafe for cyclists, particularly if you are proposing full-width speed bumps. If road safety is an issue, how are you going to make things safe for cyclists. 8.Dust pollution - each time the brakes are pressed, small metal particles are released into the atmosphere. A study by Kings College London has revealed these particles are responsible for making people sick. These particles contribute to coughs and colds, and a factor in more serious illnesses such as pneumonia and bronchitis. 9.Negative impact to those living with disabilities - with speed bumps causing further pain and injuries to those with spinal injuries 10.The installation of speed humps requires a significant level of annual maintenance costs 11.Cranley Gardens has always had the streets dug up on a regular basis caused by the bursting of the water pipes - this increase the maintenance / replacement costs of the humps 12.Speed humps will create significant vehicle damage, I have seen the damages to the underside of cars going across. 13.Speed bumps makes a car journey particularly uncomfortable for car passengers as it causes vomiting, particularly in the elderly and young children.</p>
Cranley Gardens	Support	<p>Cars travel too fast along Cranley Gardens. I am worried for my child's safety. I am in favour of speed bumps or other measures to tackle dangerous speeding.</p>

Cranley Gardens	Object	<p>I strongly object to the proposed measures. Objections are detailed below.</p> <p>1.The road already has a 20 mph speed limit. What evidence do you have that the 20 mph signage and current carriage way surfacing / road safety measures in place is insufficient to meet current needs? 2.Does Cranley Gardens have a significantly higher number of fatalities on the road than the average Haringey Street to warrant these new speed bumps? Living on the street, I don't believe I have seen any accident on Cranley Gardens to believe that it is not safer than any other street. 3.Excessive amount of proposed speed humps. What evidence do you have to support the need for further improvements to safety in the provision of an additional FIFTEEN new speed humps. This appears an excessive amount for the road in question.</p> <p>4.Creation of significant level of noise pollution - noise levels caused by the rapid deacceleration and acceleration of vehicles going over the bumps. How do you propose to deal with this issue? Noise pollution caused by 15 speed humps with an average a car every 15 second travelling down Cranley Gardens. 5.Creation of longer response times for emergency vehicles - resulting in loss of lives. It takes emergency vehicles an additional 20 to 30 seconds to get through each speed hump. This time is crucial when dealing with life or death situations. Having 15 speed humps will result in an additional 7.5 minutes for an emergency vehicle in response time to travel down Cranley Gardens. 6.What evidence do we have that speed humps actually are effective in slowing traffic? Over and above existing measures in place (Slow signage and displays of vehicle speeds)? 7.Speed humps are particularly unsafe for cyclists, particularly if you are proposing full-width speed bumps. If road safety is an issue, how are you going to make things safe for cyclists. 8.Dust pollution - each time the brakes are pressed, small metal particles are released into the atmosphere. A study by Kings College London has revealed these particles are responsible for making people sick. These particles contribute to coughs and colds, and a factor in more serious illnesses such as pneumonia and bronchitis. 9.Negative impact to those living with disabilities - with speed bumps causing further pain and injuries to those with spinal injuries 10.The installation of speed humps requires a significant level of annual maintenance costs 11.Cranley Gardens has always had the streets dug up on a regular basis caused by the bursting of the water pipes - this increase the maintenance / replacement costs of the humps 12.Speed humps will create significant vehicle damage, I have seen the damages to the underside of cars going across. 13.Speed bumps makes a car journey particularly uncomfortable for car passengers as it causes vomiting, particularly in the elderly and young children.</p>
-----------------	--------	--

Cranley Gardens	Object	Dear Ms Cunningham I am resident of Cranley Gardens and object to speed bumps being installed on Cranley Gardens as there has been insufficient analysis presented of: a) the requirement for speed bumps (eg accident statistics and the causes of the accidents on Cranley Gardens) b) how speed bumps would help c) the pros and cons of their installation for local residents and road users d) the maintenance plan for the speed bumps e) possible alternatives Please supply the required information in an easy to access online format so I can evaluate the proposal. I have thought for some time that there could be a serious accident on Cranley Gardens if a car or cyclist on Cranley Gardens was hit by a car turning out of a side road. The use of mirrors to improve sightlines coming out of side roads onto Cranley Gardens would be one way to avoid such an accident.
Cranley Gardens	Support	I write in support of the traffic calming measures on Cranley Gardens. Cars speed up and down our road and there have been several accidents outside our property caused by the speed people are going
Cranley Gardens	Object	I am writing to object to the proposed use of speed humps in Cranley Gardens. Personally, I find Speed Humps a very crude method of slowing traffic. They damage suspension of vehicles and create a very unpleasant and stressful ride for passengers. They are not an effective method of slowing drivers who travel faster than the 20mph speed limit on this road. It's also more dangerous for pedestrians, as drivers are taking their eyes off what's happening around them in order to focus on negotiating the humps. Residents living next to the humps are affected by the noise, as well by as potential damage to their properties from the vibration. They will also encourage drivers to cut through Woodland Rise and Woodland Gardens which are very narrow residential streets. I think a proper study of traffic flow is needed to justify the expense and prove this will be a beneficial project.
Cranley Gardens	Object	object to speed bumps being installed on Cranley Gardens as there has been insufficient analysis presented of: a) the requirement for speed bumps (eg accident statistics and the causes of the accidents on Cranley Gardens) b) how speed bumps would help c) the pros and cons of their installation for local residents and road users d) the maintenance plan for the speed bumps e) possible alternatives Please supply the required information in an easy to access online format so I can evaluate the proposal. I have thought for some time that there could be a serious accident on Cranley Gardens if a car or cyclist on Cranley Gardens was hit by a car turning out of a side road. The use of mirrors to improve sightlines coming out of side roads onto Cranley Gardens would be one way to avoid such an accident.
Cranley Gardens	Object	my strong objection to your proposed provision of new speed humps on Cranley Gardens, N10. It is beyond all comprehension that the Council should be considering implementing 'sleeping policemen'/speed bumps, which have already been discredited by a significant proportion of drivers as an outdated and destructive approach to traffic calming measures both for vehicles as well as surrounding dwellings

Cranley Gardens	Support	<p>We are writing to express our strongly held views supporting the proposed improvements to road safety on Cranley Gardens, Haringey, London N10. We note that the roads at either end of Cranley Gardens namely Park Road, Muswell Hill Road and Woodside Avenue, are all provided with speed calming humps and central reservations. Cranley Gardens has no effective speed reduction measures and the only central reservation occurs at the bends where Cranley Gardens intersects Woodland Rise, Connaught Gardens and The Chine and at the intersection with Muswell Hill Road. As a result Cranley Gardens attracts drivers of cars, vans and trucks wishing to avoid speed bumps and, with its two long straight sections actively encourages speeding. It also appears often to encourage aggressive driving and behaviour that is threatening to drivers that comply with the speed limit. This is obviously dangerous and frequently leads to accidents. We have had a car of ours that was parked outside our house written off after having been hit by a speeding car that was involved in a collision and lost control at the intersection of Cranley Gardens and Ellington Avenue. With regards to pedestrians and residents the excessive numbers of vehicles, few of which appear to comply with the speed limit, make crossing Cranley Gardens hazardous particularly for the elderly and for parents with young children or toddlers. It also seriously endangers cyclists. It appears that the effective freedom of drivers to use Cranley Gardens as a “rat run” and at speed prioritises their behaviour over the rights of residents to live and walk in a safer and less polluted environment. We strongly support Haringey’s proposal to introduce speed reducing measures on Cranley Gardens thereby improving road safety and pedestrian and cyclist accessibility. We very much hope that the proposed improvements can be effected timeously.</p>
Cranley Gardens	Object	<p>Much as I appreciate very much the need for reducing the speed of certain law breaking drivers on our road, I do not believe speed bumps are the answer. The Mayor of London often mentions the large number of asthma sufferers in London and it is a proven fact that speed bumps greatly increase pollution with cars stopping and accelerating away from the bump. My wife has asthma and bronchiectasis so it would be very irresponsible of Haringey council to make the air quality more toxic for her and many other sufferers by installing speed bumps. Speed cameras are a deterrent. Would you consider speed camera signs, with white lines or chevrons painted on the road in several places? Or maybe a very discreet speed camera (eg. SafeZone - Siemens) or two with its revenue raising advantages. No one wants to receive a pricey ticket in the post so I would imagine speeding could quickly become a thing of the past on Cranley with these deterrents in place. Many thanks for your kind attention.</p>
Cranley Gardens	Support	<p>I am fully in support of your proposals to place speed humps along the length of Cranley Gardens.</p>
Cranley Gardens	Support	<p>I’m generally in favour. Some cars drive dangerously fast along Cranley Gardens. I’m worried that pedestrians will be hit. But I would like to understand more. What type of speed humps are being proposed? Why these? What alternatives were considered? What about speed cushions? What about speed cameras?</p>

Cranley Gardens	Support	I support the road calming measures proposed on Cranley Gdns.
Cranley Gardens	Support	<p>I wanted to provide some feedback on the proposed road safety improvements for Cranley Gardens. In summary, I'm very, very positive about the proposal and am very strongly in favour of the proactive approach to trying to reduce speeding and improving safety. We have lived on Cranley Gardens for just over a year. In that time we have been unpleasantly surprised by the amount of speeding traffic on the road and the fact that there are no effective traffic measures in place on the road currently (I appreciate there is carriageway surfacing and a speed checker however these do not appear to have any meaningful impact on speeding drivers). Despite the limit of 20 mph, it's the exception rather than the rule that the 20 mph limit is adhered to, particularly on the steeper section from the roundabout connecting to Muswell Hill Road down to Linden Road. I've personally been involved in a couple of incidents on the road, in once case being very dangerously overtaken at a narrow section of the road by a very aggressive van driver whilst biking. The second was a scarcely believable overtake whilst I was going at 20 down the hill in a car from Muswell Hill Road and I was sped past by an aggressive driver at a speed which was probably in excess of 40 mph. It's very dangerous and also adds significantly to both noise and air pollution. Particularly at night when there are drivers rapidly accelerating to make up time on the road it can be very disruptive to the adjacent residential housing. Particularly given that all of the other local roads (Muswell Hill Road, Woodside Avenue, and even Park Road) all already have speed hump traffic calming measures, I believe Cranley Gardens has become a road that drivers try to make up time on by not observing the limit and driving recklessly. It seems like it's only a matter of time until we have serious accidents involving pedestrians, cyclists, or other drivers and in my opinion it's well over due that we get similar measures as the neighbouring roads. Happy to provide more information or context if you want it.</p>

