

This review includes a vast number of measures and my understanding is that all are seen as potentially deliverable - "whilst it is impossible to guarantee that all of the options presented here could be implemented, those that have been included have at least some chance of being implemented in the foreseeable future subject to the availability of funding".

The overview sets out that a bid has been made for £350M for the coming financial year and that similar bids may be available for the following two years, making a total project pot of £1M. This includes a total of £700M for the short-term projects (i.e. within the first two years). Further each element of the project is costed (although some with so wide a cost range as to be almost meaningless). As a rough guide I have taken the mid-point of the likely costs suggested in the Haringey document to illustrate the likely cost of each option.

I would much rather see a choice of realistically achievable options than a huge selection, most of which we know are unlikely to be achievable. Anything classed as long-term is purely aspirational, has in effect been kicked into the long grass and has no place in a public consultation on deliverable solutions to an immediate problem. Any package or set of packages that is not fundable or politically acceptable is also aspirational and similarly should not be placed in a public consultation at this stage.

I would also comment that the solutions seem rather piecemeal rather than area-wide. Whilst knock-on effects of new initiatives are considered, the solutions seem to have been thought through on a sub-area basis rather than on a holistic one. This piecemeal approach no doubt means lost opportunities for the whole area.

With regards to the Assessment Framework scores, I suggest that they may need reviewing. No negative scores are given for the AW, PC or SA packages when it is evident that the case for each is more nuanced than the current scoring suggests.

With those general comments in mind, below I have made some more specific comments on what has been presented.

			Asst Fwk Score Bal (1)	Haringey's Cost Category	Haringey's Timescale Category	Rough cost £s (2)
1. Area-Wide Improvements			14			
This list might be read by some as a standard wish-list of improvements that might be made for any area. Most are very unspecific. For some of the proposals in this section, this lack of specificity is not critical (for example car clubs). For others the lack of specificity makes the proposal almost meaningless (e.g. traffic calming).						
AW-01	Improve Streetscape	Strongly support - very badly needed in some areas where footways are almost impassable		medium	short	250,000
AW-02	Greater provision of car clubs	Support		low	short	50,000
AW-03	More effective traffic calming	Support but far too unspecific at this stage - so read as no meaningful proposal		medium	short	250,000
AW-04	Minimise impacts of school run	Support in principle, but not without significant work to understand the effectiveness of PSPOs area-wide and not just on the area defined as a PSPO		low	short	50,000
AW-05	Improve efficiency and reduce impacts of deliveries	Support		low	short	50,000
AW-06	Introduce ASLs at junctions throughout area	No comment		low	medium	50,000
AW-07	Provide more on-street Bike hangars	No comment		low	short	50,000
AW-08	Make the study area more green	Support		low	short	50,000
AW-09	Minimise noise and vibration through the use of improved road design	Support but far too unspecific at this stage - so read as no meaningful proposal		medium	medium	250,000
AW-10	Emissions based parking charges	This is not a local initiative addressing local issues and so should not be included in this project		low	short	50,000
					short	350,000
					medium	750,000
					long	-
					TOTAL	£1.1

