

**Draft to The Executive****on 20 December 2005**

Report title: **St James's C of E Primary School- Safer Routes to School- Consultation (Non-Statutory)**

Forward Plan reference number: **2005/137**

Report of: **Anne Fisher, Director of Environmental Services**

Ward(s) affected: **HIGHGATE**

Report for: **Key decision**

### **1.0 Purpose**

- 1.1 To summarise feedback from the consultation process (non-statutory) carried out in September 2005 for the introduction of traffic calming measures along Woodside Avenue.
- 1.2 To seek approval to proceed to statutory consultation on proposals to introduce traffic calming as set out in paragraph 10.8 of this report.

### **2.0 Introduction by the executive member**

- 2.1 Haringey Council is committed to improving safety for children attending schools in the borough. School Travel Plans enable us to achieve this aim through the use of education, enforcement and traffic engineering solutions. A School Travel Plan is a document produced by a school, which outlines an action plan to make journeys to and from school safer and healthier. It aims to safety and increase levels of active travel by improving facilities for walking and cycling and thereby reducing travel by car. This report sets out the School Travel Plan developed by St. James's C of E Primary School and some of the issues highlighted as a result of feedback from the non statutory consultation carried out in September 2005.
- 2.2 Having listened to the public, it is clear that we shall also need to seek a solution to wider issues related to traffic management on Woodside Avenue. We shall enter into further consultation with residents to consider traffic calming measures along Woodside Avenue at a future date.

|   |
|---|
| <p><b>3.0 Recommendations</b></p> <p>3.1 It is recommended that the Executive:</p> <p>3.2 Note the feedback of the consultation process (non-statutory) and in particular the objections received.</p> <p>3.3 Agrees to proceed to statutory consultation on proposals to introduce traffic calming measures along Woodside Avenue, between Muswell Hill Road and the eastern arms of Lanchester Road/Fordington Road, as set out in paragraph 10.8 of this report</p> <p>3.4 Agrees to refer the final decision, whether or not to proceed with the proposals noted in recommendation 3.3 above, to the Executive Member for Environment in the event of objections arising from statutory consultation.</p> <p>3.5 Agrees not to proceed with the current proposals alongside Woodside Avenue, between its junctions with Lanchester Road and Fordington Road and to enter into further consultation with residents for alternative traffic calming measures along Woodside Avenue,</p> <p>3.6 Agrees to inform residents of the Council's decision and programme of works on site.</p> |
| <p><b>Report authorised by:</b> Anne Fisher, Director of Environmental Services</p>   |
| <p><b>Contact officer:</b> Tony Kennedy, Group Manager, Traffic &amp; Road Safety</p> <p><b>Telephone:</b> 0208 489 1765</p>  |
| <p><b>4.0 Executive summary</b></p> <p>4.1 This report analyses the feedback received during the consultation process for the introduction of traffic calming measures along Woodside Avenue. The measures were developed as part of the travel plan for St James's Primary School. Although the primary aim of the travel plan was to introduce the traffic calming proposals in the immediate vicinity of the school the proposed scheme however included measures for the whole length of Woodside Avenue.</p> <p>4.2 The consultation feedback confirms strong support for proposals in the immediate vicinity of the school however proposals for the whole of Woodside Avenue were not supported.</p>   |
| <p><b>5.0 Reasons for any change in policy or for new policy development:</b></p> <p>There is no change in policy</p>   |

## **6.0 Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985**

6.1 The following background papers have been used in the preparation of this report:

- St James's Primary School Travel Plan
- 2005/6 Highway Works Plan
- Consultation responses received within the consultation period
- Written representations received during the consultation period

## **7.0 Background**

7.1 The Government has set targets for every school to have a School Travel Plan (STP) by 2010. The Mayor for London has set additional targets for every school in London to have a STP by 2009.

7.2 A School Travel Plan is a document produced by the school, which proposes an action plan to make journeys to and from school safer and healthier. It aims to increase levels of active travel by improving facilities for walking and cycling and influence travel behaviour through training, education, marketing and promotion.