Cranley Gardens	Object	<p>I have received your letter this morning about the installation of speed humps in Cranley Gardens. I object 100% at this installation, it creates noise as cars slow down then accelerate, pollution created by the same slowing accelerating process. I live at the corner of Cranley Gardens and Leinster road and the red brick pattern already creates a noise but we put up with it. Remember that some people like us have their bedroom in Cranley Gardens and in the summer, it would make it impossible to sleep with the window open. Some people like me are very sensitive to noise, light, radiation etc.... In addition to the inconvenience mentioned above, the humps damage the suspension of the cars. Have you ever been in an ambulance on speed humps?? I have . The ambulances have very poor suspension and it is no fun when it has to go over speed humps. Imagine a broken bone, a wound, etc..... Instead of concentrating on Cranley Gardens which is fine, why don't you try to find a solution for the traffic in St James lane. I never drive there but walk and every day I see people stuck in a line of traffic. Go and spend a day there and you will see. People have to reverse uphill in a narrow space, see what that does for pollution and on people's nerves, aggression. I have seen people in tears as they could not reverse uphill in a straight line. Why not make it a one way going down St James lane and up via Hillfield Park road or vice versa. I am sure that people in St James lane are fed up. I really hope that you will take my opinion into consideration. I thank you for that.</p>
Cranley Gardens	Object	<p>I support the 20mph roundels, slow markings and cycle logos. Object to the proposed speed humps. This is for a number of reasons</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I do not think the road is unsafe. I have not seen any statistics to say the road poses a risk to life to justify the spend. There is no school on the road to justify any further intervention, and I doubt our road statistics is worse than others. In 15 years I have never seen a fatality on the road or even a crash. 2. I actually think the speed humps will increase the safety risk. The speed humps will make parking more difficult. Given the hill and narrowness of the road, they are likely to increase the risk of accidents. 3. The proposed changes are likely to cause vibrations in the houses near the bumps which will be stressful for affected residents 4. The proposed changes will cause further wear and tear on resident vehicles 5. The speeding up and down causes extra pollution 6. I am sure this has been considered in the past and rejected and I am not sure what has changed to justify this 7. The council must have better things like adult social care, to spend it's money on. I do not think speed humps pass the value for money objectives compared to other services
Cranley Gardens	Object	<p>Not required in any way. They cause additional danger in snow.</p>
Cranley Gardens	Support	

Cranley Gardens	Object	<p>I object to the proposed installation of speed humps on Cranley Gardens for the following reasons: ·The road is already designated a 20mph area with the installation of appropriate signage at some cost and effective enforcement would be preferable given the multiple disadvantages of road humps. ·Speed humps have various well established disadvantages: They cause an increase in atmospheric pollution from the inevitable speeding up and slowing down between humps, resulting in an increase in CO and HC of potentially 50%+ to the detriment of pedestrians and residents - see TRL report 482; oThey cause additional noise from cars through the process of speeding up and slowing down between humps and from vehicle body and load shaking as well as tyre impact thumps from commercial vehicles to the detriment of pedestrians and residents. The latter translates to physical shaking of properties adjacent to the humps; oThey create additional road maintenance costs because the road surface before and after the humps over a short period of time develop pot holes and subsidence, as is evident throughout the Borough; oThey are a major detriment to the progress of emergency vehicles particularly ambulances and fire tenders. In relation to ambulances they cause discomfort to patients and delay progress. In relation to fire tenders they delay progress and Cranley Gardens is commonly used by tenders from Hornsey Fire Station in avoiding the delays on Muswell Hill Road.</p>
Cranley Gardens	Support	<p>I fully support your proposed road safety improvements. Back in 2009, when residents were last consulted on either having speed bumps or pattern imprints, the consensus of opinion resulted in the pattern imprints being added to the road. These imprints along with the 20MPH and slow signs have unfortunately had minimal if any impact on reducing the excessive speed that some people insist on driving especially on the lower half of Cranley Gardens. Therefore I am of the view that the only way to achieve vehicles travelling within the 20MPH limit is to have speed humps installed.</p>
Cranley Gardens	Support	<p>Some years ago supposed traffic calming measures were installed in our road, principally comprising blocks of red coloured bricks at intervals along the road together with speed activated signs encouraging motorists to reduce speed. These measures have been wholly ineffectual and consequently traffic continues to travel along our road at speeds often considerably in excess of even the previous speed limit of 30mph. This is especially dangerous with regard to the sharp bend in the road mid-way along Cranley Gardens which vehicles seem to enter at speed, in particular accelerating along the flat/straight section of our road between the junctions with Park Road and Wood Vale. I have also noticed an increasing number of vehicles parked to the side of the road near our house which seem to have collision damage. Consequently I believe that only physical speed deterrents, such as the speed humps that you suggest, will be enough to reduce speeds on our road.</p>

Cranley Gardens	Other view	<p>My comments relate to the the flat section at the bottom of the road from the junction with Park Road to the first bend just beyond the junction with Wood Vale. This a straight section of road and generously wide, even with cars parked on both sides, and offers drivers the tempting opportunity for a serious burst of acceleration. Too many drivers fall into this temptation and there is no doubt that vehicles travel up (and down) this stretch of the road at speeds far in excess of the 20 mph speed limit. Something needs to be done to reduce the speed of the traffic. Speed humps come in various shapes and sizes. Some are so small or avoidable that they have little or no effect on the speed of the traffic. Humps of that kind would be of little/no use. Others (those in Woodside Avenue for example) do have the effect of reducing speed and it essential that they do because if vehicles are driven over humps at speed the potential for damage to the houses near the humps is great. This is an issue which will no doubt be raised by the relevant parties and it will be essential to be able to satisfy them that the proposed humps will force drivers to slow down and cross the humps slowly. Other measures that could be considered:</p> <p>1 The creation of a mini roundabout at the junction with Wood Vale, with signage ahead Junction Layout Changed followed by Give Way. 2 the introduction of pinch points by narrowing the road, or introducing traffic islands in the middle of it. Examples can be found in Creighton Avenue. These extra suggestions are both designed to remove the impression that this section of road is one on which you can hope to reach a speed of 60 mph or more, by introducing features which make the driver think differently. If these measures were adopted the speed humps could probably be less fierce (as in Creighton Avenue) and consequently of less concern to adjoining owners.</p>
Cranley Gardens	Support	<p>Please can you choose a type of speed hump which is effective at slowing down traffic without causing damage to vehicles who approach the hum at the correct speed. e.g. NOT like those at the junction of Woodside Ave and Fordingly rd., or on Highgate WestHill</p>
Cranley Gardens	Support	<p>I think these plans are a good idea and would welcome speed bumps to calm traffic on my road.</p>
Cranley Gardens	Object	<p>I find it hard to comment on the proposals because there is no information about what the road humps would be like. Further to my previous query send to this email address, my response to the consultation is as follows: I would support the proposals if they were modified to increase the number of speed bumps along the road. This is because that would reduce the distance between the speed bumps, which is excessive on the current plans. The current plans would allow cars and other vehicles to speed up too much and then slam the brakes on when they reach the next speed bump. To avoid the safety risks of that speeding and breaking behaviour, AND the associated increased noise and vibration to houses along the road, the speed bumps need to be more frequent and closer together. I would support the proposals if they were modified to include this.</p>
Cranley Gardens	Support	
Cranley Gardens	Support	<p>Happy if this stops cars racing in Cranley. You could have used speed cameras and made a vast profit!</p>

Cranley Gardens	Object	Object because speed humps will slow down fire engines which use the road as a primary route. Speed isn't an issue most of the time as it's too busy! Humps distract drivers' attention to pedestrians and many drivers swerve round them. Also dangerous for cycles.
Cranley Gardens	Support	Sped humps need to be of sufficient height to be effective.
Cranley Gardens	Object	I'm against speed humps generally and in this case I think they are unnecessary, and expensive. The money could be better spent elsewhere, given the council's limited resources.
Cranley Gardens	Object	I am against these proposals for many reasons. We don't need speed humps, bicycle lanes or any other interference in our street. We are happy as we are. The proposals are costly and counter productive as they would increase noise levels, damage cars and narrow the street making it difficult and more dangerous to face oncoming traffic. The council could better use it's limited resources elsewhere.
Cranley Gardens	Support	1. Fully support the proposed improvements. 2) we've campaigned for road humps here in C.G. for 10 years and have witnessed at least 2 nasty accidents with, thankfully, no fatalities. 3)_ We would very much favour a new pedestrian crossing at the bottom of C.G. opposite the entrance to the church car park. This is because there are many parents, children and older people crossing at this point at all times of the day.
Cranley Gardens	Other view	I live on Cranley Gardens and have the following questions. -The provision of new cycle logos is highlighted. Does this mean that the proposed improvements include cycle lanes? -Can you also please let me know if the proposed safety improvements will result in a reduction in the number of available car parking spaces along Cranley Gardens. If there will be a reduction can you please explain why and where the reductions will be.
Cranley Gardens	Support	
Cranley Gardens	Support	We support the proposed measures. Other suggestions: 1. Installation of mini roundabout at bottom of Cranley Gardens (currently a T junction with Park Road). 2. Review and restrict parking on Park Road near junction at bottom of Cranley Gardens. Impossible for buses to pass each other because of parked cars. 3. Maintain zebra crossing on Park Road just before bus stop on way to Muswell Hill. Essential for people to cross road from Cranley Gardens to get to parade of shops and to catch W7 bus to Finsbury Park. Also to cross and walk into Cranley Gardens from parade of shops.
Cranley Gardens	Support	Also consider having mini roundabout at the junction with Park Road.
Cranley Gardens	Object	I object to speed humps. They cause more pollution through both exhaust fumes and noise. I support roundels ' Slow' markings and cycle logos.

Cranley Gardens	Object	<p>I object to any further interference in Cranley Gardens in respect of speed humps. 1:-They are very expensive to lay down, and Haringey Council cannot afford the cost 2:-Vibration caused by speed humps substantially damage nearby house foundations. 3:-Speed humps cause damage to cars at any speed. 4:-Speed humps cause massive discomfort at any speed. 5:-Lorries and commercial vehicles do not slow down for speed humps and the colossal vibration causes severe damage to nearby houses. 6:-Cranley Gardens is a main road used by police and fire engines---they never slow down for speed humps. 7:-Speed humps cause substantial extra pollution down to accelerating and braking at each speed hump. 8:-Speed humps create substantial extra noise owing to accelerating and braking. 9:-Moving kerbs and creating obstructions cause all of the above---Whiteman Road is a good example of idiocy. Extra signage is good, and most people abide by it. Average speed cameras DO WORK, and they produce revenue which pays for them. Furthermore, Police, ambulances, and fire engines can move freely and swiftly without speed humps.</p>
-----------------	--------	--

