

**Proposed Road Safety Improvements on Shepherds Hill and Wolseley Road**  
**Consultation period – 14 December 2022 – 18 January 2023**

The proposed improvements are designed to improve pedestrian accessibility and road safety.

The key measures are:

- Provision of new speed humps on Shepherds Hill and Wolseley Road, including associated road markings.
- Provision of a new refuge island outside no. 57/59 Shepherds Hill.
- Provision of new 20mph roundels, slow markings and cycle logos marking in various locations.

Consultation documents were delivered to 700 addresses in Shepherds Hill and Wolseley Rd.

## Analysis

		Support or object					
		Support		Object		Other view	
		Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %
Name of road	Shepherds Hill	32	48%	30	45%	4	6%
	Glasslyn Rd	3	75%	1	25%	0	0%
	Wolseley Rd	4	50%	1	13%	3	38%
	Other roads	2	67%	1	33%	0	0%
	Total	41	51%	33	41%	7	9%

While there is overall majority support at 51%, there are significant objections from many residents in Shepherds Hill.

## Comments (by Road)

Card	Name of road	Support / object	Comments
57	Other roads	Support	I live on Berkeley Road, N8, and I regularly use Shepherds Hill and Wolseley Road as a pedestrian, cyclist, and motorist. I support the proposed road safety measures. Traffic routinely ignores the 20MPH speed limit and endangers other road users.
81	Other roads	Object	<p>We have the following comments to make about the proposed safety improvements on Shepherds Hill/Wolseley Road N6.</p> <p>1)We agree that safety improvements are needed to slow the traffic.</p> <p>2)We think that some speed humps would be very welcome. However, the plan sent to us shows a very large number of humps, rather close together (e.g. 2 humps just between the junctions with Stanhope Road and Broughton Gardens) and we object to this - we think you should reduce the number of humps/increase the distance between them.</p> <p>3)We are also concerned that any humps should be smooth, not like the very high and steep humps at the Hornsey Lane end of Stanhope Road, which are uncomfortable to drive over and feel as if they damage the car.</p> <p>4)We object to the proposed refuge island outside No 57/59 Shepherds Hill. A refuge island close to the junction with Stanhope Road would be very welcome, BUT we think it is proposed to be on the wrong side of the junction. It should be on the Archway Road side, not the Wolsey Road side. This is because of the bus route. The W5 (which is a huge local asset) already often has some difficulty in making the turn from Stanhope Road into Shepherds Hill, and vice versa. A refuge more or less where it has to make that turn will be very awkward. In addition, it puts pedestrians at risk if their way or view is blocked by the bus. Please consider moving the refuge away from the bus route..</p>
77	Glasslyn Rd	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 Proposed Road Safety Improvements on Cranley Gardens, N10.
78	Glasslyn Rd	Support	Support the proposals for a new refuge island in Shepherds Hill and for new speed humps in Shepherds Hill and Wolseley Road. However the one observation we have is that there appears to be an excessive amount of proposed speed humps (22 are proposed). It would make for a very unpleasant ride for passengers and drivers on W5 buses. It would also be uncomfortable for local drivers and may cause potential damage to vehicles. Could serious consideration be given to reducing the number of speed humps, perhaps by a half?