7.3 St James's Primary School submitted their STP to Transport for London in March 2005 and it was subsequently approved in July 2005. This enabled the council to secure funding from Transport for London, to investigate the traffic calming measures as proposed in the STP.

7.4 The STP identified a need for traffic calming measures in the immediate vicinity of the school. It also highlighted problems associated with speeding along Woodside Avenue. Local residents had historically raised this with the Council. It was therefore decided to address these issues in a holistic manner.

7.5 Preliminary designs were developed in June/July 2005 and consultation was conducted in September 2005.

## **8.0 Consultation Process**

8.1 Prior to engaging the local community Ward Councillors discussed the draft consultation document and agree consultation boundaries.

8.2 445 consultation documents, consisting of background information, location plan, questionnaire, translation sheet and pre-paid envelope were delivered, by hand, to all properties within the consultation area during the week commencing 29 August 2004. The closing date for responses was 23 September 2005. See Appendix I for consultation document and the area included in consultation.

- 8.3 A further 205 consultation documents were provided to St James's Primary School for distribution to parents.
- 8.4 An exhibition was held on the 13th September 2005 at the Treehouse School, Woodside Avenue between the hours of 5pm – 8pm. The exhibition gave local residents the opportunity to speak to Council Officers about the options offered prior to completing and returning their questionnaires. 62 members of the public attended the exhibition.

## **9.0 Consultation Feedback**

### **9.1 From the Consultation Area**

- 9.2 Of the 445 leaflets distributed to properties within the consultation area we received 143 responses. 16 were not acceptable for analysis purposes, as they did not have sufficient details. A further 8 were received after the due date. This left 119 valid responses, which represents a 27% response rate.
- 9.3 Of the 8 responses that were late. One is in favour of the proposals, 3 are opposed to the proposals and the remaining 4 are in favour of certain aspects of the proposed scheme only. It should be noted that 8 responses as discussed would not have greatly affected the overall majority of support or those opposed.
- 9.4 Of those who responded, 14 (12%) are in favour of the proposals, 62 (52%) are opposed to the proposals and the remaining 43 (36%) are in favour of aspects only. A road by road breakdown of results can be found in Appendix II.
- 9.5 Of the 14 in favour, 8 respondents came from Woodside Avenue, 3 were from Fordington Road, 2 were from Holt Close and 1 from The Drive.
- 9.6 Of the 63 opposed to the scheme, 20 respondents came from Woodside Avenue, 19 were from Fordington Road, 19 were from Lanchester Road and 2 respondents each came from The Drive and Holt Close.
- 9.7 A more detailed analysis of those opposed revealed that although they had ticked the objection box, they were not opposed to all aspects of the scheme particularly outside the school. Their main concern was the pinch points with flat top speed tables and the reduction in parking availability that would result.
- 9.8 Of 43 in favour of certain aspect of the proposal only, 15 were from Woodside Avenue, 13 were from Fordington Road, 10 were from Lanchester Road and 5 were from Holt Close. The main support was for the introduction of the zebra crossing outside the school. Most however wish to state their objection to the road narrowing and priority give way due to concerns over loss of parking and congestion. A number requested consideration of speed cameras.

## **9.9 Additional feedback from St James School.**

9.10 Of the 205 leaflets distributed to parents in St James's Primary School, 40 responses were received by the consultation deadline, which represented a 20% response. A summary of additional comments received can be found in Appendix II.

9.11 Of the 40 responses received, 15 (38%) of respondents were in favour of the scheme, 8 (20%) were opposed and 17 (43%) were in favour of certain aspects of the proposal only.

9.12 As with the agreed consultation area, most were in favour of the zebra crossing but opposed the road narrowing and priority give way due to concerns over congestion.

## **9.13 Additional letters received during consultation**

9.14 We received a further of 24 letters by 23 September 2005. All were letters from residents within the proposed zone. A full summary of comments raised from the letters is shown in Appendix II.

9.15 The Woodside Avenue Residents' Association (WARA) submitted a letter. They welcomed the zebra crossing, entry treatments and roundabout but were opposed to the pinch points and priority give-way. They suggested replacing the features with flat top speed tables.