Cranley Gardens	Object	<p>OBJECT: 1. Noise pollution Cranley Gardens is a residential street studies show there is a distinct increase in noise from cars accelerating and decelerating when approaching and passing a sheep hump. As many residents have bedrooms at the front of the house this would have a detrimental effect on noise levels during the sleeping hour in particular. The council has provided no evidence that the use of speed humps would maintain or reduce the level of noise on or near the road. This proposal would therefore be contradictory to local and national planning aims and rules and should not be permitted</p> <p>2. Exhaust Pollution Studies have shown that speed humps create a total increase in pollution because of the inefficiency of engines during braking and acceleration caused by slowing for speed humps.</p> <p>3. Road Safety. A. The road safety in Cranley Gardens is very good with no accidents dating back many years therefore there is no special requirement for traffic calming. B. Given the nature of residential Parking and substantial off street parking (over 100 cars parked in residents Driveways) the introduction speed humps would add an additional point of danger for drivers entering and leaving their properties. Residents driving their cars into or out their properties either in forward reverse gear would have the addition hazard of a raised hump while driving at low speed and turning increasing the duration of the manoeuvre and increasing the distraction of the driver from other road users and pedestrian. This would lead to decrease in road safety. Also cars driving down Cranley gardens would have an increased demand on their attention while negotiating the speed humps. this would increase the danger of them not noticing pedestrians crossing the road and other drivers exiting their driveways. This would lead to decrease road safety.</p> <p>4. Emergency services. Cranley Gardens is often used by the emergency services as Muswell Hill is often blocked during peak hours. introducing speed humps will reduce response times for our emergency service at a time when they have never been under more stress. Any increase in response times will lead to further risk to life. This proposal would therefore directly increase the overall risk to people's lives and should not be permitted</p> <p>On a separate not I object to the positioning on the speed humps directly outside my property for the grounds mentioned above but also it will interfere with the additional dropped kerb I have been granted planning permission for before this proposal was published. This dropped kerb is currently in the councils dropped kerb process and will be built within the next couple of months. Therefore if this proposal is granted please ensure the positioning of the speed hump does not interfere with my new dropped kerb.</p>
Cranley Gardens	Support	<p>I'd also like to see restrictions on the size of vehicles that can pass through here. Perhaps a narrowing of the road with a gate in the middle to allow access for emergency services. This could be towards the top of the road.</p>

Cranley Gardens	Object	to formally object to the proposals to put speed bumps on Cranley Gardens as a traffic slowing measure. I believe the slowing down at the approach to the bumps and the following speeding up once over the bump will result in a marked increase in pollution in the immediate vicinity and overall. I have observed the map proposal for the location of the bumps and there is one directly outside my house (your map has incorrectly labelled my house as number 145 and not 147 which I find astonishingly sloppy and should be rectified before you finish your consultation period!) There will be far more noise and air pollution than we currently get from these proposals directly outside my house. I think putting in speed cameras and more warning sensory signs that are currently around the dogleg area would be a far more satisfactory solution. It will have the positive effect of slowing traffic without the collateral damage of increased air and noise pollution. The traffic going into Park Road quite often backs up to our house anyway so there little point in them at these times. I would also like to note that Cranley Gardens is an emergency route for police, ambulances and fire engines so cannot understand the logic of speed bumps over cameras as a solution. I am happy to speak to anyone involved with these proposals in person to further outline my concerns. I have observed that traffic proposal consultations such as this or CPZ previously are all done online without anyone have the consideration to consult us on the doorstep. I do fear the intention is to get these proposals through despite the majority of the people objecting to it so would like reassurance on that front.
Cranley Gardens	Support	
Cranley Gardens	Support	Essential that something is done for Cranley Gdns, as the road is so dangerous. There is no safe crossing place. Suggest putting in a mini roundabout at junction with Woodland Rise / Etheldene Ave, plus a raised area where Wood Vale joins Cranley Gdns. It's a very dangerous junction. Also the junction with Park Road is unsafe
Cranley Gardens	Support	Because this road has a steep slope and also, too many cyclists ride on the pavement; the pavement can be dangerous for pedestrians. DO NOT put in a separate cycle lane. There is no place for this as the road is too narrow.
Cranley Gardens	Support	In addition to the proposals, I'd suggest a mini-roundabout or peak-time traffic lights at the junction of Park Road and Cranley Gdns. This would ease the traffic build up in rush hours.
Cranley Gardens	Other view	I'm emailing on behalf of the residents who live at 183 Cranley Gardens. Can we confirm whether the speed bumps are going to affect on street parking? It's already very competitive to park in front of the house as delivery drivers often park there or the neighbour at 181 (who already has a driveway that can fit 2 cars)... Parking at the tail end of Cranley Gardens (onto Park Road) is always problematic, especially when people park there to attend shops/ the pub. It can get frustrating when returning from work/ business trips with luggage and having to park at the other end of the street, beyond wood Vale, because of the limited on street parking. I'd just like to know that the proposed speed bumps won't make an already tricky situation more difficult RE on street residential parking.

Cranley Gardens	Support	The last scheme designed to reduce speeding in Cranley Gdns was about 25 years ago and it had little effect because people objected to speed humps. Please make sure this time that speed humps remain in the scheme. Thank you.
Cranley Gardens	Support	We're in favour of traffic speed reduction measures here as cars currently race up and down in a dangerous fashion. Thank you for proposing this.
Cranley Gardens	Support	We are very pleased that these improvements on Cranley Gardens are happening and you have our full support. We hold the view that the red carriageway surfacing was insufficient for motorists' tendency to accelerate going down this road. I would be very interested to see the design options for the speed bumps. The complexity is for cyclists going down the hill and encountering the bumps at 20 mph. Cranley Gardens has an exceptionally regular and steep gradient.

Cranley Gardens	Other view	<p>I understand there has not been the possibility to achieve a unified position for the street regarding traffic calming measures. Haringey council recognises the importance and value of 20mph speed limits on the majority of roads in the borough, unless there is reason for exemption. It is recognised that this is important given the link between lower speed and a drop in serious road collisions, reducing emissions and air pollution as well as promoting the health benefits from active travel, through promoting safe cycling and walking routes. Cranley Gardens as a residential street is signposted 20mph. It is on a hill descending to Hornsey with a series of sharp bends. As a pedestrian, cyclist and car user my experience is that the speed limit is exceeded by the majority of car users and on a regular basis significantly exceeded, to the level of dangerous driving, (particularly at the top end of the street at the onset of the descent.)</p> <p>The roundabout at the junction of Muswell Hill Road is also the site of traffic delay and frequent road traffic accidents and collisions. Cranley Gardens does not have controlled parking and therefore heavily used for off street parking (primarily at the Muswell Hill end) by families and visitors to Highgate woods on a daily basis; it also serves as overflow parking for parents at drop off time for children attending St James's School on Woodside Avenue, N10. The significant road use by pedestrians often children, at this end of the road should be taken into account when considering the need for traffic calming.</p> <p>The 20mph measures on Cranley Gardens are not achieving safe levels of traffic calming. There is clearly something about being at the top of the hill, driving into a clear road that encourages faster driving speeds.</p> <p>The council may wish to consider a differential approach in different parts of the street; a speed camera at the top or mid point may act as a deterrent to using excessive speeds at the top, which are then compounded by the descent on the hill.</p> <p>It is to be noted that in the borough of Islington, the Holloway Road, a wide non- residential highway has rigidly enforced traffic calming measures through the use of cameras maintaining the 20mph limits.</p> <p>I believe it is important to therefore consider an approach which specifically tackles some of the key characteristics of this street, taking into account its geographical features and pedestrian use, especially at the top. A differential approach may be required at different ends; noting that the current measures are insufficient in maintaining a safe residential environment, as opposed to a high speed cut through from Muswell Hill to Crouch end.</p> <p>Many thanks for your consideration to this feedback.</p>
-----------------	------------	---

Cranley Gardens	Object	<p>I strongly object to the way this radically different, traffic control system is being introduced. It may or may not be the optimal thing to do but your process seems non-democratic nor do we feel that we have had enough relevant information to accept this expensive, potentially problematic decision. Amongst other things: 1.Lack of local resident consultation on the matter. Residents consulted via notices and a detailed, helpful meeting in the church hall at the bottom of Cranley Gardens was the approach taken around 12 years ago when the introduction of speed humps was last suggested. Why were we not afforded this courtesy this time around? 2.Lack of provision of information and data supporting the decision. In the dark as to why the decision has been taken this time without above. Has there been an increase in serious, traffic accidents or incidents? Having lived on the street for over twenty years, this does not seem to have been the case. If anything, in recent years, there have been fewer incidents. The fact that the road is busier has in itself reduced the possibility to speed. How has the data been collected and are there minutes of the meeting where these decisions were taken? Is this material available? 3.Lack of analysis provided as to the positioning of the speed humps. Is this information available? 4.Lack of sensible due process particularly around the timing of the decision and notification. The last two major changes in our area have been posted pre-Christmas with an end of consultation date of mid-January which is a time when everyone is busy, on holiday or focused on many other things. Is there a reason for this? Regarding Cranley Gardens itself, are you aware that it is used as a redirection route for buses when there is an issue on Muswell Hill Road or Park Road? I understand that humps are not permitted on major bus routes. Secondly, we have an unusual issue where typically once a year, the road becomes badly affected by any major snowfalls in the area. We and other neighbours have to grit the road and advise drivers as to how safely to avoid pretty dangerous situations as they try to drive up and down the hill? It looks as though a speed hump is scheduled to be built outside our house (no 34) and we have a drain outside our house. Will this be problematic? Finally, we have previously notified the council when drilling work was being carried out outside our home that our house was vibrating. We would be worried that the work itself or the need for trucks, fire engines or buses to break etc outside our house may destabilise our foundations. I assume that the council will be liable should we find that at some point in the future we have issues resulting from the introduction of the speed humps. Thanks for considering the points I raise.</p>
Cranley Gardens	Support	<p>As a resident of Cranley Gardens I would like to extend my support for the proposed road safety improvements. Despite markings and signs drivers often break the 20 mph limit or drive aggressively through the constricted road. As a residential road with resident's cars parked on either side of the road, it is unsuited to the high volume of traffic that passes through, so any measures to curtail the more inconsiderate drivers is welcome.</p>

Cranley Gardens	Support	<p>I wish to submit comments in strong support of the proposed road safety improvements on Cranley Gardens, N10 as circulated in the leaflet dated 14 December 2022. Key Issues</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.Risk of death and serious injury arising from excessive speed of some vehicles 2.Lack of safe places for pedestrians to cross the road Cranley Gardens 1.Cut-through between Great North Road and Hornsey/Tottenham/Crouch End/Wood Green 2.Roads feeding into Cranley Gardens at each end have speed tables/speed bumps (Park Road, Woodside Avenue, Muswell Hill Road) 3.Cranley Gardens used by some drivers to 'catch up'; tailgating, flashing headlights, overtaking when driving at less than 25mph 4.Pedestrians include parents dropping off and collecting children from schools at junction of Woodside Avenue and Cranley Gardens (St James Primary School, Tetherdown Primary School, Ambitious About Autism School) 5.Majority of incidents on Cranley Gardens are not reported (vehicle accidents, wing mirrors ripped off, etc) 6.Many cyclists now using the pavement - or are deterred from cycling due to unsafe conditions <p>Story So Far 2006: Council undertook consultation but - for reasons best known to the Council - consultation included residents in other roads; red rumble strips only installed - no impact (except increased noise) 2016/17: 20mph speed limit introduced but widely ignored Overall ·The freedom of drivers to race up and down Cranley Gardens seems to place ahead of residents' right to live, walk and cycle in a safer, less polluted environment. ·We shouldn't have to wait for traffic calming measures until there has been a death or serious accident on Cranley Gardens. ·A police survey on Cranley Gardens in March 2017 resulted in 97 warning letters being sent to motorists who exceeded the speed limit. What more proof is needed to acknowledge that there is a speeding problem? ·My family alone has had three accidents caused by speeding cars / aggressive driver - including one car written off and the incident attended by the police - but when we and our neighbours report the over-stretched police advise us to deal with our insurers. Thus we and our neighbours don't report accidents any longer. ·There are straight sections on Cranley Gardens (one 500m long, one 380m long) with no crossing places. Even the roads feeding into and out of Cranley Gardens - Muswell Hill Road, Woodside Gardens, Park Road - have central reservations, pelican crossings and zebra crossings. And these roads all have speed bumps. No wonder drivers try to 'catch up' on Cranley Gardens. Consider for a moment how a mum with a child in a buggy is expected to cross Cranley Gardens, never mind an elderly person. Thanks for considering my comments.</p>
Cranley Gardens	Support	<p>Strongly support these improvements and I've been asking for these for years. Excessive speed of some vehicles is a nightmare and very dangerous. Residents have the right to live in a safer and less-polluted environment.</p>

