

Report for: Head of Service for Highways and Parking following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Tackling Inequality and Resident Services

Title: Proposed Speed Reducing Measures on Perth Road, N22

Report authorised by: Simi Shah, Group Manager Traffic and Parking
Simi.Shah@haringey.gov.uk

Report Author: Danny Gayle, Traffic Engineering Manager
Danny.Gayle@haringey.gov.uk

Johann Alles, Senior Engineer
Johann.Alles@haringey.gov.uk

Ward(s) affected: White Hart Lane / Woodside

**Report for Key/
Non-Key Decision:** Non-Key Decision

1 Describe the issue under consideration

- 1.1 To determine if the proposed speed reducing measures on Perth Road should be implemented, following the completion of a statutory consultation exercise.

2 Cabinet Member Introduction

- 2.1 N/A

3 Recommendations

The Head of Highways and Parking following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Tackling Inequality and Resident Services is asked to:

- 3.1 Consider all feedback, including objections, to the statutory consultation exercise carried out from 5 March to 2 April 2025 set out in Appendix D, on the proposals outlined in **Appendix A together with officer's views regarding that feedback set out in paragraph 8.2** of this report.
- 3.2 Agree that the council shall exercise its discretion to not cause a public inquiry to be held for the reasons set out in paragraph 8.3 of this report.
- 3.3 Approve the implementation of the proposed speed reducing measures on Perth Road, as set out on the plan in Appendix A and the making of all necessary traffic management orders (TMOs) to enable the proposed measures to be implemented.

4 Reasons for decision

- 4.1 The Council as a local authority has a duty under Section 39 of the Road Traffic Act 1988 to prepare and carry out a programme of measures designed to promote road safety and carry out studies into accidents arising out of the use of vehicles and must in the light of those studies, take such measures to prevent such accidents. The proposals consulted upon will help reduce vehicle speeds and improve road safety for all road users, which will assist in reducing personal injury collisions.
- 4.2 The decision does not result in a contract being awarded or expenditure in excess of £500,000 being incurred nor any virements, so it is not a key decision for that reason.

- 4.3 The decision is also not a key decision because the scheme will not result in significant impact on communities living or working in the White Hart Lane / Woodside wards, in particular, the decision will not result in substantial public interest/significant social, economic or environmental risk.

5 Alternative options considered

- 5.1 Do nothing: This option was rejected as it would not deliver an improvement to road safety and so the Council would not be discharging its duty under section 39 of the **Road Traffic Act 1988** to “promote road safety”.

6 Background Information

- 6.1 Haringey Council regards road safety, particularly pedestrian safety, as a high priority and actively promotes road safety measures across the borough to reduce vehicle speeds, the number of road traffic accidents and to enhance the environment for all road users.
- 6.2 The Road Danger Reduction Action Plan and Investment Plan supports the Mayor’s London-wide ambition to reach ‘Vision Zero’, by having no killed or seriously injured (KSI) casualties on Haringey’s roads by 2041; and supports the Council’s own ambition to reduce all casualty types (KSIs and ‘slight’ injuries) with specific attention to vulnerable road users, including motor cyclists.
- 6.3 Officers investigated the collision data for 3 years up to 30/11/2023 on Perth Road, which revealed that there were 5 recorded road traffic collisions, which resulted in slight injury to 2 pedal cyclists, 1 pedestrian, 1 driver and 2 passengers (6 casualties in total).
- 6.4 Following concerns from the local community, including Ward Councillors, about perceived high speeds of traffic and dangerous driving on Perth Road, a consultation exercise was carried out in 2021 on proposals to introduce road humps along Perth Road. Although the majority were in favour of the proposals, a substantial number of those not in favour, raised concerns that historically round top speed humps were installed and subsequently removed due to the noise, vibration, and structural issues experienced to their properties. The proposals were therefore placed on hold, until further engagement with the community was conducted.
- 6.5 Officers subsequently liaised with the Ward Councillors and resident representatives and produced two options to reduce vehicular speeds and improve road safety on Perth Road. The proposals included speed humps, however, unlike the previously installed humps, these are of a sinusoidal profile. This type of hump has a gentler than usual incline, which assists in reducing noise and vibrations, whilst effectively reducing traffic speeds.
- 6.6 An informal public consultation exercise was undertaken between 3 July and 24 July 2024, putting forward two options. The key interventions on both options are listed below:

Option 1

- Provision of a new sinusoidal junction table (road hump built across a junction) at the junction of Perth Road and Fife Road
- Provision of a new sinusoidal junction table at the junction of Perth Road and Paisley Road
- Provision of kerb buildouts and ‘at any time’ loading restrictions at the junction of Perth Road and Paisley Road to improve visibility

- New and upgraded traffic signs.

Option 2

- Provision of new sinusoidal road humps on Perth Road
 - **Provision of kerb buildouts and ‘at any time’ loading restrictions at the junction** of Perth Road and Paisley Road to improve visibility
 - New and upgraded traffic signs.
- 6.7 The Council received 73 responses during the public consultation period, 24 (33%) in support of Option 1, 42 (58%) in support of Option 2 and 7 (9%), who did not express a preference / preferred to leave the road as it is.
- 6.8 In view of the majority support, it was recommended that Option 2 (as outlined in point 6.6 and Appendix A) be progressed to statutory consultation.
- 6.9 The total cost of the scheme is £120,000 and funding is assigned through the agreed capital programme.
- 6.10 In accordance with the section 122 duty under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, officers have considered factors relevant to securing the expeditious, convenient, and safe movement of traffic, including pedestrians, and provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities having considered securing accessibility to premises, regulating and restricting the use of roads by heavy commercial vehicles, air quality objectives and facilitating the passage of public service vehicles. Officers consider that maintaining the safe and convenient movement of pedestrians along Perth Road are important factors that the proposals to introduce speed reducing measures on Perth Road will achieve.
- 6.11 The network management duty places a statutory duty on Local Authorities to secure **the “expeditious movement of traffic” on the road network; this** includes pedestrians and cyclists as well as traffic. The Council also has a statutory duty to improve road safety, and the measures proposed support both. It is the view of officers that these changes are essential to ensure the expeditious and safe movement of traffic.
- 6.12 While the proposal may potentially impact certain residents' human rights - such as Article 1 of the First Protocol (the right to peaceful enjoyment of possessions), Article 8 (the right to respect for private and family life, home, and correspondence), and Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination), the proposal accords with the law as the Council is permitted, under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, to restrict or regulate traffic.
- 6.13 The Council also pursues the legitimate aim of securing the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and pedestrian traffic which the proposed measures will achieve by providing safe access and use for pedestrians of Perth Road and is therefore considered proportionate

7 Consultation

- 7.1 Ward Councillors were informed about the proposals on 25 February 2025. No initial comments were received.
- 7.2 Notification documents were distributed to properties in the vicinity of the proposals on 5 March 2025. A copy of the statutory consultation document and plan is attached as Appendix A and a copy of the consultation boundary can be found in Appendix B.
- 7.3 On 18 March 2025, Councillor Anne Stennett requested that residents of Eldon Road should also be leafleted as part of the statutory consultation exercise, as she felt that

they would be potentially affected by the proposals. Officers agreed and an amended notification document was delivered to the residents on 24 March 2025, advising that responses would be considered if received by 2 April 2025. A copy of the revised statutory consultation document is attached as Appendix A1 and a copy of the consultation boundary can be found in Appendix B1.