			Asst Fwk Score Bal (1)	Haringey's Cost Category	Haringey's Timescale Category	Rough cost £s (2)
2. Area-wide pedestrian and cycle network			16			
PC-01	East-west route 1	Support but far too unspecific at this stage - so read as no meaningful proposal		low-very high	short-long	750,000
PC-02	East-west route 2	Support but far too unspecific at this stage - so read as no meaningful proposal		low-very high	short-long	750,000
PC-03	East-west route 3	Support but far too unspecific at this stage - so read as no meaningful proposal		low-high	short-long	500,000
PC-04	North-south route	Support but far too unspecific at this stage - so read as no meaningful proposal		low-very high	short-long	750,000
PC-05	New River Path	Support		low-high	short-medium	500,000
PC-06	Better access to parks	Strongly support		medium	short	250,000
PC-07	Harringay Passage	No comment		low	short	50,000
					short	300,000
					short-medium	1,000,000
					short-long	2,250,000
					TOTAL	£3.55
Alternative package GL1: Green Lanes - Minor improvements			4			
GL1-01	Turnpike Lane bus station / Green Lanes junction improvements	No comment		low	short	50,000
GL1-02	Alfoxton Avenue / Frobisher Road / Green Lanes junction improvements	Strongly oppose. This would be a huge amount of money on a missed opportunity. The best solution here would be to close Alfoxton to through traffic and make it shared-space. To the north of Duckett's Green West Green Road is wide enough to carry two-way traffic and could be readily converted for this use at a much lower cost than the option outlined in GL1-02.		very high	medium	2,000,000
GL1-03	Colina Road junction improvements	Support		low	short	50,000
GL1-04	Park Road / Harringay Road traffic reduction	No comment without modelling for expected impacts on immediately proximate roads as well as on wider area		low	short	50,000
GL1-05a	Salisbury Road / Warham Road traffic reduction	Suggest this belongs in Ladder section. Support changes to Warham in principle.		medium	short	250,000
GL1-05b	Salisbury Rd / St Ann's Rd safety improvements	Support		low	short	50,000
GL1-06	Williamson Rd / Green La junction improvements	It's not clear that this is the best solution. Why not just extend the yellow box to cover the entire junction?		low-high	short-long	500,000
GL1-07	Endymion Rd / Green La junction improvements	No comment		low	short	50,000
GL1-08	Hermitage ad / Green La junction improvements	No comment		low	short	50,000
GL1-09	Review Green Lanes bus stop locations	No comment without modelling for expected impacts on immediately proximate roads as well as on wider area		low	short	50,000
GL1-10a	Review Green Lanes bus lane operating hours	No comment without modelling for expected impacts on immediately proximate roads as well as on wider area		low	short	50,000
GL1-10b	Greening on Green Lanes	This is identical to AW-08		low	short	50,000
GL1-10c	Footway decluttering on Green Lanes	This is identical to AW-01		low	short	50,000
GL1-10d	Ban U-turns on Green Lanes	No comment without modelling on expected impacts on immediately proximate roads as well as on wider area.		low	short	50,000
					short	800,000
					medium	2,000,000
					short-long	500,000
					TOTAL	£3.3

			Asst Fwk Score Bal (1)	Haringey's Cost Category	Haringey's Timescale Category	Rough cost £s (2)	
Alternative package GL2: Green Lanes - Continuous cycle facility			6				
GL2-01a	Continuous cycle facility along Green Lanes	Support in principle but reserve judgement until impacts of the GL2 package on resident parking are fully evaluated		medium	short	250,000	
GL2-01b	Review parking on Green Lanes	Support in principle but reserve judgement until impacts of the GL2 package on resident parking are fully evaluated		low	short	50,000	
Plus all options in GL1					short medium short-long TOTAL	1,100,000 2,000,000 500,000 £3.7	
Alternative package WL1: Minor improvements			4				
WL1-01a	Move pavement parking onto the carriageway	Support in principle but reserve judgement until impacts on resident parking are fully evaluated		low	short	50,000	
WL1-02	Improve Wightman Road / Turnpike Lane junction	Support but far too unspecific at this stage - so read as no meaningful proposal		medium	medium	250,000	
WL1-03	Discourage through traffic from Willoughby Road	Support in principle but reserve judgement until impacts are fully evaluated		low	short	50,000	
WL1-04	Discourage through traffic from Warham Road	Assume this refers to measure GL1-05a - see that section for comments		low	short	50,000	
WL1-05	Install traffic calming measures on Endymion Road	Support		low	short	50,000	
					short medium TOTAL	200,000 250,000 £0.5	
Alternative package WL2: Wightman Rd one-way (north)			5				
WL2-01a	Wightman Road one-way northbound	Strongly Opposed to this package - See Note 3		low	medium	50,000	
WL2-01b	Continuous cycle facility along Wightman Road			high	medium	750,000	
WL2-01c	Move pavement parking onto the carriageway			low	short	50,000	
WL2-01d	Mitigation measures across a wider area			high	medium	750,000	
WL2-02	Improve Wightman Road / Turnpike Lane junction			high	medium	750,000	
WL2-03	Discourage through traffic from Willoughby Road			low	short	50,000	
WL2-04	Discourage through traffic from Warham Road			low	short	50,000	
WL2-05	Install traffic calming measures on Endymion Road			low	short	50,000	
					short medium TOTAL	200,000 2,300,000 £2.5	
Alternative package WL3: Wightman Rd one-way (south)			5				
As for WL2						As for WL2	