Cranley Gardens	Support	<p>There have been a lot of views expressed on a WhatsApp group. The principal concern is the fear of the apparent noise and vibration caused by speed bumps. The drawing of the proposals attached to the leaflet refers to “proposed speed bump” but gives no details. Can you please advise which type of speed bumps are proposed? E.g. ·Speed humps/round top ·Sinusoidal ·Speed cushions ·Speed tables/flat top</p> <p>Further to above comments on 15 Dec: For the attention of Joan Hancox, Head of Sustainable Transport I wish to submit further comments in strong support of the proposed road safety improvements on Cranley Gardens, as circulated in the leaflet dated 14 December.. Excessive speed of some vehicles using Cranley Gardens: ·The DfT[i] states that 20 mph zones should be used where excessive speeds occur, and where traffic calming measures would be needed to ensure speeds are at or below 20 mph. ·The DfT’s Setting Local Speed Limits Circular[ii] states that, where the mean speed is at or above 24mph, it is generally recognised that using sign and road markings only will not be sufficient for the scheme to be self-enforcing or self-explaining, an issue that will create an unsustainable enforcement problem. In cases where the mean speed is above 24mph, additional speed reduction measures should be used.</p>
Cranley Gardens	Support	<p>I want to express my strong support of the proposed road safety improvements on Cranley Gardens, N10 as circulated in the leaflet dated 14 December 2022. In my experience as a resident of Cranley Gardens for over 25 years there is quite a number of vehicle users who drive very fast both up and down Cranley Gardens. Living opposite Ellington Road I often see and hear vehicles accelerating from the top of Cranley Gardens before racing past me and braking as they approach the bend in the road at the junction with Linden Road. Vehicles also drive fast up Cranley Gardens, only braking as they near the junction with Muswell Hill Road. The top section of Cranley Gardens is straight and drivers seem to want to use this stretch to catch up after being delayed on adjoining roads. Cyclists are in real danger. Many now take to the pavement. Parents and carers walking children to the schools on Woodside Avenue are also in danger when crossing Cranley Gardens. Indeed there are no safe places to cross the road. I support the proposal to introduce speed humps/tables. I would also like to see safe crossing points for pedestrians and a mini roundabout at the junction with Ellington Road.</p> <p>Thanks for considering my comments.</p>

Cranley Gardens	Object	<p>Stupid, damaging idea to put speed humps in Cranley Gardens</p> <p>WE STONGLY OPPOSE THIS HARMFUL IDEA. Hello, It seems that every few years you arrive, once again, to propose speed humps in Canley Gardens, after it had been rejected by everyone last time, using valid reasons. Are you just so desperate to spend our money on projects that we do not want? I thought that Haringey, like other councils was short of money. You could spend it on helping poor families, rather than stupid ideas which will keep us awake at night. I will explain, as I did last time, why this is a dumb idea, and why we don't want it. Cranley Gardens is a fairly quiet street, and people rarely speed down it, The 20mph signs work really well in slowing the traffic. Here are some reasons why humps would be to the detriment of people living in the street. And add to this the fact that people need financial help, this looks like a really thoughtless waste of residents' money, and really bad taste.</p> <p>1) At the moment, as you lie in bed at night, you hear only the gentle "swish" of the cars as they pass, not accelerating, not braking. 2) If you put humps, cars slow down to each hump. The engine sound changes, You would be aware of each slowing car. 3) Once over the hump, the car would accelerate, being noisy and waking us if we are in bed. 4) When cars accelerate, there is a LOT of pollution. So, instead of our peaceful lives, and nights, you want to needlessly spend our money to give us more noise, and more pollution! Remembering that trucks will have to do the same things, the noise and pollution from the trucks will be much greater as they go through the above four points. Why would anyone waste residents' money, to give residents more noise and more pollution? I don't think that anyone was elected in order to do this. In hard times it is also in very bad taste. It is like the Chancellor saying: I can't give the nurses a pay rise, because we do not have the money, but instead I will use the state's money on some useless, harmful project, because it amuses me. If you do not understand any of this please let me know.....I wish to add another objection to this damaging proposal.</p> <p>Cranley Gardens is used often by ambulances. If you put humps in the road, they will be unable to use it, taking longer to get people to hospital. Ambulances do not have soft suspensions. If you are a young mother, rushing to hospital to give birth, can you imagine the pain and fear of banging into high bumps. Or someone with broken limbs, suffering the pain of being thrown up in the air? You have already done this consultation only one or two years ago, and the residents rejected it. Have you heard about democracy? You cannot keep asking the question, hoping that enough people will be away or not notice it. The traffic generally moves slowly on this street. The signs that light up if you exceed 20mph do the job. This idea would cause vehicles, including trucks, to slow down, changing the engine noise, then accelerating, waking us at night, with the accelerating increasing the pollution for people living here. So you want to disturb our sleep, increase our pollution, and make us pay for it. Why are you so keen to waste money when the poor of Haringey need so much help?. Please kill this stupid idea permanently.</p>
Cranley Gardens	Object	keep it as it is. One could add a couple of 20mph roundels. Please no speed humps

Cranley Gardens	Object	<p>I am a resident of Cranley Gardens and I have been given a chance to be consulted on this issue. Thank you for this opportunity. I wish to make an evidence based decision on whether or not to support the scheme</p> <p>Ms Cunningham's letter date 14th December says there have been requests from the local community. I have asked for her to say what those requests are and this letter was ignored</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ·Ms Cunningham's letter date 14th December says speed reducing measures have been included for my road in the Road Danger Plan. This is misleading. ·Because Ms Cunningham has completely ignored my requests for information I do not know why she thinks the scheme should be introduced ·No alternatives to speed bumps have been proposed ·Speed bumps will increase noise in the road all day long ·The noise of fire engines racing up the road at night and hitting the bumps will certainly wake residents and their children ·Vibrations may damage buildings and infrastructure (there is a mains water supply down the road). ·Speed bumps will not reduce accidents in the road which occur at the junction at the top of the road and not along its length ·The road is subject to a 20mph speed limit. If this were properly enforced by clearly marked road markings and a couple more light up road signs that would make sure the limit is adhered to
Cranley Gardens	Object	<p>I Have found the fact that you are doing a consultation and opportunity to object at the same time confusing. I my reply to the consultation is set out below and ask you to read those comments to this response I object to the scheme.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ·Ms Cunningham's letter date 14th December says there have been requests from the local community. I have asked for her to say what those requests are and this letter was ignored ·Ms Cunningham's letter date 14th December says speed reducing measures have been included for my road in the Road Danger Plan. This is misleading. ·Because Ms Cunningham has completely ignored my requests for information I do not know why she thinks the scheme should be introduced ·No alternatives to speed bumps have been proposed ·Speed bumps will increase noise in the road all day long ·The noise of fire engines racing up the road at night and hitting the bumps will certainly wake residents and their children ·Vibrations may damage buildings and infrastructure (there is a mains water supply down the road). ·Speed bumps will not reduce accidents in the road which occur at the junction at the top of the road and not along its length ·The road is subject to a 20mph speed limit. If this were properly enforced by clearly marked road markings and a couple more light up road signs that would make sure the limit is adhered to. <p>.....It has been drawn to my attention that studies have shown that where drivers slow down and speed up between bumps that this increases pollution against a steady drive at one speed. I am not an expert and I must urge you to provide evidence of the likely impact on pollution of these measures</p>

Cranley Gardens	Object	<p>I would like: 1)Details of the speed hump design proposed including such details as the profile (sinusoidal, flat top etc), height and width 2)Full details of the different hump designs considered and the report if any showing how the proposed design was selected 3)Estimates of the likely noise and vibration impacts on the nearest properties to each road hump. These are to be provided to me as peak vibration levels (mm/s) similar to the TRL papers on road humps eg <https://trl.co.uk/uploads/trl/documents/TRL416.pdf> 4)The levels of vibration considered allowable in the scheme design (again in mm/s) 5)Clarification of the roads being consulted and if these differ from the roads consulted previously for a similar scheme in approx. 2016. If the consultation approach this time differs from previously I require an explanation of the different approach In addition, I formally request that the consultations be put on hold until such time as the full details of the scheme have been properly disseminated to local residents. Then, as is normal practice, an informal consultation should precede the statutory consultation.</p>
Cranley Gardens	Object	<p>I would like to register my objection to the proposed changes for Cranley Gardens, N10. I live at 55 Cranley Gardens. Objections 1.No evidence has been offered that the current configuration of the Cranley Gardens road is unsafe. I am not aware of any significant accidents or incidents that would be sufficient to merit making changes. Does Haringey Council have any data or evidence that suggests otherwise? 2.The consultation notice states that there have been “requests from the local community”. Can you please set out how many requests have been received, the nature of these requests, and why you believe these request merit any action at all. I do not consider it reasonable that the council merely act on suggestions/requests because requests have been made. Why does the council feel it appropriate to take action as a consequence of these requests? 3.Cranley Gardens is already a 20mph zone. Is there any evidence that this measure has in some ways failed to mitigate a danger from road traffic? If not, then why are additional measures deemed necessary? 4.Residents, citizens and council tax payers are facing significant financial burdens in the current economic climate. As such, I consider expenditure of this nature to be inappropriate and would instead propose that the budgets set aside for these measures be reclaimed and used to reduce council tax levels. 5.The road surface on Cranley Gardens has some significant pothole degradation in a number of places. In my experience, a greater risk is posed by drivers taking unexpected evasive action to avoid potholes, risking collision with other vehicles, rather than from excessive speed. Repairing these potholes would be a more appropriate measure for improving road safety. The same is true of a number of roads in the N10 area, for example Wood Lane. I look forward to your response to my objections.</p>
Cranley Gardens	Object	<p>I would like to object to the proposed speed humps on the following grounds: 1. In my opinion there is not much speeding on the road, and therefore no need for bumps to reduce speed. 2. To my knowledge there have not been any car accidents. 3. Bumps cause cars to slow down and speed up creating emissions and noise 4. Bumps damage suspension, and I own a car and just spent £2,000 having it repaired.</p>