9.16 The WARA also carried out a survey to gauge support for individual aspects of the scheme. The survey results reinforced their comments in their letter and highlighted that 'Nearly all respondents agreed that some traffic calming measures are desirable'. The response rate was 62% (47 of a possible 73) and the majority favoured selected aspects of the Councils proposal, notably the Zebra crossing (98% in favour) and 20 Mph measures and signing at both ends of Woodside Avenue (74% in favour). A majority was opposed to the pinch points (91% opposed) and the proposed priority give-way (67% opposed).

## **9.17 Comments from Emergency Services**

9.18 The London Fire & Emergency Planning Authority provided comments. They expressed favour for the scheme but stated that "access for fire engines must be maintained through any measures designed to reduce the road width and that speed humps/cushions must be so designed to allow for fire engines to pass with minimum delay. No comments were received from the Police.

## **10.0 Summary and response:**

10.1 On analysis of the responses, it is clear that there is a high level of support for the measures to be introduced in the immediate vicinity of the school. However there is a small majority opposed to the overall proposals to

include Woodside Avenue, between its junctions with Lanchester Road and Fordington Road.

- 10.2 The main area of concern focused on the road narrowing and priority give-way. It was felt that the proposals would result in congestion during peak hours, encouraging motorists to bypass the proposed pinch points by using Lanchester or Fordington Road. Concern was also expressed that parking availability along Woodside Avenue would be reduced.
- 10.3 It is agreed that the pinch points would reduce parking and that in the early stages of the proposed scheme there is likely to be some displacement onto Fordington Road and Lanchester Road during peak hours, as motorists adjust to the new road layout. It is not however anticipated that this will continue in the longer term. During the peak hours queuing occurs along Woodside Avenue as a direct result of the volume of vehicles seeking to exit Woodside Avenue onto the Great North Road and Muswell Hill Road. The pinch points will not result in extended queuing times but will regulate the speed and movement of traffic. During off peak hours when volumes of vehicles will be reduced, the features act as speed controls. However in view of the level of these concerns, it is felt that further consideration should be given to the section of Woodside Avenue between the eastern arms of Lanchester Road/Fordington Road.
- 10.4 The introduction of speed cameras as an alternative measure was a popular request. We work closely with the London Safety Camera Partnership (LSCP) to identify locations that would benefit from the introduction of speed cameras, subject to the current criteria.. A recent discussion with the LSCP has confirmed that Woodside Avenue does not meet current criteria and these are unlikely to be relaxed in the near future. It is not therefore be possible to consider Woodside Avenue for speed cameras at this stage.
- 10.5 There was a level of support for the introduction of further pedestrian facilities by Holt Close to provide access to children attending Tetherdown Primary School. This could be considered as an alternative option to the priority give-way as a centre refuge would also have the effect of narrowing the lane width and therefore reduce the potential to speed.
- 10.6 There was a mixed feeling regarding the proposed 20mph speed limits and the associated proposals that would be implemented to compliment the signs. Those that oppose a 20-mph zone feel the speed restriction will not be enforced and motorists would simply ignore the restrictions. Other residents in support consider the vehicular activated signs will be an effective deterrent to speeding motorists. The use of 20mph signs has been positively received in other areas of the borough although is agreed that enforcement does need to be improved, the presence of accompanying traffic calming however (i.e. junction treatments and flat-top speed humps) does increase the efficiency of the measures.

## **10.7 Conclusions**

- 10.8 In conclusion, the views expressed by respondents clearly shows that there is support for some form of traffic calming to be introduced. It is therefore recommended to introduce the 20mph Zone with entry road surfacing and signing, zebra crossing, vehicle-activated signs and mini roundabout, as set out in consultation document in the vicinity of the school.
- 10.9 In view of the inconclusive feedback regarding the traffic measures proposed between the eastern and western arms of Lanchester Road and Fordington Road on Woodside Avenue. There is not sufficient support to proceed with the proposals. The Council will however proceed with further consultation along this section of Woodside Avenue.
- 10.10 It is further recommended to consider an additional pedestrian facility to replace the proposed priority give-way and enter into further discussions with residents regarding measures for the section of Woodside Avenue between its junctions with Lanchester and Fordington Roads.