80	Glasslyn Rd	Object	1. We would propose Speed Cameras to restrict overall speed. (Please note there is already a 20mph restriction anyway and camera monitoring is obviously better than speed bumps, which are expensive, need frequent maintenance, and are harmful to buildings alongside. 2. We note there is not a proposal for a Zebra Crossing at Wolseley Rd/ Park Rd Junction...Why? As a pedestrian victim of this crossing I (BDF) I/ We believe this can only lead to further accidents to pedestrians, especially from traffic turning from Park Rd into Wolseley Rd. (It is not unusual for there to be two Zebras at or very near a busy junction).
75	Glasslyn Rd	Support	I am a resident of Glasslyn Road and fully support the proposed safety improvement measures. Traffic routinely moves at twice the posted speed limit and as the area is heavily residential with a large population of school children I believe these measures are essential to the safety of all in the area. Thank you for taking these measures and I look forward to seeing them in action.
68	Other roads	Support	Not before time! Could the height of the speed humps be increased, as most of the vehicle owners around here are rich, privileged, and consequently drive around in 'Chelsea Tractors!' (4 * 4)
17	Shepherds Hill	Other view	Speed humps are not good, they cause added pollution. A couple of cameras would be more effective and cheaper for the council - but not always popular!
65	Shepherds Hill	Support	Add warning signs for speed humps at junction with Wolseley Rd. + Park Rd. Add 'keep clear' markings to junction of Shepherds Hill and Shepherds Close.
56	Shepherds Hill	Support	I would like to fully endorse the proposal for road safety improvements on Shepherd's Hill and Wolseley Road. These are overdue, and I have witnessed a lot of dangerous speeding by cars, vans and other motorized vehicles since moving here. I commend the Council for bringing forward this measure.
6	Shepherds Hill	Object	Could you tell me what kind of speed humps you are proposing? There seem to be many different types. Please give me an example in local roads. Thanks
58	Shepherds Hill	Object	As a long-time resident on Shepherds Hill, I would like to express my views. Whilst safety and security are of paramount importance and the proposed cycle logo, 20mph roundels and slow markings are great visuals; I am not a supporter of speed humps. For a driver, nothing is more frustrating than having to slow down and speed up repeatedly. 20mph is not a realistic speed limit for such a long stretch of road. Furthermore, it is wasteful of energy and causes more air and noise pollution for the residents. On Shepherds Hill, virtually no one obeys the 20 limit, and some drivers, especially after dark, fly past in excess of 50mph. Take a cue from Germany and best practices from other EU countries. Perhaps a speed camera may be a better option than erecting humps.

2	Shepherds Hill	Object	While we welcome the fact that something is being done to address the speeding traffic on Shepherds Hill, the number of speed humps seems excessive. Also, it is well-known that cars accelerate having crested a speed bump. It would therefore be preferable if the humps were placed adjacent to the gaps between houses so as to reduce the effect of the associated noise.
9	Shepherds Hill	Object	<p>strongly object to the proposal of a refuge island outside 57-59 shepherds hill on the grounds that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-it will severely impede access to the drive ways of the flats on either side of the road.</li> <li>-it will make accessing the off-street parking very difficult for Fitzroy Court (located 57-59 shepherds hill)</li> <li>-it will make turning into and out of the drive way of Fitzroy court next to impossible</li> <li>-it will mean no delivery vans/ service vehicles can access Fitzroy court at 57-59 Shepherds hill, as the turn will be to tight</li> <li>-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</li> <li>-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.</li> <li>-the island would make turning into and out of stanhope road very difficult for long vehicles such as coaches/ refuse trucks/ delivery trucks.</li> <li>-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</li> <li>-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</li> </ul> <p>I invite you to contact me should you wish to discuss further</p>

3	Shepherds Hill	Object	<p>We object to this proposal for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Speed humps are agony for patients in ambulances and taxis going to or from Hospital, before or after serious operations.</li> <li>•Speed humps cause increased vibration and long-term damage to adjoining houses and flats. (see note [1] below)</li> <li>•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.</li> <li>• Slow moving or stationary cars with their engines revving cause increased noise and pollution.</li> <li>•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.</li> <li>•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.</li> <li>•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.</li> <li>•Elderly people might mistakenly think they are safe on the Refuge Island unaware that still could be knocked down by passing motorbikes.</li> <li>•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.</li> </ul> <p>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.</p> <p>This proposal appears to be being rushed through ("the statutory consultation on the proposed changes will begin on 14 December 2022").</p> <p>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. SEE PICTURE</p>
---	----------------	--------	---

1	Shepherds Hill	Object	A few objections regarding new speed humps and their locations: 1. The proposed Speed hump at 68 Shepherds Hill is too close to the entrance and exit of the block to easily navigate around. The entrance to the block is quite narrow. 2. Emergency services often use Shepherds Hill road, and it will slow them down if speed humps are installed. 3. Speed humps increase air pollution.
12	Shepherds Hill	Object	We think the proposed number of speed humps is too many. They should be halved. Also the Refuge Island is much too close to the R/A
43	Shepherds Hill	Object	Strongly object to speed humps and traffic island. Both will increase noise and pollution on this narrow road. Bus route 305 already congested much of the day. Constant deliveries have the effect of slowing traffic. Parking problems will be increased. Proposal will increase danger to pedestrians. A pedestrian crossing would be more useful - and safer.
20	Shepherds Hill	Support	I fully support this because motorists speed on this road at up to 80mph. It feels like a motorway and becomes noisy at night.
10	Shepherds Hill	Support	While the speed humps will help reduce speeding on Shepherds Hill - which is a straight road; they will be superfluous on Wolseley rd which bends and is on a hill.
59	Shepherds Hill	Object	Re the speed humps; I'm very concerned about impact on W5 bus, ambulances, and people going to Whittington Hospital causing slow-downs and increased pollution as well as impact on passengers. I support the other measures and suggest they be put in and the costly speed humps dropped. They can then be reviewed and a proper consultation done.