Cranley Gardens	Object	Speed humps will cause more noise and more pollution for residents. I don't object to signage or markings. I do object to speed humps.
Cranley Gardens	Support	I strongly support the speed humps. There is a lot of fast moving traffic on Cranley Gdns which makes crossing very dangerous - especially for children.
Cranley Gardens	Support	Thank you!!
Cranley Gardens	Object	I am strongly opposed to the introduction of speed humps to the road. I am not opposed to other measures like markings on the road, interactive speed reminder signs, cameras etc. I am not persuaded that there is clear and robust evidence that the proposed scheme is needed and consider that speed humps are likely to cause additional noise, vibration and pollution, thereby adversely affecting residents rather than improving our day to day living. While the road is not a major thoroughfare it is often used by emergency services which also will not be assisted by speed humps. There have been a number of accidents at the junction of Cranley Gardens and Muswell Hill Road and I do not believe speed humps will lessen the risk there. Haringey has many responsibilities and I think the current proposals are disproportionate to the issue being tackled and I would urge the Council to abandon any plans to install speed humps on Cranley Gardens. My neighbour at number x, has pointed out in his submission various procedural issues and concerns about the manner in which Haringey has carried out this process, which I too find unsatisfactory.
Cranley Gardens	Support	
Cranley Gardens	Object	

Cranley Gardens	Object	<p>I hereby strongly OBJECT to the introduction of speed humps or bumps in Cranley Gardens, for the following reasons (note that I will refer to speed 'bumps' for simplicity, even though I understand that the Council is consulting for speed 'humps': in any case my considerations apply to either):</p> <p>-GENERAL OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Cars and especially lorries or fire engines driving over speed bumps notoriously damage adjoining houses by causing vibrations which in turn cause cracks. This is even more so in areas built on London clay such as Muswell Hill. The effects are obviously much worse for old Victorian or Edwardian houses, built with very shallow foundations, such as the majority of those along Cranley Gardens. There are many cases of homeowners suing Councils for damages up and down the country for these reasons, with Councils backing down and removing speed bumps. -Speed bumps generate increased noise and exhaust pollution, not just because of the dynamics of vehicles driving over them, but also because drivers will typically brake before a speed bump, and re-accelerate once past it. <p>-OBJECTIONS SPECIFIC TO CRANLEY GARDENS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -There is already a traffic calming scheme in Cranley Gardens which was implemented a few years ago at considerable cost, comprising many elements: speed-reducing carriageway surfacing in various points, 20mph signage along the whole length of Cranley Gardens and on both sides, traffic islands, electronic boards displaying real-time measured vehicle speed, and 20mph roundels and cycle logos painted on the carriageway. Maybe some of the above should be freshened up, but there is no absolutely need to add to all of this! -Cranley Gardens is a main route for fire engines from the nearby Hornsey fire station and needing to attend emergencies in the Muswell Hill or Fortis Green area. These vehicles should not be further slowed down. Besides they will obviously tend to adopt a relatively high speed in an emergency, which would further exacerbate the problems mentioned above of heavy vehicles driving over speed bumps - did you contact the Hornsey Fire Station for comment please? <p>-OBJECTIONS SPECIFIC TO THE JUNCTION OF CRANLEY GARDENS WITH THE CHINE / CONNAUGHT GARDENS / WOODLAND RISE (Cranley Gardens nos. 80, 82,):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -This junction already has traffic islands which tend to slow down traffic as the carriageways become much narrower, in addition to the chicane which also acts as a natural speed deterrent. For these reasons it is totally unnecessary to place speed bumps near this junction. There are surely much better ways to spend taxpayers' money these days than indulging in unnecessary initiatives such as this one. If additional traffic calming measures are absolutely essential (with due respect, I am sceptical about this need here), why not consider a couple of speed cameras, which are surely less disruptive to residents (plus they can generate cash)? The technology is surely widely available?
Cranley Gardens	Object	<p>1. What evidence (accident rates / personal injuries) are you putting forward to support this proposal? 2. Speed humps are environmentally unfriendly and create NOISE. Also Haringey council would fail to maintain them. 3. Why not install more radar enabled signs to show drivers' speeds?</p>
Cranley Gardens	Support	<p>The road has become more dangerous. The humps will slow lunatic drivers down.</p>

Cranley Gardens	Other view	Support traffic calming - but NOT speed humps; as too many HGVs - esp. fire engines - use this road. Our houses already shake when lorries pass. Install more warning lights instead.
Cranley Gardens	Object	Strong objection to speed humps because of the noise, vibration, damage to vehicle suspension. They also impede emergency services. I suggest installing 'rumble bars' at bends in the road instead.
Cranley Gardens	Support	I strongly support the use of speed humps, as nothing else works
Cranley Gardens	Support	We have looked at the proposals and would support the installation of speed bumps in Cranley Gardens.
Cranley Gardens	Other view	I support tables with flat tops, but NOT steep sided humps. My preference would be for chicanes
Cranley Gardens	Support	Support in general, but the number and frequency of the speed bumps looks somewhat excessive. Could not some calming effect be achieved with fewer speed bumps?
Cranley Gardens	Other view	I support this IF the number of speed humps are increased; so as to reduce the distance between them and stop cars accelerating between humps.
Cranley Gardens	Object	My objection to the public consultation and related statutory consultation on 2022-T80 Speed humps in Cranley Gardens is attached. Please send confirmation that this representation is placed on the records for both the public and statutory consultations.
Etheldene Avenue	Object	It is Etheldene Avenue N10 which needs speed restrictions. It is used as a regular cut through and cars travel far too fast. If you incorporate speed restrictions in Cranley Gardens alone it will make more cars cut through Etheldene Avenue at speed. You need to instigate speed restrictions eg humps in both roads simultaneously. The other option is to use Etheldene Avenue for access only and close the end of the road to all traffic.
Etheldene Avenue	Object	these changes will only force more traffic down Etheldene Avenue, where you have steadfastly refused to implement any traffic calming measures whatsoever, despite years of protests from us residents? This will turn Etheldene into an even more dangerous rat run. Furthermore the problem will become exponentially worse whilst you implement these works. You need to implement calming measures in Etheldene FIRST and only then in Cranley. There are a lot of young families on Etheldene who are very worried.
Etheldene Avenue	Object	I live on Etheldene Avenue and would like our street to be included in any planning consultation for Cranley Gardens. Our street is used as a short cut and becomes very dangerous at rush hour with cars zooming down. We also suffer with congestion as the road is very thin. It allows cars in both directions, but is only wide enough for one car. Any traffic calming changes and measures on Cranley Gardens will have a knock on effect on our street. Please could you let me know if you can extend your consultation? If not, why not?

Etheldene Avenue	Other view	Speed bumps in Cranley Gardens would be welcome, but it is vital that Etheldene Avenue has the same safety measures as Cranley. Etheldene is already used as a short cut to the lights at the foot of the Hill, and attracts impatient and speeding drivers. Making Cranley safer with bumps may make Etheldene even more hazardous. The two roads must be given the same treatment
Etheldene Avenue	Object	Re your proposal for traffic calming on Cranley Gardens, I'm concerned that this will push even more traffic down Etheldene Avenue. We already have frequent speeding down Etheldene so I fear the proposal is simply moving the problem.
Etheldene Avenue	Object	Given all the traffic issues in Etheldene Avenue .. repeatedly brought to council attention why are we not included in traffic calming measures Outrageous ! The speed of traffic in Etheldene is far worse than Cranley and a serious health and safety risk We were told no money to address situation .. clearly there is and we pay exorbitant council tax Why is etheldene being ignored where the problem is very serious ?
Etheldene Avenue	Object	I understand that the council is currently consulting on the addition of new road safety measures on Cranley Gardens. Whilst I welcome the aims of the consultation and the addition of road safety measures, I believe that neighbouring roads, particularly Etheldene Avenue, should also be considered as part of the consultation. Etheldene Avenue already suffers from a high volume of traffic and speeding cars which use it as a cut through/rat run. The addition of further road safety measures on Cranley Gardens without the same/similar measures being put in place on Etheldene Avenue risks funnelling even more speeding cars down Etheldene Avenue as they seek to avoid traffic calming measures on Cranley Gardens. I have a young family and am very concerned about the dangerous drivers on a road that is not at all suited for the volume of traffic it now experiences. Therefore, I request that Etheldene Avenue is included as part of this consultation.
Etheldene Avenue	Other view	We support the proposed traffic calming proposals for Cranley Gardens N10 BUT ONLY IF the same traffic calming proposals are extended to Etheldene Avenue N10. We live in Etheldene Avenue and it is a rat run for through traffic. A lot of the vehicles go down Etheldene at excessive speed. These facts have been brought to the attention of Haringey Council many, many times but nothing has been done by Haringey to address these issues. If speed calming measures are taken for Cranley Gardens then this will undoubtedly lead to worse traffic and traffic speeds in Etheldene Avenue with resultant pollution and increased danger to residents and pedestrians. Why has Etheldene Avenue not been included in the proposed road safety improvements?

Etheldene Avenue	Other view	I would like it noted that this will be a second set of traffic calming measures for Cranley Gardens. I live in Etheldene Avenue, N10 3QH and we have had several accidents involving children and also cars over the last 30 years and despite numerous calls for traffic reduction measures we have been ignored. What will it take for some action to be taken in Etheldene - a fatality? My daughter was taken ri hospital after being hit by a car twenty years ago and my neighbour's granddaughter, a couple of doors down was airlifted after being hit by a car. Please consider taking some action in Etheldene Avenue as well.
Etheldene Avenue	Object	I understand that the Council are not considering similar speed restrictions for Etheldene Avenue despite the fact that (as has been made clear on a number of occasions), this road is used as a "rat run", is considerably narrower than Cranley Gardens and is frequently subjected to drivers ignoring 20mph signs. Therefore by proposing to impose restrictions on users of Cranley Gardens, more traffic is likely to use Etheldene Avenue to gain access to Park Road thereby worsening the position for Etheldene Avenue residents. This is simply another example of Haringey ignoring requests for improvements to Etheldene Avenue in a number of ways - including traffic-calming measures, the idea of closing the road to through traffic, re-laying of the pavements due to uneven surfaces along the entirety of the road etc. Please therefore accept this email as a request to introduce calming measures on Etheldene Avenue as soon as possible and as a formal objection to the Cranley Gardens proposals in the meantime, for the reasons stated
Etheldene Avenue	Other view	This email is in response to the Cranley Gardens traffic calming consultation. I have no problem with the addition of traffic calming measures on Cranley Gardens. My main concern is that this will increase even more traffic down Etheldene Avenue, the parallel street. Etheldene Avenue alternates between a speedway rat run to bumper to bumper traffic. I feel strongly that Etheldene should be included in the traffic calming measures. Please consider adding some sort of speed deterrent to our road.
Etheldene Avenue	Other view	I am writing to request as a matter of urgency that Etheldene Ave is considered for traffic calming measures. This road is used as a cut through by many vehicles, many of which ignore the 20mph speed limit.
Etheldene Avenue	Object	I am a concerned resident of etheldene avenue. Number 22. We have been trying to get traffic calming measures in our road for years. I'm saddened and surprised to see the extent of the consultation for cranley that takes no account of our road. It is obvious that our road is already a rat run and this will become worse as it becomes the obvious faster solution with your plans. I'd like to see etheldene added into the consultation. I'm annoyed this hasn't already given the extent of our communication with you around this issue.