## **11.0 Recommendations:**

- 11.1 It is recommended that the Executive:
- 11.2 Note the feedback of the consultation process (non-statutory) and in particular the objections received.
- 11.3 Agrees to proceed to statutory consultation on proposals to introduce traffic calming measures along Woodside Avenue, between Muswell Hill Road and the eastern arms of Lanchester Road/Fordington Road, as set out in paragraph 10.8 of this report.
- 11.4 Agrees to refer the final decision, whether or not to proceed with the proposals noted in recommendation 3.3 above, to the Executive Member for Environment in the event of objections arising from statutory consultation.
- 11.5 Agrees not to proceed with the current proposals alongside Woodside Avenue, between its junctions with Lanchester Road and Fordington Road and to enter into further consultation with residents for the consideration of traffic calming measures along Woodside Avenue,
- 11.6 Agrees to inform residents of the Council's decision and programme of works on site.

## **12.0 Financial Implications**

- 12.1 Funding to the value of 120k is available from TfL as part of our 2005/6 Borough Spending Plan. This funding is however dependent on submitting the proposals to TfL for approval.

## **13.0 Equalities Implications**

13.1 The consultation document was distributed to all properties within the agreed consultation area.

13.2 The consultation document included a section offering the form in minority languages and also included a question to determine the ethnic origin of respondents. See Appendix IV for breakdown of ethnic origin of respondents.

#### **14.0 Comments of the Director of Finance.**

14.1 Environmental Services capital budget for 2005/06 contains a provision of £120k for the Woodside area traffic management scheme as part of the overall Safer Routes to School allocation from TfL Expenditure on this scheme must not exceed the budget provision.

#### **15.0 Environmental Implications**

15.1 There are no environmental implications resulting from this report. Any recommendations will be the subject to statutory consultation.

#### **16.0 Comments of the Head of Legal Services**

16.1 Before reaching a decision to make the necessary Traffic Management Order to implement a 20 mph zone and mini roundabout, the Council must follow the statutory consultation procedures pursuant to the Road Traffic Regulation Act ("RTRA") 1984 and the Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedure)(England and Wales) Regulations 1996. All objections received must be properly considered in the light of administrative law principles, Human Rights law and the relevant statutory powers.

16.2 Before introducing a zebra crossing the Council must consult the Police and give public notice of the proposal.

#### **17.0 Equalities implications**

17.1 The Consultation is seeking the views of all residents/businesses of an area and the leaflet offers translation facilities in community languages.