			Asst Fwk Score Bal (1)	Haringey's Cost Category	Haringey's Timescale Category	Rough cost £s (2)
Alternative package WL4: Wightman Road filtered		Support the concept of filtering, but this would be best achieved with a more imaginative system of timed closures through electronic enforcement as I have suggested at the steering group.	3			
WL4-01a	Wightman Road closed (filtered)			low-high	short-long	750,000
WL4-01b	Improve cycle conditions along Wightman Road			low	short	50,000
WL4-01c	Move pavement parking onto the carriageway			low	short	50,000
WL4-01d	Mitigation measures across a wider area			very high	medium	2,000,000
WL4-02	Improve Wightman Road / Turnpike Lane junction			high	medium	750,000
WL4-03	Discourage through traffic from Willoughby Road			low	short	50,000
WL4-04	Install traffic calming measures on Endymion Road			low	short	50,000
					short	200,000
					medium	2,750,000
					short-long	750,000
				TOTAL	£3.8	
Hermitage area package			4			
HE-01	Move pavement parking onto the carriageway	Support		low	short	50,000
HE-02	Area-wide junction improvements	Strongly oppose - given objectives of project and funding restrictions, this should not be considered a priority within the remit of the funding pot for this project. Should there be a political requirement to spend money on this area within this project, I strongly suggest that it is focussed on the very busy eastern section of Hermitage Road.		medium	short	250,000
HE-03	Widen footways at Hermitage Road rail bridge	Support		low	short	50,000
					short	350,000
					TOTAL	£0.4
St Ann's / Gardens area package			9			
SA-01	West Green Road improvements	No comment		low	short	50,000
SA-02	St Ann's Road improvements	Support		low	short	50,000
SA-03	Improve zebra crossings on St Ann's Road	Support		medium	short	250,000
SA-04	Improve access arrangements around Chestnuts Primary School	Support		medium	short	250,000
SA-05	Improve St Ann's / Hermitage Road / North Grove roundabout	Support in principle but not a priority within the funding of this project		low	short	50,000
SA-06	Discourage through traffic from Woodlands Park Road	Support in principle but am opposed without detailed modelling evaluating where displaced traffic will go.		low	short	50,000
SA-07	Provide passing places on Gardens roads	Support		low	short	50,000
SA-08	Convert Warwick Gardens rising bollards to a permanent closure					
				short	750,000	
				TOTAL	£0.8	
Notes						

Notes

1. Assessment Framework Score Balance: This refers to the scoring given to each solution by the Council. Each plus point was counted as +1, a no change as zero and a negative impact as minus one. The score given is the net result of these scores
2. Rough Cost: The figure is calculated by taking the mid point from the range of costs suggested by the Council for each cost category - low, medium, high and very high.
3. Rationale for opposition to one-way:

Essentially one-way systems create an environment solely based around the needs of the car. Whilst the approach may have a role in certain areas, places where people live are not the right place for it. One way systems favour the movement of the car against all else. They dehumanise an area and make it much less liveable.

From various studies, I've gathered the following information about how one-way systems impact on neighbourhoods.

- a. Studies show that speeds tend to be higher on one-way streets. Two-way streets tend to be slower due to "friction"
- b. Safety tends to be lower with studies suggesting that drivers pay less attention on them because there's no conflicting traffic flow. One study showed that collisions are twice as likely in one-way streets as in similar streets with two-way traffic
- c. Livability: vehicles stop less on one-way streets, which is hard for bikers and pedestrians.
- d. Traffic flows on one-way streets are often significantly higher than on two-way streets.
- e. A US study showed that one-way streets are associated with higher crime rates and lower property prices than two way streets. It says that two-way streets "bring slower traffic and, as a result, more cyclists and pedestrians, that also creates more "eyes on the street" — which, again, deters crime. A decline in crime and calmer traffic in turn may raise property values.

South Gloucestershire Council recently issued the following warning:

Many streets suffer from 'rat-running' or high volumes of traffic. Creating one-way streets is one way of solving this problem. However, there are also disadvantages to altering the direction of traffic flow in this way. Residents should be aware that the following may occur:

- Some through traffic will simply be diverted onto other, less suitable streets
- The new one-way street may attract more traffic, albeit in the remaining direction
- Residents may have to access their street by an alternative, and less convenient, route, which may involve the use of other neighbouring streets
- Traffic speeds may increase due to drivers' perception that there is no on-coming traffic
- Without physical traffic calming, there may be an increase in accidents and their severity
- Some short sections of one-way street are likely to be contravened by drivers – which may require police enforcement.

One US Study said, "If your goal is to move traffic quickly from one place to another, then one-ways are a great method to accomplish that. But, if your goal is a productive place with thriving local businesses, then slowing traffic with two-way streets is a much better plan. It's a tried and true method."