7.4 The original **notification letter was uploaded on the Council's website. Legal notices** were placed on-street and in the local newspaper and London Gazette. A copy of the legal notice is attached as Appendix C which gave parties 21 days to make representations regarding the proposals in Appendix A as required by the **Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure)(England and Wales Regulations 1996 ("LATOR")**. As per 7.3, the statutory consultation process was extended by 7 days, which allowed all representations received by 2 April 2025 to be considered A copy of the legal notice and draft order together with the statement of reasons explaining why the Council has proposed to make the order was made available at its offices as required under LATOR.

7.5 As part of the statutory process, the following statutory bodies were also notified, some as required by LATOR:

- AA
- London Transport
- Police (local)
- Fire Brigade
- London Ambulance Service
- Freight Transport Association
- Road Haulage Association
- RAC
- Metropolitan Police (traffic)
- London Travel Watch
- Haringey Cycling Campaign

8 Responses to Consultation

8.1 The full consultation report from which table 1 was extracted, is attached as Appendix D.

Table 1 – Statutory Consultation Analysis

		Count	%
Support / Object	Support	25	71.43%
	Object	6	17.14%
	Other / no view	4	11.43%
	Total	35	100.00%

8.2 The Council received 35 responses during the statutory consultation period, 25 (71.43%) in support, 6 (17.14%) objections and 4 (11.43%) who had other views on the proposal. It should be noted that no grounds were provided for two of the objections and therefore cannot be considered as formal objections. The remaining four objections **have been analysed and summarised below together with officer's recommended response.**

8.2.1 Objection 1 – Various matters

'1. During walkabout on 09/11/2023 with councillor Anne Stennett & Council officers, the main complaints were to do with drivers speeding from White Hart Lane towards

Wood Green and losing control near the bend at Fife Road. Most of the crashes occur near this junction. I and other residents who live between Paisley & Fife have witnessed accidents and sometimes our vehicles have been totalled due to dangerous driving. The officers suggested a table extending outwards from Fife and Paisley. The officers did not suggest installing humps all the way down Perth so why did the Council give the option to install them? 2. Previous experience of road humps means that buses, delivery vans & SUVs do not slow down and consequently hit the humps at speed causing high vibration and damage to our property. There is no evidence that sinusoidal humps deter speeding cars - they were created to make it easier for cyclists to ride over. 3. If Haringey installs the humps near the junction of Fife (where my house is situated), and if there is damage to our homes (as in 2001), will the Council consider removing them? 4. Once humps are installed, the speeding drivers will divert to Paisley, Eldon, Stirling etc and they will become rat runs. Residents in those roads should have been consulted as there will be a knock-on effect. 5. We asked for a pedestrian crossing or chicanes at the bus stops NN & NJ as it is very dangerous for pedestrians getting on/off the buses. This was not added to either option. - PLEASE INSTALL "TABLES" ACROSS PERTH (AT FIFE & PAISLEY). - PLEASE CREATE A CROSSING FOR PEDESTRIANS BETWEEN THE 2 BUS STOPS NEAR PAISLEY. INSTALL HUMPS BETWEEN STIRLING & DUNBAR FOR THOSE RESIDENTS THAT WANT THEM. - PLEASE INSTALL 20MPH LIGHT-UP SIGNS ON EITHER SIDE OF THE JUNCTION WITH FIFE TO ALERT DRIVERS THEY ARE SPEEDING Thank you'

Officer Response

Following the site meeting in November 2023, officers provided Councillor Anne Stennett with two road safety proposed options for discussion. Following feedback, it was agreed that both options would be consulted upon at the initial public consultation stage which took place in July 2024. In view of the majority support for Option 2, the council agreed to proceed to statutory consultation.

Drivers who travel at higher speeds have less time to identify and react to what is happening around them. It takes them longer to stop, and if they are involved in a collision, it is more severe, causing greater injury to the occupants and any pedestrian or rider they may potentially hit.

Vertical deflections in the carriageway such as road humps are one of the most effective, reliable and cost-effective speed reduction measures currently available. The principle is that the traffic calming measures will slow vehicles down to speeds below **or at the limit, and in this way the 20mph limit becomes 'self-enforcing'**.