#### **18.0 Use of Appendices / Tables / Photographs**

- Appendix I – Consultation Documents
- Appendix II – Analysis of results



**Appendix I**  
**Consultation Documents**



**Appendix II**  
**Analysis of feedback and comments received.**

| <b>Woodside Avenue</b>   |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Excellent progress! However there must be a "slow down" sign at the other end of Woodside avenue. We need a 20-mph sign opposite no.1 Woodside Ave.</li> </ul>  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ I am in favour of the mini round about however I do not favour the pinch points. &amp; priority give way. Traffic is backed up from muswell hill if these things are implemented then there will be more traffic backed up in both directions.</li> </ul>   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ I pinch points will cause further congestion, I do not object to the other proposals</li> </ul>   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ I am against pinch points- Barnet council implemented pinch points and they are now removing them. The pinch points will add to congestion</li> </ul>   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ I do agree with the proposals but do think that speed cameras are better. In my opinion 20 mph with no cameras is just a waste of time.</li> </ul>  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Not in favour- loss of significant parking spaces, making entering and exiting driveways harder, changing the characteristics of Woodside Ave, causing more congestion in rush hours</li> </ul>   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ I agree with the 20-mph and the pedestrian crossing around the vicinity of the school. I strongly disagree with the pinch points</li> </ul>   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ All these traffic-calming measures have not made any provisions for a safe place for pedestrians to cross.</li> </ul>   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ I am only in favour of the St James School traffic plan. Traffic calming could be implemented by imposing restriction on traffic turning into Woodside sve at both ends (great north rd and muswell hill.</li> </ul>  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ I am only in favour of the proposals on the SCHOOL END of Woodside ave, no other.</li> </ul>  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Please help us to implement these proposals, as status quo would be a huge loss to all of us. The people who are vocal about this are just focused on the risk that their parking outside their property rather than the benefit of actually having the cars pass at the stipulated speed limits.</li> </ul>  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ I am concerned that the mini round about and particularly the build out will make it very difficult to drive my car into the road. I am 81 years old.</li> </ul>  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The scheme will increase congestion, road rage will ensue, prospects of drivers speeding up other times to be first through the pinch points, the proposals do not provide an safe crossings along the stretch of the road.</li> </ul>  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Woodside Avenue is a dangerous rd when vehicles use it at excessive speed. Some residents are opposed to the scheme some have indicated that they are opposed to many of the measures. The scheme has bee designed by those qualified to do so. The scheme is suitable for Woodside Ave and would meet the councils duty to provide safer routes for schools and people.</li> </ul> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Woodside avenue is a dangerous rd when vehicles use it at excessive speed. Some residents are opposed to the scheme some have indicated that they are opposed to many of the measures. The scheme has bee designed by those qualified to do so. The scheme is suitable for Woodside Ave and would meet the councils duty to provide safer routes for schools and people.</li> </ul> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ By introducing pinch points then there will cause back up onto Muswell hill</li> </ul>  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Oppose everything except for 20 mph signs and zebra crossing</li> </ul>   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ We cannot have single line traffic on this road!</li> </ul>   |

- I agree with all the proposals as a whole, particularly the priority give way reduced speed restrictions the pinch points & roundabout
- Traffic calming measures are needed on WA but should minimise the introduction of other problems, most of the proposals have nothing to do with safer routes to school
- It is essential to introduce speed-calming measure not just for the school but for residents.
- It is wrong to put double yellow lines in when some people don't have parking in the gardens.
- This seems a thoughtful scheme the key elements are to promote safety, I am not sure this is fully understood by residents. I am pleased that after so many years calming scheme is at long last with us.

### **Lanchester Road**

- We are opposed the proposed measures because, only the zebra crossing and 20 MPH addresses the problems. Also the mini roundabout and priority giveway are hazards and also increase the chance of traffic via dangerous rds on Lancaster and Fordington (blind bends and hill crests. Waiting restrictions on Woodside ave and Lancaster will only disperse parking into Fordington and Lancaster at the time the works are being developed.
- Worried that the proposal will cause Lancaster rd to become an escape route for cars and will cause traffic on woodside avenue especially during peak times. Traffic will disable emergency vehicles. Will cause parking and congestion problems.
- I do not feel these measures will reduce congestion, they may even increase it. St James school should ensure more of its pupils walk to school. This would reduce congestion.
- I am in favour of the mini roundabout, but otherwise not in favour of the proposal, I suggest the use of speed cameras or 20 mph on Woodside ave. What ever happens on Woodside avenue considerations should be made for the knock on effects on Lancaster Rd.
- Danger of causing rat run effect through Lancaster road
- I think that the speed table option is a wiser choice than the pinch points. My only objection. I do not think that parking in the road- woodside ave. is anything to be fought for. All the houses have drives. I think that the proposals will help not only St James school but also tetherdam school and the treehouse school and also the pupils of Fortismere.
- Pinch point and priority give ways are a waste of time and money. Standard speed humps would suffice and be cheaper. The round about is completely unnecessary, it would make better sense to put in this mini round about at the junctions of woodside avenue and the great north rd, where there has been many accidents already.
- Pinch points will encourage greater use of Lanchester road as a cut through to avoid them. The pinch points from great north rd are not effective to the roundabout at lancaster and fordington and form no value to the scheme as presente.Speed cameras will have better effect.
- A speed camera rather than pinch points