76	Shepherds Hill	Object	<p>1. Please give consideration to disabled people....I live on Shepherds Hill, have a blue badge, and have had multiple spinal fractures, some 'spontaneous' i.e. without a fall, and driving over bumps even at a slow speed is hazardous. Also disabled drivers need parking and I suspect parking places will be reduced as a result of the bumps. 2. Bumps come in different sizes...a low height would certainly help although wouldn't eradicate the hazard. Bumps can be across the whole road, as you appear to have indicated, or be small and in the centre of each side....the latter would help the jolt. Also small bumps might help in maximising available parking spaces. 3. Most of the road is a W5 bus route with hail and ride, and has a stop on Shepherds hill on the corner of Stanhope Road.....currently on a double yellow line outside Stanhope House and also opposite. It is really important to keep the stops there as there is wall space on both sides for disabled people to sit whilst waiting for the bus. Therefore having bumps there would not be a good idea as it might impede the bus stopping. There's sheltered housing with a lot of elderly people at 22 shepherds hill so moving the bus stop further away would not help them. 4. As regards the island by 57/59 shepherds hill, for the reason mentioned above , it is likely to impede the bus stopping there....so could the island be placed on the archway road side of the mini roundabout at Stanhope Road? 5. Bumps cause extra pollution, with some cars breaking and then revving up again, and bumps at 20mph particularly going uphill from Park road along Wolseley road will cause a lot more pollution. 6. I question the use of cycle logos.....the road is wide enough so that cyclists do not need to be in the centre of a lane.....in areas I've seen this, it's led to more road rage and therefore less safe for everyone.</p>
50	Shepherds Hill	Object	Speed humps are a menace. NO
33	Shepherds Hill	Support	Support all measures proposed. Thanks. This will be vital in reducing high levels of off-peak and overnight vehicle speeds which are so dangerous. They will also make the road safer and easier to cross on foot. It will also make cycling more appealing.
48	Shepherds Hill	Support	Excellent. Needed for all - but especially children.
52	Shepherds Hill	Object	I object to the speed humps. I work in medicine and know how important it is for roads to be clear of humps to enable ambulances to transport patients safely. I would like to hear the history if accidents here than justify this drastic measure. Clearly a speed limit of 20mph should be sufficient. Implement it please.

	Shepherds Hill	Other view	Our principal problems are the increasing usage of Shepherds Hill (particularly between Stanhope Road and Archway Road) of Heavy Goods Vehicles and the inclination of all vehicles to cruise at excessive speeds in Shepherds Hill between Archway Road and Wolseley Road. Shepherds Hill (and Stanhope Road) and Wolseley Road have insufficient width to accommodate HGVs safely and the straight stretch of Shepherds Hill from the top of the hill to the bend at the top of Wolseley Road is too inviting to passenger vehicles to drive too quickly. HGVs should be banned from using Shepherds Hill and Stanhope Road (as they are from nearby sections of roadway between Stanhope Road and Archway Road). Danger to parked cars and pedestrians and cyclists will be increased even above current levels if HGVs are permitted to continue using the suggested roads and only speed bumps are introduced as proposed. The higher the bumps, the more dangerous the road will be, with or without HGVs. (The proposals moreover do not state the height of the proposed bumps, which is very important.) In Stanhope Road, where occasional bumps are installed, the HGVs using the road regularly fracture the road surfaces where the bumps are located, requiring frequent road repairs which they do not normally receive. The height of any road bumps installed should be carefully monitored and regulated in any case to ensure they are not excessive. The number in Shepherds Hill should be reduced to achieve the desired result without causing increased danger to local users and residents, and warning signs for drivers should be installed near the junctions with Archway Road and Stanhope Road. The frequency of bumps should be no greater than that in Stanhope Road.
41	Shepherds Hill	Object	I like to go fast. Put rocket boosters on all cars. Don't put speed humps on Shepherds Hill
45	Shepherds Hill	Other view	Dealing with humps requires driving in low gear - increasing pollution. I'm not sure about statistics on accident numbers with or without humps. Wear and tear on cars is probably worse with the bumps. Cameras would be more effective (and remunerative) but to offset protests from car users; you would need to increase the speed limit to 30mph.
66	Shepherds Hill	Support	1)_Your graphics are very poor - difficult to see. 2)_These roads are not wide enough to include a cycle lane - with parked cars on both sides of the road. 3)_why no pedestrian crossing???
35	Shepherds Hill	Object	I support the road safety improvements but NOT speed humps in front of 28 - 32 Shepherds Hill. This is because of noise concerns when cars drive over them. Thank you.
23	Shepherds Hill	Support	Traffic on these roads travels far too fast and I don't think the proposed measures go far enough to stop this. Also I'm not sure that speed humps work well because cars swerve over the road to avoid them. Speed cameras work better to reduce speed.