Etheldene Avenue	Other view	While I welcome your proposal to improve road safety across the borough, including at Cranley Gardens, I am concerned that you have not included Etheldene Avenue in the proposals. Our street is often used as an alternative to Cranley Gardens. It has become a has become a dangerous rat-run, with cars regularly speeding well above the 20mph limit, as well as occasional traffic jams backing up almost to Cascade Avenue, creating inconvenience, noise and exhaust fumes. This is a quiet residential street with many families with children and as well as elderly and disabled residents, where the through traffic is impacting on safety and amenity. We have made a number of representations to the Council requesting traffic calming measures, and feel strongly that the Cranley Gardens proposals should now take these into account. Ideally we would like to see the whole area enclosed by Cranley Gardens and Muswell Hill become an LTN. This could well prove popular and assist your efforts to gain public support for LTNs generally.
Etheldene Avenue	Other view	I approve of the Cranley Gardens scheme but only on condition that traffic calming measures will be installed on nearby Etheldene Avenue, N10. The Cranley Gardens plan will only increase the already seriously dangerous and polluting speeding on Etheldene. To ignore Etheldene now is outrageous, inconsiderate, and frankly irrational.
Etheldene Avenue	Other view	As a resident of Etheldene Avenue, please could I ask that our road is considered as part of the consultation for proposed speed reductions on Cranley Gardens. The Cranley Gardens scheme will have a knock-on effect on Etheldene Avenue which is already used as a cut though for those coming down Cranley Gardens and turning out on to Park Road. Our road already has faster traffic, due to the supposed (by non-resident drivers) 'one-way' nature of the road. Because there are few cars coming up the road (only residents), cars drive down at frightening speeds, and much faster than they do on Cranley Gardens. By making Cranley Gardens slower, more traffic will come down our road without restrictions to slow them down. Even as I write I can hear cars hurtling down the road at 9.45pm. We have been speaking to Haringey councillors for years about traffic measures on our road due to very real fears that one day there will be a really bad accident on the road, and with many young families and elderly people this is a constant threat. I look forward to hearing that our collective voice has been heard and that Etheldene Avenue will be considered as part of this scheme.

Etheldene Avenue	Other view	While I am largely in favour of traffic calming measures I worry about the consequences of the measures on Etheldene Avenue We live at 43 Etheldene and daily see the road being used as a cut through for drivers who think they can take 30 seconds off their travel time by speeding down Etheldene towards the Park Road junction, instead of taking a left turn at Cranley Gardens. Drivers who choose to take this route inevitably exceed the 20 mph speed limit since they figure they have an unobstructed route. This is dangerous for pedestrians crossing Etheldene, or cyclists riding the opposite way up Etheldene. I fear that the council's plans for Cranley Gardens will only exacerbate this problem. In my view the council should consider closing off to car traffic the access to Park Road from Etheldene, and instead making Etheldene one way towards The Chine and onto Cranley Gardens. In view of the fact that there is not a lot of car traffic to and from the Rookfield Estate this would be an easy way of calming traffic on Etheldene Avenue
Etheldene Avenue	Object	I am extremely disappointed that there is a consultation on speeding in Cranley Gardens which does not include Etheldene Avenue. I and a number of Etheldene residents have repeatedly raised issues of rat running and speeding which have fallen on deaf ears. Please rectify this oversight and include Etheldene in the measures,
Etheldene Avenue	Object	We live on Etheldene avenue. If speed bumps are installed on Cranley, cars will divert down Etheldene. Cars already speed down our road, sometimes at 40+mph. I do not think that the Cranley proposals should be considered in isolation, but the impact on Etheldene taken into account as well. I therefore oppose the plan, unless it is amended to address the potential impact on our street, either making it a no through road or otherwise restricting access.
Etheldene Avenue	Other view	I am concerned that Etheldene is not included in the current traffic calming proposals. We are on the corner of the above road and the Chine and are worried that calming Cranley Gardens with humps will cause 'boy racers' to divert to the rat run of Etheldene in even greater numbers than they do now unless the road is included in the current proposals.
Connaught Gardens	Object	I'd like to express opposition to the plan to put in speed bumps. I do not think they are necessary (have not noticed any problems with people speeding) and they make local journeys much more uncomfortable. I have 3 children and they really feel the bumps in the car on Woodside Avenue and it causes two of them great discomfort. We avoid Woodside Avenue for this reason and I am concerned that if more local streets are given speed bumps, there will be even fewer ways for us to get around locally in the car.
Connaught Gardens	Support	I live on Connaught Gardens. I wanted to send my support for the proposed speed bumps. I think it is an excellent idea and would encourage you to proceed.

Connaught Gardens	Object	<p>strong objection to the proposal to install speed humps in Cranley Gardens, Muswell Hill, N10. My reasons are as follows: Procedural issues 1. In the previous consultation in 2009, adjacent roads were consulted but were not consulted this time around. As a result, the current consultation cannot be regarded as valid. Statement of Reasons 2. Both stated reasons for the Council proposing speed humps in Cranley Gardens, being (i) requests from the local community, and (ii) policy, as per the Road Safety Investment Plan, can be shown to be without substance. There have also been no accidents reported. 3. The Council's own papers shows that exceeding speed the limit is a contributory factor in only 6% of collisions in the borough, while human error (failing to look properly or a poor turn or manoeuvre) accounted for 60% of collisions. Side effects - pollution, vibration damage and noise, stressful ride for passengers 4. Speed Humps are a very crude method of slowing traffic. They damage suspension of vehicles and bicycles and create a very unpleasant and stressful ride for passengers. Having recently just been over such humps in an ambulance to hospital I can speak from experience! It is also more dangerous for pedestrians, as drivers are taking their eyes off what is happening around them in order to focus on negotiating the humps. Residents living next to the humps are affected by the noise and pollution, as well by as potential damage to their properties from the vibration. No alternatives considered 5. Installing speed humps is acknowledged as just one possible approach to traffic calming. Other possibilities include average speed cameras (which would also bring income to the Council), build outs, and more interactive speed reminder signs. A couple of additional pedestrian crossings for Cranley Gardens might also be helpful. 6. There is no evidence that the Council has considered any of these alternatives. Ongoing maintenance 7. Speed humps wear more quickly than the road itself. The speed humps in nearby Woodside Avenue show severe signs of wear and the Council seems unable to maintain these humps. 8. While the initial cost of the proposed speed humps in Cranley Gardens will apparently be met from external funding, Haringey would have to meet the ongoing regular maintenance costs. Conclusions 9. I oppose the proposed scheme in Cranley Gardens because there is no robust evidence that it is needed. The Council's Statement of Reasons are not robust and credible. Speed humps along the length of Cranley Gardens would be a blunt instrument which will have adverse effects such as noise, vibration and increased air pollution affecting all the residents of the street. 10. In summary, the scheme is poorly justified, some £100,000 has already been spent on significant traffic safety measures in 2009. Any further expenditure is not necessary and is likely to produce major detriment to both users and residents of the road. Humps are simply unjustified, unnecessary, and not needed.</p>
-------------------	--------	---

Connaught Gardens	Object	<p>We are residents on Connaught Gardens, N10. Several adults living in this house. We would like to oppose the use of street bumps on Cranley Gardens and suggest to use speed cameras instead. Speed cameras are an effective way of enforcing speed limits and reducing accidents. Although you have the cost of implementing and maintaining the cameras you will benefit from it as a revenue-generating tool and still ensure your goal of traffic calming. Traffic calming measures are there to create safer and more livable streets for all users, whether they are drivers, pedestrians, or cyclists. It's important to consider the needs and concerns of all stakeholders when deciding on the most appropriate traffic calming measures for a particular area and as car users as well as cyclists, speed bumps are an utter nuisance. Speed bumps are also increasing noise levels which for Cranley gardens is the least we all want!</p> <p>Thank you for reading our opposition.</p>
Connaught Gardens	Object	<p>I have lived for many years in Connaught Gardens, which leads onto Cranley Gardens at one end. In that time I have been a heavy user of Cranley Gardens as one of two main thoroughfares into and out of our neighbourhood. In 2016 extensive road safety improvements were made to Cranley Gardens at considerable expense after consultation, with a proposal for the installation of speed humps dropped after consultation. The Council has brought forward this latest proposal without producing any evidence that the current safety measures are now inadequate. Personally I have seen no evidence that the new measures are required. My experience is that generally there is adherence to the 20 mph limit along the road and certainly there has been no deterioration in compliance in the last few years. Motorists are mindful that care is needed to ensure that vehicles pass each other safely and speeding (other than by the odd additional mile per hour) is rare. I object to the installation of speed humps. The noise and vibration they give rise to are a nuisance to local residents. They cause damage to the suspension systems and tyres of vehicles. They are very expensive to install. The Council has produced no cost/benefit figures to support this proposal. Without any supporting evidence on its part I am strongly opposed to this proposal. I am not opposed in principle to the other measures proposed. However I would strongly question whether the costs involved are justified in the light of the heavy demands being made on the Council's resources in the current financial crisis.</p>

Connaught Gardens	Object	<p>We are writing to object to the proposal of speed humps on Cranley Gardens. We strongly object to this proposal for numerous reasons as set out below;</p> <p>1. These ideas were proposed and then rejected by the Council in 2009. Instead, alternative solutions were found - placing islands at various points on Cranley Gardens to slow the traffic down. 2. There has been a lack of transparency about the decision and no information is available by a structural or engineering survey or environmental survey on aspects of vibration caused by vehicles, accelerating and decelerating, noise levels, pollution levels and potential structural damages to the homes. Surely the expertise exists and there is an obligation to provide such independent reports and we would have expected the Council to investigate this and provide the relevant information. 3. This is a significant waste of public funds (not just construction but also maintenance) at a time when funding is urgently sought or other more carefully thought out for other priorities. 4. The problem could simply be addressed by review and appropriate redesign of the junction at Cranley Gardens and Muswell Hill Road where the majority of accidents that have occurred. 5. Putting speed cameras at a number of strategic locations on the road would achieve greater benefits and less adverse consequences. The revenues raised could be used to good purpose and cameras would furthermore alter the behaviour of drivers who exceed speed limits. 6. Cranley Gardens is a major artery used by ambulance and fire emergency services. 7. Finally, we note that in the 2009 original consultation process that was rejected, this included residents not only Cranley Gardens but the adjoining streets such as Connaught Gardens, Onslow Gardens and other streets that link Cranley Gardens to Muswell Hill road. These residential streets are very narrow and it is exceedingly difficult for traffic to flow both ways, this frequently leads to situations where cars cannot advance or retreat on these steep roads. There is no doubt that speed bumps along Cranley Gardens would encourage drivers to use these narrow connecting residential roads causing major traffic blocks on these roads. We therefore find this extremely surprising that the local residents on these connecting streets have not been invited to the consultation process. In summary, this is a poorly thought out scheme which has previously been rejected and will bring no benefit to local residents. The council owes the local residents an explanation of exactly why this approach which was rejected more than 10 years ago has resurfaced and provide the professional reports as mentioned above. Furthermore the consultation process needs to be widened to include residents on the aforementioned.</p>
-------------------	--------	---