When considering the use of road humps, the Council relies on data provided by the Department of Transport, who commissioned the Transport Research Laboratory (TRL) to carry out track trials to assess the effects which road humps might have in generating ground-borne vibrations when vehicles are driven over them for a sustained period. The results were used to calculate minimum distances, which would be desirable for road humps to be sited from dwellings, according to different soil types.

The proposed humps have also been spaced to comply with the Highways (Road Humps) Regulations 1999 and Traffic Advisory Leaflet (TAL 2/96). Both publications provide guidance on the hump spacing to encourage motorists to drive at a constant

speed and discourage accelerating and braking between features which will also reduce noise and air pollution.

Moreover, the type of humps proposed have a sinusoidal profiled ramp which has a gentler than usual incline, which assists in reducing noise and vibrations whilst effectively reducing traffic speeds. It is acknowledged that ramps with a sinusoidal profile is preferred by cyclists.

The above study showed that even very minor hairline cracking should not occur unless the road humps are placed less than 2m from the dwelling (for London Clay soils type). The humps proposed adhere to the recommendations from this study. However, in the unlikely event that damage to properties occurs as a result of the road humps, the council would undertake measures which could include the removal of the offending hump(s).

As part of any new traffic calming scheme implemented in the borough, before and after speed surveys in selective adjoining roads will be undertaken to ascertain the potential impact of the proposed speed reduction scheme on Perth Road. Should traffic volumes and or vehicular speeds increase, then the council will explore the viability of introducing appropriate mitigation measures.

All comments provided during the public consultation stage are noted. A pedestrian crossing near bus stops NN and NJ would not be feasible due to the geometry of the road. Chicanes would result in the loss of parking and are not favourable to cyclists without the provision of cycle bypass lanes, resulting in the further loss of parking.

8.2.2 Objection 2 – Upgraded signage only

‘Upgrading road signs is OK but I strongly object to having any road humps put in’

Officer Response

The proposal includes upgrading of existing signage and new chevron signs, both of which are designed to highlight the bend on Perth Road (close to the junction with Fife Road). These measures are unlikely to significantly reduce the speed of approaching vehicles.

The speed at which a vehicle travels is a major factor in the level of danger it poses to other road users and the occupants themselves. Speed significantly increases the chance of severe injury or death in a collision, especially when the collision involves a vulnerable road user. The Royal Society for Prevention of Accidents reports states that there is a 1.5% chance of being fatally injured in a 20mph collision versus an 8% chance at 30mph.

Vertical deflections in the carriageway such as speed humps are one of the most effective, reliable and cost-effective speed reduction measures currently available. The principle is that the proposed traffic calming measures will slow vehicles down to speeds below or at the limit, and in this way the 20mph limit becomes ‘self-enforcing’.

8.2.3 Objection 3 – Install speed cameras

‘Much better to have speed cameras as that avoids the noise and vibration caused by speed humps’

Officer Response

Currently the council has no mechanism to install speed cameras in the borough without **Transport for London's (TfL's) input**. TfL has advised that they are currently undergoing a review of their process for assessing speed camera requests. Once this exercise is completed, they will then take on and review new requests. It should be noted that whilst speed cameras are a good speed reducing measure, they are only effective for particular sections of road, after which drivers may accelerate to inappropriate speeds.

8.2.4 Objection 4 – Road humps will negatively impact adjoining roads

'Increasing the number of road humps all the way down Perth Road, will only divert all the traffic down Paisley Road onto Eldon Road and then back to Lordship Lane (as motorists will want to avoid the humps). Motorists already speed down Paisley and Eldon Road and this will only make the situation worse and increase traffic flow for those who live on these roads. In addition, the proposed kerb build out on an already narrow road junction with limited visibility, will only make it that much harder to drive into and out of Paisley Road from Perth Road, increasing the chances of collisions'

Officer Response

As part of any new traffic calming scheme implemented in the borough, before and after speed surveys in selective adjoining roads will be undertaken to ascertain the potential impact of the proposed speed reduction scheme on Perth Road. Should traffic volumes and or vehicular speeds increase, then the council will explore the viability of introducing appropriate mitigation measures.