49	Shepherds Hill	Support	It may also be worth having speed cameras of some sort because cars speed between the bumps. I hope generally that it will stop people from speeding and ensure they stop at the roundabout - which they currently fail to stop at.
63	Shepherds Hill	Object	Top priority is the junction of Shepherds Hill and Stanhope Road roundabout. Drivers think they can ignore the roundabout, and this results in a lot of hooting and sudden breaking - all very dangerous part of the road. Instead of humps, install 20mph flashing light warning and thank you signals when keeping within the speed limit (red face and smiley face).
14	Shepherds Hill	Support	
7	Shepherds Hill	Support	I think all of the proposals are excellent ideas and support them. People drive far too fast along Shepherds Hill which is a completely residential road.
69	Shepherds Hill	Support	I agree with the above proposals.
74	Shepherds Hill	Other view	In response to your letter of 14 December last, I wish to make the following comments to the proposals: 1)The number of speed humps proposed - 22 - is too many. As cars and larger vehicles - including the daily journeys of the huge, refrigerated supermarket lorries of Waitrose, Tesco and the Co-op who join Shepherds Hill from Archway Road and then turn into Stanhope Road - grind over all these humps in 1st or 2nd gear, the level of pollution this will generate will be increased substantially. Surely this is not the price we are paying to limit speed? I don't think any resident will welcome this. I would therefore like you to consider a reduction of around one-third to the number of speed humps proposed. 2)Please do not impede access to house driveways and blocks of flats' parking areas by installing speed humps at their entrances/exits, which could endanger safety particularly in dark and wet weather. Perhaps better street lighting could be considered as well? 3)I welcome the proposed refuge island outside No 57/59 Shepherds Hill, which will make crossing the road much easier and safer. However, please site it slightly further away (east) from the mini roundabout, as it will impede the W5 bus turning right from Stanhope Road into Shepherds Hill, thereby ensuring sufficient notice and space for the bus between the island and parked cars.
16	Shepherds Hill	Object	These works will create traffic jams which are a nuisance in themselves, and lower the air quality. When completed the speed humps will cause jams and lower air quality. All of it will cost money that could be better spent not spoiling quality of life. Stop virtue signalling at other people's expense.
13	Shepherds Hill	Support	Excellent proposals to reduce speeding traffic. Please also consider a cycle lane in place of the parking bays near Highgate Station. The bays are often empty as there is a lot of off-street parking.

54	Shepherds Hill	Object	Please leave things as they are. The problem is not fast moving traffic , but the traffic lights at the junction between Shepherds Hill and Archway Road not giving enough time for cars to drive out of Shepherds Hill.
64	Shepherds Hill	Object	I object to speed humps. They are unnecessary and cause problems for cyclists on the steep hill.
25	Shepherds Hill	Support	Speed cameras would also be good.
28	Shepherds Hill	Object	This is an expensive project with little evidence it will provide value for money
34	Shepherds Hill	Object	We don't require the road to have speed bumps. 20mph limit should be enough. As a pedestrian I don't see any problems with speed on this road
15	Shepherds Hill	Support	It's about time something was done. 20mph might be a bit low, but cars are being driven at 40-50mph. We also need a police trap which will earn substantial income for Haringey
30	Shepherds Hill	Object	There isn't a problem with speeding cars. Spend the money on something useful.
40	Shepherds Hill	Support	

