

Feedback Categories	Order Support
Parking, Traffic	Partly Support
Parking, Financial	Partly Object
Parking, Financial, Environmental	Object

Parking, Traffic, Safety, Access, Disturbance, Financial, Environmental, Other	Object
Parking, Traffic	Partly Object

Traffic,Safety	PartlySupport
Parking,Traffic,Safety,Access	Support
Traffic,Safety,Access	Support
Safety	Object
Safety,Access,Disturbance,Other	PartlyObject

Feedback Text

Dear Ann, many thanks for sending the Bus priority and zebra crossing proposal regarding Fortis Green where [REDACTED].

I agree with the above particularly with points A, B and C concerning the removal of 2 uncontrolled parking spaces and the wide zebra crossing instead of the existing refuge island.

However as I work from home every working afternoon day I can see that the main problem of this Fortis Green sector is the congestion as shown in the enclosed picture, in the part of the road just after the Muswell Hill Club, facing the shops.

This is due to the parking of cars on both side of the road which make impossible for the buses to come along together.

While I think parking on shops side should be maintained as it is useful for groceries suppliers etc., I believe that the Eastbound bus stop (D) may be moved forward after the Muswell Hill Club in the area where there are now 4 parked cars.

The total reduction of parking lots would be the same as 2 or 3 more cars may be parked in the area of the current Eastbound bus stop but you would reduce the problems for buses and traffic.

There are no clear benefits in the proposal and clear disadvantages. I can understand the removal of parking spaces immediately prior to the westbound bus stop, southern side of the road, where buses might struggle to turn to the stop. However, I don't see any benefit in building a zebra crossing and moving the eastbound stop. There is already another zebra crossing about 100 m east between Leaside Mansions and Twyford Court. Another zebra will unnecessarily impede traffic. Moving the eastbound stop will result in a loss of another parking space, which are very limited along and around Fortis Green, and hurt local businesses. All of these changes are an additional expense for the council and residents. Due to this, I am neutral to the removal of parking prior to the westbound bus stop and against the zebra crossing and moving the eastbound stop.

I am writing to formally object to the current proposals on the following grounds:

* Redundancy and Waste: There is an existing, functional zebra crossing just meters away that safely serves Fortismere students and residents daily. Installing a second crossing in the same block is an unnecessary and poor use of public funds.

* Economic Harm: Removing parking spaces will directly damage local independent businesses that rely on short-stay trade. At a time when the council should be supporting small businesses, this plan creates an avoidable barrier to their survival.

* Residential Impact: The plan offers no solution for displaced resident parking in an area already heavily restricted, unfairly penalising those who live here.

Basis for proposal

This is a total waste of public funds. I pay council tax to support my local area and residents not to have my hard earned money wasted.

This proposal is harmful for local business and pointless.

There are not frequent accidents to any vehicle or pedestrians in this area.

There is no basis for this proposal.

Zebra Crossing

There already is a zebra crossing within the same block a few metres away. I live [REDACTED] and see all the students going to and from Fortismere school using that one every day. Another zebra crossing is completely unnecessary.

Removal of parking spaces

Removing all those parking spaces will impact on the local businesses there that rely on through traffic for trade. I frequently see people park there to use those businesses. Haringey is supposed to support local independent business not restrict it especially in these difficult financial times.

One of which is a gym, isn't Haringey supposed to support residents attempting to get and maintain fitness for health and well being?

Where will local residents park with the restricted zones all around?

Solution

Surely the cheapest and most effective response would be to remove the traffic island instead?

This would encourage pedestrians to use the existing zebra crossing.

It would also allow buses more space.

Alternatively move the bus stop as planned but do not install yet another zebra crossing so close to

Dear Sir or Madam,

I am writing in response to the statutory consultation regarding the proposed changes on the A504, including the relocation of the bus stop and the introduction of a new zebra crossing east of Midhurst Avenue.

Bus stop relocation

I support the relocation of the bus stop in principle. However, I am concerned that the proposal results in the removal of three existing kerbside parking spaces on a residential stretch of road where uncontrolled parking is already extremely limited. The loss of these spaces will have a direct impact on residents.

I therefore request that the council considers appropriate parking mitigation, such as reallocating or freeing up an equivalent number of resident parking spaces within the immediate vicinity, to offset the loss created by the scheme.