- Will create more traffic and then the mini- round about will cause rat runs down Fordington and Lancaster road. The best and more effective way to reduce the traffic is to introduce speed cameras
- Excessive measures that are not necessary- suggest a pelican crossing outside St james school
- It is obvious by introducing these pinch points, both Fordington and Lancaster rd will become alternative routes. Much of the Woodside avenue traffic is because PARENTS park their cars outside the school. The installation of a zebra crossing may reduce the number of cars being parked.
- The pinch points will cause drivers queue jump your scheme by racing through Lancaster and Fordington road. I do agree with the yellow lines.
- I agree with the zebra crossing by the school this will help more local children to walk to school rather than parents driving
- A flashing sign would and speed cameras are sufficient. Pinch points will cause drivers to divert into Lancaster and Fordington rd, children play on this road, so this will cause more danger than good.
- Flat top tables are better than pinch points, pinch points will cause rat runs on other roads.
- I agree with the 20-mph flat top speed tables, roundabout but the priority give and pinch points no.
- Speed cameras will help the situation rather than the measures proposed
- By all means have a pedestrian crossing and 20 mph signs but the rest isn't necessary and will cause more congestion in an already congested road

### **Fordington Road**

- I am in favour of most of the proposals except the priority give way. In principle it sounds good but knowing the level of traffic towards muswell hill when build occurs there will be congestion. I do not think pinch points would be fair on the woodside avenue residents.
- There is a danger of people racing down Lancaster and fordington road, there is already too much of that already.
- I am in favour of the proposals in the vicinity of St James school, I am not in favour of the rest of the proposals for woodside ave unless further measures be installed to avoid Lancaster and Fordington becoming a rat run. It already occurs and causes traffic to form in Great North Rd. Speed restrictions would be sufficient.
- We believe the "give way" would cause jams especially morning and late afternoon. Pinch points we believe would cause similar problems.
- The 20 mph and rd surfacing is drastic and unnecessary. 35 or 30 min. Mini round about again not necessary but could be useful at woodside/ great north road (or traffic lights). Give way is bad idea for traffic flow at busy times
- In favour of proposals but suggest place no right turns on grt north rd. which would help congestion, residents on lancaster and fordington rd will be concerned about traffic moving into the roads.
- all other aspects of the proposals I agree with bar the round about. This will not stop traffic.
- I am against the priority give way and pinch point measures because it will only slow down and build up traffic in the area. The other measures are welcome and should be sufficient.

- High risk areas Western rd, fordington rd and lancaster rd intersection with woodside the school, great north road intersection. All that is needed is a few speed bumps
- I am in favour of speed restrictions on Woodside Avenue, however my concern is the impact on traffic on the other roads. The proposals are overkill.
- Terrible proposals that will cause congestion, road rage and lateral flow of traffic down other roads
- not in favour of 20 mph should be 30, pinch points will only cause impossible traffic, spoiling environment, waiting restrictions will make parking worse
- Pinch points were unanimously rejected on a residents meeting 15th sept.
- I agree that the zebra crossing and the electronic speed sign. The rest I do not agree with
- There is two schemes here unacceptably merged into one. The proposals for the school is one scheme which are acceptable. The proposals for for woodside are unacceptable, the roundabouts directly affect me. There are many people who cross here and the roundabout will make things very difficult for mothers and children who cross here.
- To reduce traffic, DROP OFF POINTS should be sited in the great north rd and children escorted to & from the school. Ask local residents to volunteered for this duty. A lollipop person at each end of lancaster rd. Police cars and emergency vehicles must be able to go fast and buses often use woodside so therefore no speed humps, flat tops speed tables, pinch points or priority give way.
- How about a traffic light at the middle pinch point or a flashing red light or speed monitor. A camera would be even better
- ONLY agree with speed cameras, flashing lights, zebra crossing, speed control signs
- These measures are overwhelming for a residential area!
- double yellow lines are excellent idea on corners as at present impossible to see traffic in woodside when existing fordington lancaster because of parked cars.