4	Shepherds Hill	Object	<p>I concur with the objections to this proposal made by my neighbours as stated below. In addition, the dedicated disabled parking bay DB051, at 57-59 Shepherds Hill is registered in my name. The proposed Refuge Island would be obstructive and make it impossible for me to get in and out of my car or drive in and out of the space.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Speed humps are agony for patients in ambulances and taxis going to or from Hospital, before or after serious operations.</li> <li>•Speed humps cause increased vibration and long-term damage to adjoining houses and flats. (see note [1] below)</li> <li>•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.</li> <li>• Slow moving or stationary cars with their engines revving cause increased noise and pollution.</li> <li>•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.</li> <li>•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.</li> <li>•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.</li> <li>•Elderly people might mistakenly think they are safe on the Refuge Island unaware that still could be knocked down by passing motorbikes.</li> <li>•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.</li> </ul> <p>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</p>
---	----------------	--------	--

5	Shepherds Hill	Object	My objections are on the following grounds:- 1. The location of the refuge island would make it unnecessarily difficult for vehicles to turn in or out of the drive of Fitzroy Court at 57-59 Shepherds Hill, particularly for larger vehicles, delivery trucks and service vehicles such as gardeners. 2. The location of the traffic island so close to the intersection with Stanhope Road would make it next to impossible for large vehicles like school coaches and delivery vans to turn into or out of Stanhope Road 3. The proposal would probably mean losing the parking spaces outside Fitzroy Court - a significant loss to the many elderly residents in the block who are dependent on their cars to get about locally. 4. Shepherds Hill is narrow at this point and does not provide a natural place to cross. 5. The proposed placement of the refuge island is not justifiable. It would not improve road safety but would result instead in new and unnecessary problems, particularly for those in the immediate vicinity who would be adversely affected. Please acknowledge receipt of these objections.
42	Shepherds Hill	Object	As a cyclist I welcome the road safety improvements - but disagree with the proposed refuge island outside 57/59 Shepherds Hill. It will narrow the road for cyclists (dangerous) and is of no benefit to pedestrians
21	Shepherds Hill	Object	This will cause noise and air pollution as well as accidents. A better and cheaper one would be to install a zebra crossing at the junction of Stanhope Rd and Shepherds Hill
73	Shepherds Hill	Support	we are in support of these proposals. However - we feel there is a very important road safety issue that is not addressed. We have lived here for some years now, and in that time we have witnessed an increasing number of vehicles mounting the pavement when there are queues, in order to squeeze down to the end of Shepherds Hill when wanting to turn left onto Archway Road. This section of pavement runs from opposite Highgate Library, passing Goldsmith Court, to the junction with Archway Road. What is most alarming about this is the disregard for pedestrian safety - this pavement is used daily by children going to school. It has reached the point where we have taken to walking in front of cars that have mounted the pavement, in order to protest & alert them to their illegal behaviour. Please could this matter be investigated with urgency? I would suggest the installation of a few bollards along that stretch of road to prevent this continuing.
27	Shepherds Hill	Support	This is welcome because the road is dangerous because of the speeding. Pollution is bad and causes us asthma. Speed humps might deter drivers from using our road
22	Shepherds Hill	Support	I think it's a good idea, but I suggest having fewer humps because Shepherds Hill is a route used by emergency vehicles
19	Shepherds Hill	Support	Install as many humps as possible. Make speeding impossible for all the boy racers who zoom down this road. Thank you.