Proposed zebra crossing

I object to the installation of an additional zebra crossing east of Midhurst Avenue to replace the existing pedestrian refuge island.

While the consultation describes the current refuge island as substandard and narrow, it does not adequately justify the need for an additional zebra crossing at this location given that a zebra crossing already exists approximately one block away, closer to Fortismere School. This existing crossing already provides a safer, controlled crossing point and is more conveniently located for students travelling to and from the school.

The consultation states that students currently use the refuge island to cross the road; however, no evidence is provided as to why the existing zebra crossing is insufficient or why it cannot adequately serve this demand. Without such evidence, the introduction of a second zebra crossing in such close proximity appears unnecessary.

Traffic, bus movement, and residential amenity

The installation of two zebra crossings so close together is likely to result in vehicle queuing

I fully support to add an additional zebra crossing in the area as it improves in particular safety of teenagers crossing the street. Road traffic is high and cars parked on the side reduce visibility for people crossing the street.

Since there is already a zebra crossing 20-30m ahead on Fortis Green I wonder whether it would

It is extremely useful to have a zebra crossing. I have two kids and always find it very dangerous to cross the road because there are cars parked on the side of the road blocking the view of

The proposed zebra crossing will make crossing this busy road much safer. The traffic is heavy along Fortis Green and speed limits aren't always observed.

There are significant issues with speeding on this road, as well as traffic not stopping at the existing zebra crossing. There are a lot of elderly people in the area as well as a high number of children from both Fortismere primary and secondary. [REDACTED] opposite the current zebra crossing and near daily there is a pedestrian hit. The only thing which leads to a slow down of traffic is the fact that the buses slow things down as does the informal crossing and cars using the allocated parking

I support the main elements of the proposal and welcome the new safety measures; however, I object to the proposed re-siting of the current bus stop 6 metres to the west. The existing bus stop is located in the centre of a residential block where the pavement is already narrow and frequently becomes congested with people waiting, blocking an auxiliary pathway for residents. It is also a source of noise disturbance from passengers late in the night. Moving the stop would significantly increase these already negative impacts for the following reasons:

1-The proposed location would obstruct one of the main entrances to the westside of a busy residential building, particularly at peak times when the bus stop is heavily used.

2-The relocation would compromise residents' security, as people waiting for buses frequently stray into our front garden area given how narrow the pavement is.

3-The new location would increase noise disturbance for residents particularly at night, as it would be closer to bedroom windows than the current location.

For these reasons, I strongly object to the proposed relocation and request that alternative locations

Thank you for consulting Haringey Cycling Campaign. As far as I can see there will be no change to the traffic island dimensions. Subject to this being the case I confirm HCC's support for the proposals.

Officer Response

The suggestion to relocate Bus Stop D further east, into the area currently used for parking, has been reviewed in principle. This option was not taken forward as it is not feasible. Relocating the stop would mean that a zebra crossing could not be provided at this location. Without the zebra crossing, pedestrians accessing the bus stop would need to cross the road at an uncontrolled point, which would increase safety risks for those boarding or alighting from the bus.

For these reasons, relocating Bus Stop D cannot be progressed.

The objection to the proposed zebra crossing and the relocation of the eastbound bus stop has been noted. A pedestrian crossing survey was undertaken at this location as well as at the existing uncontrolled crossing further west. While both locations experience pedestrian activity, the survey identified significantly higher pedestrian volumes at the proposed crossing point, including a substantial proportion of users under the age of 16.

In comparison, the survey at the uncontrolled crossing further west did not identify a need for any changes.

Based on the results at the proposed location, a signal-controlled crossing would ordinarily be recommended. To minimise the impact on traffic flow, a zebra crossing has instead been proposed. In order to install the zebra crossing, the eastbound bus stop would need to be relocated. Without relocating the stop, a zebra crossing cannot be provided. Without a formal crossing, pedestrians accessing the bus stop would continue to cross at an uncontrolled point, which presents a safety risk—particularly for younger users.

Redundancy of Crossing

A pedestrian survey was undertaken at the proposed site and the existing uncontrolled crossing further west. Although both locations are used, the proposed site recorded significantly higher pedestrian volumes, including many under-16s. Providing a formal crossing here addresses the point of greatest demand and improves safety on key school routes.