**The Drive**

- We Disagree with the proposals we believe it will cause major congestion in woodside avenue in both directions with consequences of pollution and a detrimental effect on the efficiency of the emergency services. Will also result in traffic being diverted on other roads Rat runs! also the 20 mph is unrealistic.
- Will increase congestion along woodside, increase traffic on lancaster and fordington rds. Problem is better solved with a pedestrian crossing outside the school and speed cameras

**Holt Close**

- Pinch points will create fresh problems as they have repeatedly done at many other sites in Britain. Many of the other proposals are quite reasonable
- In favour of all proposals, suggestions- more vehicle activated signs along whole length of Woodside Ave. and speed cameras
- Pinch points will cause congestion in the morning and rush hour. Traffic backs up from great north rd and the pinch points will obstruct. The priority give way in the evening and rush hour traffic will also cause congestion

- If speed is a problem install speed cameras, the 20 mph should be around the school and not for the whole of Woodside avenue.
- We agree with the zebra crossing outside the school, we agree with the 20 mph signs. We want woodside avenue to be a 20 mph zone. Pinch points are a blight on the environment.
- Definitely not in favour of any measures that will increase congestion like priority give ways.
- The proposals are both inconvenient and excessive.
- 

**Summary of comments received from outside the consultation area**

- Only in favour of the rest of the zebra crossing
- I walk my children to school, however as a motorist I am deeply opposed to the suggestion of pinch points, humps and priority give ways. The traffic calming measures are unnecessary at each end of the schools. All that is needed is proper pedestrian crossings.
- The zebra crossing is especially a good idea
- I think there should be proper separate cycle lanes at pinch points
- As a parent and teaching assistant at St James school, the measures directly outside the school are essential but another problem is parking.
- Should the priority give way area not be put facing the opposite direction? Cars going from Muswell Hill Rd towards the Great North rd will already be travelling slowly with the zebra crossing I believe they should have priority over those going in the opposite direction. Who may not see the zebra around the bend.
- Superb layout, but too many pinch points (only 2 needed) waiting restrictions are totally unnecessary, why? You are just causing problems for relatives and residents
- I am in favour of nearly all proposals except for the priority give ways as this will cause even more congestion and traffic
- I think the proposals will only frustrate already impatient drivers. Once they past these speed tables they will only speed up again afterwards, so it is a waste of time and money.
- Please can we have a lollipop man or woman at the crossing as well.
- I think it sounds excellent, especially the zebra crossing
- The zebra crossing and the 20mph are long overdue and should help, however, the priority give way and pinch points seem certain to cause congestion. Woodside Avenue is used frequently by emergency vehicles and buses diverted of muswell hill road is closed. The points seem excessivley restrictive.
- I think the only resonable aspect of the proposals is the 20 mph signs at the junctions of grt north road & muswell hill. I think vehicle activated signs are horrific for local people to live with, the one on dukes avenue is hideous.
- It might help if there were traffic lights on the zebra crossing so children could go across in batches rather than in drips and drabs- Otherwise it looks like a really good plan.
- The proposals are good, however I wonder about the priority give way. There is already a lot of congestion this might make it worse. Queueing traffic is also very dangerous for children and it wil make it harder to cross the road.
- We have four young children, 2 of whom attend St James school on Woodside Avenue. We walk to school and we find the cars are driving much too fast for safety. Our eldest walks alone and a zebra crossing would give us piece of