The proposed kerb build out at the junction of Paisley Road and Perth Road is designed to improve visibility for drivers exiting Paisley Road and will not reduce the carriageway width of Paisley Road. The proposed road humps on Perth Road alongside the provision of the kerb build outs and loading restrictions, will greatly improve road safety at the junction.

8.3 It is noted that the Local Authorities Traffic Orders Procedures (England and Wales) **Regulations 1996 ("LATOR") sets out when local authorities should hold a public inquiry** and when it has the discretion of whether or not to hold a public inquiry prior to the making of a TMO. Whilst the order does prohibit loading/unloading at the junction of Perth Road and Paisley Road, the total reduction in loading at this location is of a length that shall not be taken to have the effect of prohibiting loading at any time and so there is no *obligation* to hold a public inquiry for that reason as set out under 9(4)(b) LATOR. In addition, the order does not prohibit or restrict the passage of public service vehicles, and so there is no *obligation* to hold a public inquiry for that reason as well, but the Council has a discretion whether or not to do so.

8.4 This report does not include the recommendation to hold a public inquiry on account of the above, and that the project will contribute towards improved safety and road danger reduction and that holding a public inquiry would lead to expense and delay while being unlikely to alter the ultimate decision.

9 Contribution to the Corporate Delivery Plan 2024-2026 high-level strategic outcomes

9.1 The installation of speed reducing measures on Perth Road will support the delivery of **the Council's Road Danger Reduction Action Plan** action, by reducing vehicular speed and improving road safety. It will also support the delivery of the Councils' wider [Transport Strategy](#), encouraging walking, reducing speed, encouraging cycling as road users will feel more confident and safe.

Theme 1: Resident experience and enabling success

- Positive Resident Experience
- Inclusive Public Participation

Theme 2: Responding to the Climate Emergency

- A Greener and Climate Resilient Haringey
- A Just Transition
- A Low Carbon Place

Theme 3: Safer Haringey

- Improved road safety for all road users

10 Carbon and Climate Change

10.1 The scheme will help contribute positively to carbon emission reduction and mitigate climate change in the following ways:

10.1.1 Improving road safety: Improving road safety through reduction in motor vehicle speeds. This will reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

10.1.2 Reducing motor vehicle speeds: This may encourage switch to other active modes as the journeys undertaken by motor vehicle might increase for those not adhering to the speed limit.

Statutory Officers' comments

11 Comments of the Chief Financial Officer

11.1 This report seeks the approval for the implementation of the proposed speed reducing measures on Perth Road for a total cost of £120,000 which will be funded through the agreed Council Capital Programme.

12 Comments of the Assistant Director of Legal and Governance

12.1 Traffic calming measures involving the installation of road humps can be installed under section 90A of the Highways Act 1980 provided they comply with the Highways (Road Humps) Regulations 1999. Introducing restrictions on loading and unloading on the **Council's road network** is authorised under section 6 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.

12.2 Before restrictions on loading and unloading are implemented, the Council must undertake a consultation in accordance with the LATOR which is explained in section 7 of this report.

12.3 When a consultation has been undertaken the Council must take into account the representations received in response to that consultation when taking a decision. The consultation responses received are sent out in Appendix D to this report and **officers'** consideration of the same set out in paragraphs 8.2.1 to 8.3.4 of this report which must be taken into account before the decision whether to implement the speed reduction measures /make the necessary TMOs is taken. A judgment is to be exercised as to how much weight each representation should carry and whether or not to approve any of the measures in the proposals in light of those representations.