Impact on Local Businesses

Parking removal is required to provide statutory zig-zag clearways and ensure adequate visibility for a formal crossing. This is standard safety practice and supports the council's transport and parking strategy objectives, which prioritise pedestrian safety over kerbside parking retention. Pay for parking and permit holder bays remains available nearby.

Resident Parking Loss

While parking pressures are acknowledged, kerbside space must be reprioritised where necessary to deliver safety-critical infrastructure. Permit holders are entitled to park within the CPZ as a whole, and sufficient alternative capacity remains available. The safety benefits outweigh the localised loss

A serious injury collision near the uncontrolled crossing, together with pedestrian survey data showing significantly high pedestrian volumes at the proposed site, many of whom are under 16, supports installing a formal crossing at the point of high demand. This will improve safety on key routes and aligns with the Transport Strategy and Vision Zero aims.

Although a zebra crossing exists nearby, pedestrian movements are focused at the proposed location, and a formal facility here will reduce informal and unsafe crossing.

Active travel schemes are known to benefit local businesses, and the removal of parking is required to provide statutory zig zag clearways that ensure visibility. Pay by phone and permit bays remain available in the area.

Permit holders can park anywhere within the CPZ, and kerbside reallocation is necessary to deliver safety-critical infrastructure.

Removing the traffic island or relocating the bus stop alone would not address the high pedestrian demand or the collision risk. A formal crossing is the most effective measure.

The relocation of the bus stop and extending double yellow lines requires the removal of three parking spaces to maintain safe bus movements. Pay by phone and permit parking remains available in the area, and the wider CPZ provides sufficient capacity for residents.

The carriageway on Fortis Green is approximately 9 metres wide, which is narrow for an A-class road with parking permitted on both sides. Additional parking on this section would restrict vehicle movement and could prevent larger vehicles, including buses, from passing safely. Alternative parking is available on nearby side roads such as Midhurst Avenue, Fortis Green Avenue and Collingwood Avenue.

A serious injury collision near the uncontrolled crossing and pedestrian survey data showing significantly high pedestrian volumes at the proposed site, including many under 16, support installing a formal crossing at the point of high demand. This improves safety on key school routes and aligns with the Transport Strategy and Vision Zero aims.

Although a zebra crossing exists nearby, pedestrian movements are focused at the proposed location, and a formal facility here will reduce informal and unsafe crossing.

The spacing between the existing and proposed crossings meets design guidance and is not expected to cause vehicle queuing. A formal crossing at the point of highest demand provides more predictable conditions for traffic and supports bus reliability.

The existing zebra crossing serves a separate desire line and remains beneficial. Survey data confirms the greater need at the proposed site. Removing the existing crossing is not recommended.

The scheme responds to collision evidence and observed pedestrian behaviour. Parking removal is required to meet statutory safety requirements, and alternative parking remains available within the CPZ.

Two pedestrian crossing surveys were undertaken: one at the proposed location and one at the existing uncontrolled crossing further west near the former police station. While both locations recorded pedestrian activity, the proposed site showed significantly higher pedestrian volumes, including a substantial number of users under the age of 16. In contrast, the survey at the uncontrolled crossing further west did not identify a need for any changes at that location. Based on

The relocation of the bus stop will require the removal of three parking spaces to ensure safe bus movements. A serious injury collision near the existing uncontrolled crossing, together with pedestrian survey data showing very high pedestrian volumes at the proposed location, many of whom are under 16, supports the installation of a formal crossing at this point of high demand. This measure will improve safety on key routes and aligns with the Transport Strategy and Vision Zero

Due to a number of constraints, it is not feasible to place the bus stop in an alternative location. On-street parking, nearby junctions, and bus stops on the opposite side limit suitable options that meet required safety and operational standards.

A zebra crossing is also proposed at this location, supported by pedestrian survey data showing high footfall, including many users under 16. To install this crossing safely, the bus stop must be repositioned.

For clarity, the bus flag is not proposed to move 6 metres west. Current plans are to keep it in its existing position, subject to TfL approval.

HCC's comment was based on their understanding that the traffic island would remain unchanged. However, the concept design notes confirm that the existing 1.3m refuge will be removed and replaced with a 1.8m central island. This increase is necessary to meet current accessibility and safety standards for wheelchair users, pushchairs, and other vulnerable pedestrians. To accommodate the wider refuge, each carriageway lane will be reduced to 3.9m, which remains suitable for vehicle movements and does not create a pinch point for cyclists. The revised layout