Connaught Gardens	Object	<p>I am writing as a local resident to register my strong objection to the proposal to install speed humps in Cranley Gardens, Muswell Hill, N10. My reasons are as follows:</p> <p>1). They are a very crude and indeed dangerous method of slowing down traffic. They take away a driver's attention from what is happening around them in order to focus on negotiating the humps.</p> <p>2) They increase air pollution due to vehicles being in a lower gear and slowing down and accelerating as they negotiate the humps.</p> <p>3) They increase noise and vibration which is detrimental to the environment and the well-being of local residents.</p> <p>4) There is no evidence that they are wanted by the local community. A previous consultation did not show a majority in favour of humps.</p> <p>5) There is no evidence that the current traffic calming measures need replacing. Please reconsider this proposal.</p>
Rookfield Avenue / Close	Other view	<p>Many thanks for your focus on road safety in Cranley Gardens, which is very welcome indeed. As a nearby resident, in Rookfield Avenue, I want to point out a similar problem in a parallel road, Etheldene Avenue, with similar dangers. It's a smaller road, quieter, also residential, and already being used as a cut-through to avoid Cranley Gardens. It has a blind curve and people race along the road sometimes 30-40mph, and cutting the corner blindly, straying into the other side with oncoming traffic. It's terrifying. I am very worried that the problem in Etheldene Avenue will increase after the speed bumps are put in to Cranley Gardens. Please could the new initiative be extended to include Etheldene Avenue as well? I know I speak for many other residents nearby, who I think will be writing too. Thank you for considering this request.</p>
Rookfield Avenue / Close	Object	<p>I am concerned by this proposal as it would merely deflect further traffic on to Etheldene Avenue, which is widely used as a rat-run. I know you are well aware of speeding on Etheldene Avenue, because I have seen the police using a speed gun there. If you are going to put speed bumps on Cranley Gardens, you need also to put them on Etheldene Avenue.</p>
Rookfield Avenue / Close	Other view	<p>We are writing in response to the proposed provision of speed humps and 20mph roundels on Cranley Gardens amongst other measures. Whilst these traffic calming measures are welcome for Cranley Gardens we are concerned about the knock on effect they will have on the current traffic flow on Etheldene Avenue.</p> <p>Currently Etheldene Avenue suffers from very fast traffic at rush hours as drivers try to avoid the regular congestion at the foot of Cranley Gardens at the junction with Priory Road. The traffic speeds down the road and it is especially dangerous on the blind bend where The Chine becomes Etheldene Avenue. We feel the traffic calming measures on Cranley Gardens will further exacerbate this problem as drivers will attempt to avoid the traffic calming measures in Cranley Gdns and further use Etheldene as a rat run. We are afraid there is a serious accident just waiting to happen.</p>

Rookfield Avenue / Close	Object	It has come to my attention that you plan to introduce speed bumps to calm traffic in Cranley Gardens. However, I see no mention of Etheldene Ave in your plans. There is already a problem of through traffic speeding down Etheldene. With traffic calming on Cranley this will lead to INCREASED speeding down Etheldene. In my view, Etheldene needs to be part of this scheme with speed bumps on Etheldene. This affects all residents on Etheldene and the Rookfield estate whose route in and out is along Etheldene.
Rookfield Avenue / Close	Other view	I wish to sound my worries that not including Etheldene Avenue in the scheme will allow the avenue to become a rat run to avoid Cranley gdns! This Must NOT happen....include the Chine as well as Etheldene in the road speed controls to avoid future mayhem in a residential road.
Woodland Gardens	Object	I have just heard about the speed bumps that are scheduled to be placed on Cranley Gardens. I live on Woodland Gardens which is already a very tight road to drive on, and I fear this is just going to drive traffic to our already busy street. I am also concerned about increased pollution as cars idle, reverse and slow as our road gets busier. I oppose this change.
Woodland Gardens	Object	There has been no notification about the Council's intention to put speed humps here. We are totally against this. You have already spent a six figure sum on traffic calming and now propose yet another which, this time, will harm ambulances, anyone with a bad back and any car's suspension. Would you please put statistics about requests from residents in the public domain. We have a right to know. As residents of Woodland Gardens, we know that such a measure would only bring more traffic to this and other parallel roads

Woodland Gardens	Object	<p>I never could understand why Haringey Council always waste money and energy on solving non-existent problems. How many accidents were recorded on Cranley Gardens? How many were related to speeding? It looks that for quite a few years there were no injuries recorded on Cranley Gardens and none of the incidents was related to speeding. So what is the purpose of this humps? It looks that the most dangerous part of Cranley Gardens is the junction with Muswell Hill Road with a few casualties, most of them with motorcycles involved and none of them related to speeding. Wouldn't be more effective to pay more attention to tackle bad motorcycle driving instead of wasting money on installing unnecessary humps. Accordingly to statistics only 6% of accidents are related to excessive speed, while 60% is attributed to human error. Maybe better traffic organisation in high risk places would be more effective in reducing the number of accidents than placing unnecessary humps in random places with no recorded accidents. Humps increase pollution. Isn't the Council policy to reduce pollution? Installing humps obviously contravene Council's policy in this matter. Humps damage vehicles costing vast amounts in repairs and contribute to increase CO2 emissions due to cars being replaced more often. Vibrations caused by passing traffic are damaging surrounding properties. What about increased noise levels? Humps are detrimental to emergency services. Ambulance and fire brigade are affected by humps causing delays in attending emergencies and putting lives at risk. Have you ever been in an ambulance with severe condition or pain while the ambulance negotiate humps? If yes, I hope you enjoyed it. There were many humps on Woodside Avenue. Recently the number of humps increased. Most of them are already in urgent need of repair as they are dangerous to passing vehicles. Obviously, there is no money for their maintenance. So why to waste money on installing more humps, which once installed will be left neglected posing more road danger. Do not waste money on something which does not solve any problems, is detrimental to vehicles, residents' health and their properties. Use the money for something useful like keeping our streets clean. It is January and dead leaves are still not cleared from pavements since autumn posing not potential but real danger to people walking down the streets. You want to reduce rubbish and recycling collection. Do not waste money on useless humps, keep rubbish collection! Consider removing ALL humps in the whole borough. Do something useful to make our life more pleasant.</p>
------------------	--------	---

Woodland Gardens	Object	<p>We are residents on the bottom of Woodland Gardens about 75meter off Cranley Gardens and a frequent user of Cranley Gardens either as cyclists or car drivers. We heard about the proposal to implement 16 speed bumps on that road aiming to slow down traffic. We appreciate your aim to slowdown traffic speed, however on balance our view and strong opinion is that this would be a bad idea for the following multiple reasons: * the impact on car journey is very unpleasant. As an example Woodside avenue with an equal number of speed bumps became almost undriveable. - Not only is it bad for the cars, their suspensions, their tyres but - for the passengers it becomes a health hazard: the continuous motion upwards/downwards when passing over the bump but as well as the continuous forward and backward movements when it comes to quasi stopping the car than accelerate. We have multiple people with motion sickness in the family for whom this is causing a real health issue and we actively search to avoid roads with multiple speed bumps. We will not be able to avoid Cranley Gardens though. - progression of emergency vehicles will be slowed down and journey in them very difficult particularly in ambulances * air pollution: the repeat accelerations will reduce the quality of air and increase CO2 and NOX pollution in the air. As a keen cyclist I can confirm that particularly on uphill roads such accelerations are noticeable and will make a big difference to the air quality immediately observable not only nearby but also further in neighbouring streets. * noise pollution: all these acceleration will make the road much more noisy than it already is for the entire neighbourhood not only for those living directly on the street. We are also of the view that while the road is wide and could allow certain cars to speed, we did not observe such behaviour over the past 10 years living nearby. Neither did we hear of any accident/incident that would warrant such a drastic action. In the above example of Woodside Avenue, there are two schools, a retirement village potentially warranting such drastic action. Not here. For all these reason, we would much prefer to implement a milder version of speed control such as speed cameras, perhaps narrowing of lanes via bends/island. Speed cameras would also have the benefit to generate revenue to the council. Please be assured we are in favour of speed control- however of a different nature than the proposed one.</p>
------------------	--------	---

Woodland Gardens	Object	<p>I am writing to strongly oppose the speed calming measures proposed for Cranley Gardens. 1. Firstly your consultation is flawed as you have not actively consulted with the surrounding roads which will bear the impact of these proposals and shift potential risk on to these surrounding roads. I only heard about the consultation and proposal through the grapevine yesterday! 2. I understand that the council has already spent £100K on speed calming measures. These already have impact. Putting 16 humps along Cranley gardens is a really bad idea. It causes potential damage to properties, affects the suspension of vehicles, and most importantly is a problem for the emergency services slowing them down substantially. Imagine the experience of being seriously ill and having to experience 16 humps on one road only, in an ambulance on the way to hospital. 3. No regard has been given to the impact on surrounding roads. Whenever Cranley Gardens is slowed due to road works there is severe impact on Woodland Rise which becomes a speed trap as frustrated drivers speed up the road. There are many families with young children living on Woodland Rise. This presents a danger to them. Also it is a narrow road when cars are parked on both sides. This leads to damage to cars. There has been no formal notification to residents in our road who will have the impact of 16 humps in Cranley gardens. 4. I regularly drive up and down Cranley Gardens and do not think that it is a road where people particularly speed. The Council can put cameras on Cranley Gardens which will change behaviors where they need to be changed. It is already a 20 mile speed limit road. In conclusion we are against the proposal and also very disappointed that the council has not formally consulted with our road. The council has many calls on its budget and these plans are not a priority at all.</p>
Cranmore Way	Other view	<p>Please but speed bumps down The Chine / Etheldene Ave. if the bumps go into Cranley Gdns then cars will divert down Etheldene Ave which is narrow and could do with them anyway</p>
Cranmore Way	Object	<p>Re your consultation letter of 14th December which I have only gained sight of today, 17th January 2023. We are residents on the Rookfield Estate, adjoining Etheldene Avenue and would like to express our concern over the proposed traffic calming on Cranley Gardens, which runs parallel down to Park Road. Etheldene becomes an overflow road whenever there are traffic issues on Cranley. Traffic calming on Cranley will mean many vehicles choosing Etheldene as an alternative. Vehicles already often exceed speed limits, causing hazards to pavement users and traffic joining from Rookfield Avenue and Cascade Avenue. Turning onto Etheldene from the Chine is a sweeping blind curve which downward moving traffic often 'cuts', quite perilous at the permitted speed of 20mph, positively dangerous at higher speeds. Parking on both sides of the road creates blind spots - increased volumes of traffic will increase the chance of accidents for vehicles turning into Etheldene traffic. If Haringey introduces traffic calming on Cranley and leaves Etheldene as is, the council will be creating a dangerous rat run along Etheldene. Please acknowledge receipt of this email and I do hope the views of residents in roads abutting Cranley will be taken into account. It seems odd we were not sent any details of the proposals direct.</p>