8	Shepherds Hill	Support	We are strongly in support of your proposals. To get to Highgate tube station and to Queen's Wood we have to cross the road on Shepherds Hill. This can be difficult for us. The 20 mph limit is rarely complied with, as shown on the illuminated speed-response sign on the north side of the street just near our building. Shepherds Hill bends slightly around the junction with Broughton Gardens and this limits our ability to see vehicles going eastwards. There is no zebra crossing or pedestrian traffic lights between Archway Road and Coolhurst Road, which truly surprises us. Suggestions/Recommendations 1. Ask the Police to enforce the 20 mph limit. 2. Site a new zebra crossing midway between Archway Road and Coolhurst Road, for instance where you are planning a traffic island at 57 Shepherds Hill. We are most appreciative of your attention to this problem
24	Shepherds Hill	Support	Speed cameras (average speed) between Stanhope Road and Coolhurst Road.
32	Shepherds Hill	Support	I suggest having an additional refuge island near the bus stop and near Shepherds Hill Gdns (outside #66)
11	Shepherds Hill	Object	Speed humps slow down small cars but have little effect on large cars and SUVs. They can be risky for bicycles when it's icy weather. Why can't we have speed cameras instead? The biggest problem is drivers speeding along the full length of Shepherds Hill at 50mp; and an average -speed camera would fix this.
62	Shepherds Hill	Object	1. Emergency service use this road, so speed humps will slow them down. 2) Speed humps increase air pollution. 3) Proposed refuge island is too close to the roundabout and could well cause road traffic accidents. 4)_Proposed speed humps at #68 Shepherds Hill is TOO CLOSE to entrance and exit of block to easily navigate around.
29	Shepherds Hill	Support	Great proposal. It's an unsafe road because of speeding cars - danger for children as Highgate Woods school is just around the corner
26	Shepherds Hill	Support	
37	Shepherds Hill	Support	Strongly support this. I will feel a lot safer getting in and out of my car.
51	Shepherds Hill	Object	Object to speed humps except at the junction with Montenotte Rd. I support the refugee island and the 20mph roundels.
55	Shepherds Hill	Support	I'm in favour of having humps as there is a problem with speeding vehicles here. However I think there are an excessive number of humps which may lead to excessive acceleration and breaking and creating more emissions from fuel exhaust, as well as brake and tyre particles which would make air quality worse. Maybe have enough humps to stop drivers treating the road as a race track.
31	Shepherds Hill	Support	
61	Shepherds Hill	Support	Too many drivers speed down the road, so it's dangerous at times. Please can you use low impact speed humps that cause less noise on impact and don't make drivers slow down so much that they then accelerate again very rapidly - with even mor increased engine noise. in what is a quiet residential area.
47	Shepherds Hill	Support	

18	Shepherds Hill	Support	It is an extremely difficult road to cross because some cars speed. Cyclists also speed downhill and are a hazard. It would help if they were more visible.
53	Shepherds Hill	Object	Please reconsider the number of humps. There are far too many and not well placed. Nos 1 and 22 need removing. No 14 obstructs access to buildings and is too close to the bus stop.
72	Shepherds Hill	Support	I live on Shepherds Hill, but don't seem to have received a paper copy of the scheme proposals through my door. Nevertheless, I support the proposed improvements in road safety, although the proposed speed bumps need to be located so that they do not interfere and clash with the W5 bus hail and ride stops, one of which is in front of Fitzroy Court, 57 Shepherds Hill, and thus impede access to / exit from the bus, particularly for less able-bodied passengers. There may be other hail and ride locations along Shepherds Hill & Wolseley Road where this also occurs. Perhaps speed cameras could be installed in conjunction with speed bumps? Particularly as the existing 20mph light-up signs are not particularly useful, and do not prevent speeding.
44	Shepherds Hill	Object	No need for humps on this hilly road.
79	Wolseley Rd	Support	I would like to respond to the proposed road safety improvements by firstly saying how pleased I am that this will be happening on my street. In fact I would like to see stronger measures for road safety put in place across Crouch End. I have lived on Wolseley Road since the 1980s and over the past five years the volume and speed of traffic has increased to an alarming degree. I know that this is something that the proposed measures will begin to deal with, but I really hope this is just a start to a larger implementation across Crouch End, which has become a real traffic pinch point. I am a cyclist and would absolutely love to see more cycle lanes, cycle routes and cycle road signs in Crouch End. I am very pleased that there will now be some cycle signs on my street and this must improve across the whole local area to increase safety and encourage more cycling. I would also be keen for the idea of an LTN to be introduced to the Crouch End area, car traffic needs an overall reduction and this I believe would be a way to do so. Thank you for your time and I hope that the safety improvements are put in place soon

