

Link and QR code to online form:

<https://online1.snapsurveys.com/9t93lx>



Results of Public and Statutory Consultation:

		Count	%
Support or Object	Support	3	75%
	Object	1	25%
	Other view	0	0%
	Total	4	100%

Comments & any reasons for objections

Case Summaries^a

	Road name & house / flat no	Support or Object	Any other comments.
1	150 Rivulet road n17	Support	I strongly agree with this plan because my child goes to secondary school crossing Perth Road every day. I worry a lot because that way is very dangerous for children - no traffic lights, no zebra crossing I'm so happy about this plan. Thanks.
2	White Hart Lane 200	Support	
3	Perth Rd 157	Support	Renew paving stones and overhaul pathways.
4	Perth Road	Object	<p>Met Police:</p> <p>I am very concerned about the placement of this crossing so close to the junction mouth on such a busy turning. I believe Perth Road is 20mph and, if so, TSM Chapter 6 lays out a Recommended Stopping Sight Distance of 22m for an 85th percentile of 20mph. This crossing doesn't meet that distance for vehicles turning in from White Hart Lane. Looking at Streetview; both the park and the property on the east corner have trees very close to the border of their respective boundaries and there is also a sign post and telegraph pole on the east footway. None of this helps "inter-visibility". Additionally, the tactile layout shown does not meet the guidance. The MPS does not support this proposal.</p> <p>Met police further email following site meeting with Council officers:</p> <p>Thanks for the new plans. Although the crossing is more or less in the area we discussed at the scene it is still fairly close to the junction. It does look like a better sight line for the bus drivers and, hopefully, safer, but this is something that we can assess on the stage 3. I have no objection to this new layout.</p>
Total	4	4	4

a. Limited to first 100 cases.