- 12.4 The Courts have held that a decision maker must consider consultation responses with 'a receptive mind' and be prepared to change course if persuaded by a response, but is not under a duty to adopt the views of consultees.
- 12.5 The factors which have pointed in favour of introducing speed reducing measures on Perth Road when considering the section 122 duty under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 are set out in paragraph 6.10 of this report and how the expeditious movement **of traffic on the Council's road network will be achieved is set out in** the paragraph 6.11 of this report.
- 12.6 **The impact of the decision on persons' human rights is considered to be proportionate** as set out in paragraph 6.12 of this report and therefore lawful.
- 12.7 The decision to approve the introduction of speed reducing measures on Perth Road is an executive decision that can be exercised by the Head of Highways and Parking in **accordance with the Council's Constitution and delegation given by the Director of Environment and Resident Experience** in this scheme of delegation dated 14 October 2024.

13 Equality Comments

- 13.1 The council has a Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) under the Equality Act (2010) to have due regard to the need to:
- **Eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation and any other conduct prohibited under the Act.**
 - **Advance equality of opportunity between people who share protected characteristics and people who do not.**
 - **Foster good relations between people who share those characteristics and people who do not.** The three parts of the duty apply to the following protected characteristics: age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy/maternity, race, religion/faith, sex and sexual orientation. Marriage and civil partnership status applies to the first part of the duty. Although it is not enforced in legislation as a protected characteristic, Haringey Council treats socioeconomic status as a local protected characteristic.
- 13.2 The decision outlined in this report is approve the installation of sinusoidal speed humps on Perth Road, as outlined in Appendix A.
- 13.3 A statutory consultation opened on 5 March 2025, with relevant documents (see Appendices A-C) distributed to all households and businesses within the vicinity of the proposals.
- 35 responses to the consultation were received, with 25 (71.43%) in support of the proposals, 6 (17.14%) against and 4 (11.43%) who had other views.
 - Of the 6 objections were raised. Of these, 5 related to concerns around the impact of the proposals on adjacent properties and the effectiveness of speed humps relative to other measures.
 - One response indirectly related to the potential effects on groups with protected characteristics. This response argued that the speed humps would increase

congestion, noise and pollution on Perth Road. These issues can disproportionately affect some groups with protected characteristics.

- Officers have responded by highlighting that the proposal design includes traffic calming features which achieve uniformity of speed, reducing the disturbance caused by breaking and accelerating and so limiting noise and air pollution. To reduce noise and vibrations further, the proposed speed humps will have a sinusoidal profile which has a gentler than usual incline.

13.4 Due consideration has been given to the impacts the decision will have on groups with protected characteristics:

- **Age:** The decision will have a positive impact on the road safety of certain age groups, namely children and the elderly, by reducing traffic speeds. For the 11% of White Hart Lane residents who are aged 65+ (Haringey Ward Profiles, 2024), this will reduce the likelihood of their potentially slower mobility preventing them from crossing the road safely. Likewise, by ensuring that drivers slow down, children are at less risk of harm if they step out into the road unsupervised.
- **Disability:** The traffic calming measures proposed in this report could benefit the of 16% White Hart Lane residents who are disabled (Haringey Ward Profiles, 2024), particularly those in wheelchairs. This is because the risk of a traffic accident causing physical harm is dramatically reduced when vehicle speeds are lower.
- **Sex:** On average, women spend a higher proportion of their time caregiving to children than men (ONS Census, 2021). Therefore, the positive effect of the crossing **on children's road safety** will have positive implications for women.
- For other groups with protected characteristics, this decision will have a neutral impact.

14 Use of Appendices

- Appendix A – Statutory consultation letter and plan
- Appendix A1 – Statutory consultation letter for Eldon Road
- Appendix B – Consultation Boundary
- Appendix B1 – Consultation Boundary including Eldon Road
- Appendix C – Legal Notice
- Appendix D – Full consultation report

15 Background Papers

- None