68	Wolseley Rd	Support	<p>I wish to wholeheartedly support the scheme proposed which is necessary following years of speeding issues and accidents on the area covered. I would also like to reaffirm that that this consultation should take in to account the 400+ petition signers that I submitted in support of road safety improvements along these roads (as well as the crossing on Wolseley Road). I wish also to highlight some specific point of consideration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The roads form part of the W5 bus route (hail and ride section, and I would ask that the council engages with the bus provider about any changes and takes their views in to consideration. I would also request that officers observe the routine drop off and pick up points, particularly the one by the junction with Stanhope Hope, and ensure that the introduction of the island at this point does not lead to the potential for vehicles to try to overtake stationary buses on the other side of the road, across the island and then across the roundabout which could lead to a significant incident with vehicles exiting Stanhope Road. If necessary the bus operator should be informed about ensuring they pull in away from possible islands -</li> <li>- Wolseley Road has a significant gradient and carries a number of lorries and HGVs (despite being a residential road). It is important to ensure that the gradient of any speed bumps/tables, when added to the existing gradient do not cause a gradient over the road standards and that they can be traversed safely without any grounding which can cause significant noise and vibrations. This is particularly important for the w5 bus which has a low bed and could easily ground on speed bumps when going up or down hill here. The issue currently happens with the 184 single decker bus on Albert Road / Alexandra Park Road which has caused many issues from residents.</li> <li>- That no parking is displaced as part of the measures (a separate TMO would be required)</li> <li>- That the location, height and gradient of speed bumps take in to account the location and therefore proximity of residential properties as well as best practice design/standards to ensure there are no issues with additional noise/vibrations from vehicles (particularly vans/lorries etc) traversing them.</li> <li>- That any new speed bumps do not introduce drainage issues with water pooling in front of them, or running on to the pavement</li> <li>- That best practise for cycle routes is considered with the implementation of the speed bumps given new cyclist signs will be painted on the road and it's a key cycle route to Highgate Station. Cyclists should be given design consideration. I also wish to request the following:</li> <li>- That further islands are considered around the mini roundabout at the junction with Stanhope Road to encourage vehicles to slow down and improve crossing facilities. Drivers going straight across the roundabout in both directions rarely treat this as a roundabout and do not slow down to go across the junction, instead driving across the roundabout (as it's just painted). Safety measures should be introduced to ensure this is treated as a junction as accidents have happened here previously</li> <li>- That consideration is given for the roundabout junction to be reassessed and potentially changed</li> </ul>
----	-------------	---------	--

			to a built up roundabout to slow vehicles down (in reference to my point above). - That the current informal island crossing near Priory Gardens on Shepherds Hill are changed to zebra crossings like the one by the junction with Coolhurst Road, to improve pedestrian safety. - That additional zebra crossings are introduced along Shepherds Hill between the existing one at the junction with Wolseley and the junction with Archway Road
	Wolseley Rd	Other view	I would support the installation of speed humps, but I think that what we really need are speed cameras. Some drivers use Shepherds Hill / Wolseley Road as a speed track, and the only thing that will stop them is the threat of a speeding fine. There are still so many drivers who see the 20mph signs as 'advisory', they do not take them seriously at all. I would also say that speed bumps will not stop them from driving on the wrong side of the road as they come around the bend where Shepherds Hill becomes Wolseley Road. We have been told that speed cameras will not be installed until a 'serious accident' has occurred - are you actually waiting for someone to be killed? I cannot understand this logic at all. Do the two incidents of cars flipping onto their sides in the last year, and the woman with her young son in the front seat crashing into and demolishing the front wall of the house opposite mine on Wolseley Road in December not count as serious accidents? What will it take?
46	Wolseley Rd	Other view	I'm in favour of road safety improvements having lived here for many years and witnessed several accidents at the top end of Wolseley Rd. Speed humps do however need to be carefully constructed, otherwise they cause noise and disruption. Why not put in speed cameras?
60	Wolseley Rd	Support	
39	Wolseley Rd	Support	Improve signage as well as new safety measures including speed humps. Some sort of crossing further down Wolseley Rd could be beneficial. There are limited safe places to cross what is a long stretch of road.
36	Wolseley Rd	Object	I cycle and think that speed humps are extremely dangerous for cyclists, as cars accelerate and break hard between the humps. I would support a scheme as on Cranley Gdns where humps are 'painted' etc which don't impact cyclists. I suggest the money is spent elsewhere in the borough supporting hungry families.
38	Wolseley Rd	Other view	Ensure speed humps cannot be bypassed by motor-cyclists.
81	81	81	81