Cranmore Way	Object	I am opposed to speed bumps on Cranley Gardens unless steps are also taken to control speed on Etheldene Avenue. Etheldene is already a rat run for cars cutting through the residential roads, and this will only get worse if these cars have been 'controlled' before entering Etheldene. Please consider carefully the safety implications of controlling speed on Cranley Gardens and not Etheldene. I believe it will worsen speeding and compromise safety if no control measure are taken on Etheldene alongside Cranley Gardens.
Cascade Ave / The Chine	Other view	We are supportive of the speedbumps on Cranley gardens however concerned about traffic then favouring Etheldene Road - which already has many cars which seem to be exceeding the speed limit in such a built up area (delivery vehicles in particular) I would propose putting speedbumps down Etheldene Road too to mitigate the inevitable increase of fast flowing traffic.
Cascade Ave / The Chine	Other view	While traffic calming measures on Cranley Gardens are to be welcomed, these will also encourage traffic descending Cranley Gardens, intending to continue to Priory Road, to use The Chine and Etheldene Road rather than continuing to Park Road and turning left. Speeding traffic and "rat-run" traffic on the early section of The Chine and Etheldene, part of the Rookfield Conservation Area, is of much more concern than any issues on Cranley Gardens.
Ellington Rd	Object	RE Public and Statutory consultation Proposed Road Safety Improvements on Cranley Gardens, N10. TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN: I don't currently think that speed bumps will be beneficial to the traffic on Cranley Gardens as the road I live on: Ellington Rd will become a cut through for speed. I live very close to the Cranley Rd junction and have never had problems with speeding traffic here. I am also afraid of an increased noise and air pollution from people travelling uphill braking and then accelerating on the bumps. I also know from using Woodside Ave regularly that the bumps deteriorate and become uneven and unsafe (I am a cyclist and motorbike user- also). The speed bumps also cause tailbacks and more idling traffic. The bumps also require upkeep as they wear and tear. In my opinion the 20 zone is enough of a calming measure, so I object to this.
Priory Gdns	Object	Having been informed by Cllr Luke Cawley-Harrison of your 'road safety improvements' proposal for Shepard's Hill N6/Wolseley Rd N8 and having not received anything from Haringey Council itself, I would hereby like to object to the proposal of 20 speed bumps on Shepard's Hill between Archway Rd and Wolseley Rd. As a resident of Priory Gardens, N6, it seems to me that there has been no accidents on this road in the passed years. Pedestrians and drivers alike seem to use common sense and responsibility on such roads and why not let them use those qualities instead of treating them like they are incapable of doing so by forbidding them to use their own judgement?

Shepherds Hill	Object	<p>strongly object to the proposal of a refuge island outside 57-59 shepherds hill on the grounds that: ·it will severely impede access to the drive ways of the flats on either side of the road. ·it will make accessing the off-street parking very difficult for Fitzroy Court (located 57-59 shepherds hill) ·it will make turning into and out of the drive way of Fitzroy court next to impossible ·it will mean no delivery vans/ service vehicles can access Fitzroy court at 57-59 Shepherds hill as the turn will be too tight ·it will make it very difficult for the w5 bus to pass by and stop at its current stop at 57-59 shepherd's hill ·there are also multiple school coaches that pickup/drop off kids at the proposed location. The coaches will not have space to pass or turn. ·the island would make turning into and out of stanhope road very difficult for long vehicles such as coaches/ refuse trucks/ delivery trucks. ·the island would increase traffic and create danger as driver would be forced to do a U-turn further up or down shepherds hill to access properties ·there is insufficient space for an island without removing the parking spaces. The parking spaces on are reserved for disabled people and should not be removed. Please note that continuing with the proposal to instal a refuge island will result in legal proceedings from the management company that runs Fitzroy Court on the grounds that access to private property is being unnecessarily being impeded by Haringey Council</p>
Shepherds Hill	Object	<p>As a resident of Shepherds Hill, I object to speed humps, considering the increased noise on acceleration as cars clear the speed hump, which will be more audible in my flat. Should the Council wish to reduce the speed of traffic, I would rather see a proposal similar to the meandering course implemented in Wightman Road or fixed parking bays with kerbs and chevron signs, protruding into the road slightly, to protect the parked cars and provide an incentive for traffic to proceed with caution.</p>

Shepherds Hill	Object	<p>object to this proposal for the following reasons: •Speed humps are agony for patients in ambulances and taxis going to or from Hospital, before or after serious operations. •Speed humps cause increased vibration and long-term damage to adjoining houses and flats. (see note [1] below) •Tailbacks already occur on a regular basis at either end of Shepherds Hill/Wolseley Road and Shepherds Hill/Archway Road. These will increase due to the slowed-down traffic. • Slow moving or stationary cars with their engines revving cause increased noise and pollution. •The supposed road safety "improvements" would on the contrary make the road more dangerous, especially for pedestrians, due to frustrated drivers ignoring speed limits, driving at high speed over the humps etc. More cyclists would be forced to cycle on the pavements and more accidents to pedestrians would inevitably occur. •A Refuge Island immediately opposite the main vehicle entrance to Fitzroy Court would make driving in and out of Fitzroy Court's driveway more difficult to negotiate, especially by the larger delivery vehicles which frequently need access to Fitzroy Court (Royal Mail, supermarket and other delivery vans, Landscape Gardeners, Contract Cleaners, furniture removal vans etc).If these were forced to park on Shepherds Hill they would delay passing traffic and cause increased parking problems. •The existing Disabled Bays outside Fitzroy Court are used by elderly residents of Fitzroy Court who have mobility problems, The Refuge Island would mean the Disabled parking bays would be lost. If moved, they would reduce the number of regular parking bays, and be more difficult or impossible to access by elderly disabled badge holders. •Elderly people might mistakenly think they are safe on the Refuge Island unaware that still could be knocked down by passing motorbikes. •The W5 bus stops outside both Stanhope House and Fitzroy Court to let passengers on/off; while this was happening cars behind the stationary bus would no longer be able to pass the W5 bus, due to the narrowing of the road where the Refuge Island was, causing constant loud hooting, etc, from angry motorists. This proposal would not reduce Road Danger but increase it. A cheaper and better proposal would be the installation of a long overdue pedestrian crossing at the junction of Stanhope Road/Shepherds Hill. This proposal, received yesterday (19 December 2022) appears to be being rushed through ("the statutory consultation on the proposed changes will begin on 14 December 2022"). Please include the following further objection to this scheme: The proposed Refuge Island is at the muster point for school children who regularly gather and wait at 7am in order to board a large school coach. Photo: school coach outside Fitzroy Court taken this morning 5/1/22 at 7.10am.</p>
----------------	--------	--

Shepherds Hill	Object	I am writing to object to a feature of the proposed road safety improvements document we received today. While we agree traffic often travels too quickly on this road and speed reduction measures could be beneficial, we strongly object to the proposed speed humps due to the increased noise this will create. Extra signs, road markings, refuge islands or speed cameras would be welcome, but without an accompanying weight limit we fear the noise of trucks and lorries rattling over speed humps would make our flat unbearable to live in, especially since we both work from home. Our flat is in the road-facing half of the building and we therefore have no rooms where we could avoid the noise from the proposed speed hump directly outside our windows.
Not stated	Object	The scheme on Cranley Gardens is on the preferred route recommended by HCC, as the WCAP route up Muswell Hill, the steepest hill in the Borough, is honestly never going to be suitable.....2022-T80 - Cranley Gardens- The inclusion of the sinusoidal hump detail in the drawings is very welcome, however we suggest the wholesale introduction of humps on these roads is premature without plans in place for local cycle routes or the Highgate East LTN. Filtered road should not need humps. Humps impede access for ambulances, other emergency services and MIP drivers, who may need to cut through on filtered roads. LB Enfield's policy is not to use humps on LTN roads.
Not stated	Object	Speed humps in Wolseley Road will significantly increase both noise and pollution, which is totally inappropriate in a wholly residential street. Installing a speed camera or two along this road and Shepherds Hill would instantly slow the traffic down.
Not stated	Object	I object to speed bumps as they make taking care in driving really difficult - driver always looking on road for next speed bump rather than looking out for pedestrians or fellow road users. Much prefer speed cameras.
Not stated	Object	I am very concerned at the proposal to put speed bumps on Cranley Gardens and wish to object in the strongest terms. There were considerable measures taken not long ago (at great expense) to slow the traffic down and the signs that light up when a vehicle exceeds the limit are clear and helpful. But there are not many of them - we could use more. If these are not effective enough and further measures are needed why not put speed cameras at regular intervals instead? These might even generate some income for the council. Speed bumps are painful and uncomfortable for any passenger suffering from injury or ill health, they damage the suspension of cars, generate noise, additional fumes and vibration for residents on either side as cars slow down and speed up again, including vibrations that can damage their houses and they can also cause drivers to take their eyes off the road to negotiate them. We need at least some routes that make it bearable to travel for those who are infirm! Can we really afford this kind of additional expenditure?
Not stated	Object	This is to register my objection to the above. There is already a 20mph speed limit and speed camera. Humps are totally not necessary and cause noise and suspension issues. Better to spend the money on some kind of pedestrian crossing on the corner with Park Road

Not stated	Object	<p>Dear Ms Cunningham I am writing on behalf of the Friends of the Parkland Walk. Our group engages with the council as a critical friend on matters relating to the Parkland Walk. Although not normally communicating with Haringey Council's Highways and Parking Department, we are prompted to respond to your 14th December 2022 consultation letter about the year's Road Danger Reduction Investment Plan as there is a concern arising whereby a lot of extra pedestrians and cyclists coming from or going to the Parkland Walk will foreseeably be crossing roads at a junction which is already known to be dangerous. We can't find references to Road Danger Reduction Investment Plans on the Haringey website but nevertheless it sounds like there may be funds available to address improvements to road safety and pedestrian accessibility. We ask that funds are allocated for measures to mitigate the risk to Parkland Walk users. The situation is that a busy entrance to the Parkland Walk from Muswell Hill Road will be redeveloped as part of the Cranwood project. To facilitate contractors carrying out the works safely, public access through the underpass will presumably need to be suspended for a period. If the underpass below Muswell Hill Road can't be used, more people and cyclists than normal will be crossing the Muswell Hill Road/Cranley Gardens junction at surface level. As you will be aware Muswell Hill Road/Cranley Gardens is a notoriously dangerous junction and with increased use, the risk of more accidents there increases too. The main problem appears to be the speed of the southbound traffic on Muswell Hill Road, and that very few vehicles or cyclists stop and give way at the mini-roundabout as directed. Also it is not uncommon for frustrated northbound drivers to overtake buses that have stopped at the Cranley Gardens bus stop beside the Muswell Hill Road entrance to the Parkland Walk. Please would Haringey Council make the Muswell Hill Road/Cranley Gardens junction safer for the extra pedestrian footfall when the underpass (tunnel) option is not available. We don't ask for improvements to necessarily be long term or to incur maintenance in the way speed humps do. We ask simply for an assessment of possible road safety interventions for the duration of the closure of the underpass, and implementation of interventions to improve safety for when there is extra footfall at that junction.</p>
146	146	146