|  |
|--|
| mind.  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ I agree with the 20mph signing, mini round about and zebra crossing. However in school time, cars don't tend to speed on woodside avenue as there is a lot of traffic. I think the priority give way &amp; pinch points would cause unnecessary delays and reduce parking in the area. For those of us who have to drive to school, there are already too many speed humps roundabouts etc. Rather than more expensive traffic calming measures, wouldn't it be cheaper and safer to employ a lollipop person at the relevant times?</li> </ul> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ I am not sure about 2 things. There will be less parking outside the school. As a priority give way in this area will affect parking spaces. Children &amp; parents cross this point , will be difficult to cross here. Mini round about cars turn at this point so will this be safe for cars goin back on themselves. Coming from school direction and turning to come back</li> </ul>  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ I am in favour of the zebra crossings, I am not in favour of a priority give way though because that will cause more traffic</li> </ul>   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ zebra crossing is long over due. I have been campaigning for years. Please if nothing else can we have a zebra crossing</li> </ul>  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ my only concern is the priority give way build out. There is a lot of congestion in the mornings. It can become grid locked. I am very concerned that this problem may increase the traffic and not allow the free flow away towards the great north road</li> </ul>  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Woodside ave, definitely needs a safe crossing. However I feel the pelican crossing with lights are safer than</li> </ul>   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ I am not in favour of the measures for woodside ave, Woodside avenue is a long established and important through route and should remain convenient for through traffic.</li> </ul>   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ In favour of the zebra crossing but not the mini round about pinch points on woodside avenue, priority give way.</li> </ul>   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ In favour of red surfacing, zebra crossing, slow road markings, pinch points, not in favour of priority give way, will cause congestion.</li> </ul>   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ In favour of the 20 mph round about and zebra crossing, however the reduction in parking is a concern</li> </ul>  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ I am in favour my only concern is about the implementation of waiting restrictions in the form of double yellow lines.</li> </ul>   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Not in favour of pinch points, will cause more congestion and the at present congestion lasts for short periods during drop off and pick up times after that it is fine. Traffic for loner periods is disconcerting that is a worse situation than what we currently have</li> </ul>  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ I am not infavour since there has been road closures, humps and other implementations the roads in north london has made traffic worse. We should go back to 1993 when I chose to live in Muswell Hill it was actually easier to get around</li> </ul>  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No mini roundabouts and pinch points speed humps are a waste of time will cause accidents as cars slow and speed up.</li> </ul>   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ I am in favour of the majority of proposals except the pinch points</li> </ul>  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |



## SAFER ROUTES TO SCHOOL - RESULTS

### Analysis of Results.

Responses from within the consultation area

Please indicate your preference.

|                 | In Favour | %          | Not in favour | %          | In favour of aspect only | %          | TOTAL      |            |
|-----------------|-----------|------------|---------------|------------|--------------------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Woodside Avenue | 8         | 19%        | 20            | 47%        | 15                       | 35%        | 43         |            |
| Fordington Road | 3         | 9%         | 19            | 54%        | 13                       | 30%        | 35         |            |
| Lanchester Road | 0         | 0%         | 19            | 56%        | 10                       | 23%        | 29         |            |
| The Drive       | 1         | 33%        | 2             | 67%        | 0                        | 0%         | 3          |            |
| Holt Close      | 2         | 22%        | 2             | 22%        | 5                        | 56%        | 9          |            |
| <b>Total</b>    | <b>14</b> | <b>12%</b> | <b>62</b>     | <b>52%</b> | <b>43</b>                | <b>36%</b> | <b>119</b> | <b>119</b> |

Summary of feedback from Letters received

|                 | In Favour | %         | Not in favour | %          | In favour of aspect only | %          | TOTAL     |           |
|-----------------|-----------|-----------|---------------|------------|--------------------------|------------|-----------|-----------|
| Woodside Avenue | 1         | 8%        | 9             | 69%        | 3                        | 23%        | 13        |           |
| Lanchester Road | 0         | 0%        | 5             | 83%        | 1                        | 25%        | 6         |           |
| Fordington Road | 0         | 0%        | 4             | 100%       | 0                        | 0%         | 4         |           |
| Holt Close      | 0         | 0%        | 1             | 100%       | 0                        | 0%         | 1         |           |
| <b>Total</b>    | <b>1</b>  | <b>4%</b> | <b>19</b>     | <b>79%</b> | <b>4</b>                 | <b>17%</b> | <b>24</b> | <b>24</b> |

Summary of feedback from additional consultation

|              | In Favour | %          | Not in favour | %          | In favour of aspect only | %          | TOTAL     |           |
|--------------|-----------|------------|---------------|------------|--------------------------|------------|-----------|-----------|
|              | 15        | 38%        | 8             | 20%        | 17                       | 43%        | 40        |           |
| <b>Total</b> | <b>15</b> | <b>38%</b> | <b>8</b>      | <b>20%</b> | <b>17</b>                | <b>43%</b> | <b>40</b> | <b>40</b> |

