

Dear Haringey Council,

Please find attached feedback on Haringey's Local Implementation Plan on behalf of Living Streets - Haringey branch. We are a campaigning group led by volunteers to transform our streets and public spaces - enabling and inspiring people to walk. We want a borough that is open to everyone – not just car users – to enjoy.

As a newly established branch, we welcome this opportunity to provide feedback on the Local Implementation Plan. We wish to highlight that there are a great many positives in this document which we support wholeheartedly. Particularly the ambition for Haringey to build a reputation for being a walking and cycling borough.

What we have learnt from neighbouring boroughs such as Waltham Forest and Hackney is that we will need to be bold in our approach if we want to bring about meaningful change to our streets. As such, this plan needs to highlight more clearly, that active travel cannot simply be encouraged, the council will need to commit resources to meaningful infrastructure and will need forward-looking traffic management. Creating borough-wide [low traffic neighbourhoods](#) is an obvious priority, which can be delivered even under budget constraints. The council will need to be clear with residents that modal shift to reduce car usage and increase active travel is not only necessary but an inevitable consequence of the need to make areas safer for residents of all ages, particularly those in vulnerable groups; and the reality is this will require the relocation of road space away from motor vehicles to walking and cycling provision.

The feedback from the group is outlined below. We look forward to working with Haringey Council in future to create a liveable, walking, inclusive and safer borough for all residents. We would be very happy to discuss this feedback further should you wish.

Best wishes,

Catherine Kenyon and Tom Pigott-Smith
Co-Chairs – Haringey Living Streets

London Borough of Haringey - Local Implementation Plan 2019-2022 – Haringey Living Streets Feedback

Enabling Active Travel – Not Encouraging/Promoting It

- We strongly support and welcome the council's ambition in the LIP to make Haringey's streets healthy and to build a reputation for being a walking and cycling borough
- We agree that active travel through walking and cycling will improve the wellbeing of our residents, reduce obesity, and improve air quality. We appreciate the commitment to work with walking groups such as Living Streets to improve walking facilities (page 87)
- The Mayor's Transport Strategy is calling us to 'fundamentally change the way people choose to move around our city'. Evidence shows that 'promoting' or 'encouraging' cycling will not increase cycling figures.
- Instead, if Haringey wants to meet this ambition for fundamental change, we must talk about 'enabling' walking and cycling through meaningful infrastructure, not promotion. While this LIP refers to this point on page 30, at various other points contradicts itself and discusses encouraging (page 3, 30, 31,32, 79, 89, 107). We request that the need for infrastructure is reflected throughout the LIP

- The actions of neighbouring boroughs should serve as an example of how simple affordable steps can bring huge benefits

Why Walking and Cycling should be the Priority for Haringey's LIP & Targets

- As per TFL figures, at present 75% of journeys in Haringey are already made by public transport, cycling and walking. 38% by public transport, 2% by bike and 34% by walking. So the pledge on page 6 that more journeys will be made by walking and cycling than by car has already been met. We need a more ambitious target here.
- In comparison to other boroughs, Haringey scores highly on numbers of journeys made by public transport (2nd highest percentage of journeys across inner boroughs)
- In comparison to 11 other inner-city boroughs, Haringey comes lowest in terms of the number of trips residents made by walking.
- These figures show cycling is the mode with the greatest growth potential. While 2% of our journeys are made by bike in Haringey, the figure is 8% in Hackney
- We support Haringey's target to increase journeys made by public transport, bike and foot to 88%, however, can the LIP please clearly state what percentage rise it wants to see in journeys by bike and walking by 2021 and 2041, so that the targets for these transport modes are clear.

(Note on page 26 you state that 77% of journeys are made by public transport, walking and cycling. I believe this is an error, and should be 75% based on TFL

figures <https://tfl.gov.uk/cdn/static/cms/documents/travel-in-london-report-11-data.xlsx>)

Streets Fit for Walking

- We strongly support the sections on page 31 which cover making better drop crossings, prioritising pedestrian movements over vehicles at footway crossings and side entry treatments (where the footway is carried across the entry giving the impression that drivers are driving across the footway rather than pedestrians walking across the road), dealing with problem drainage and repairing broken footways and decluttering streets. We would like to see these commitments outlined more clearly throughout the document.
- Given this is a document which commits Haringey to becoming a borough known for walking, it is surprising how little the improvement of footpaths or pavements are referred to in the document.

Vision Zero & Enforcement

We would suggest that Haringey's response to the mayor's Vision Zero Action Plan could be strengthened (page 61). We think more work should be done to look at road danger reduction and our Vision Zero approach – focused on vulnerable groups. We also need commitments in this LIP to work with local policing teams to:

- Enforce the 20mph limits (you state 20mph on page 34 but don't cover enforcement)
- To address intimidating driving (including jumping pedestrian red lights, not stopping at pedestrian zebra crossings, not giving way to buses, aggressive driving, not giving way to pedestrians at side road junctions, illegal and dangerous parking, queueing across and blocking pedestrian crossings etc. We would also like to see explicit targets for ANPR to address the huge number of uninsured cars and unlicensed drivers.
- Emphasis should be also placed on the hazards posed by HGVs to pedestrians. There must be restrictions on the roads HGVs are permitted to travel on, consolidation of freight delivery to reduce the use of HGVs and encouragement of cargo bike deliveries in Haringey.

We feel that that policies around Vision Zero should include the following: a) a recognition of the impact that Low Traffic Neighbourhoods (<https://londonlivingstreets.com/low-traffic-neighbourhoods-two-new-guides/>) can have on casualties as a way of reducing road danger at source and b) in relation to Safe Vehicles, a greater list of actions to increase compliance with

(lower) speed limits. As there are elements of new technology and in particular mandatory Intelligent Speed Adaption (ISA) which are starting to offer significant benefits in increasing compliance with lower speed limits, we would suggest that Haringey incorporates the following into its policies for Safe Vehicles in relation to vehicles operating in the borough in the future (ie Haringey sets a date (eg 2022) that, for all new vehicles from that time on in the following categories, mandatory ISA is a requirement):

- Adopting ISA in its own fleet procurement practices as part of its renewal programme;
- Ensuring ISA is a standard requirement for any service procured by the Council with a fleet requirement;
- Promoting the installation of ISA in taxis and private hire vehicles and encouraging TfL to make ISA a requirement for new taxis and private hire licensing;
- Encouraging the uptake of ISA in other fleets which operate in the borough, such as hauliers, construction firms and coach operators – potentially this could be as aspect of granting planning applications;
- Working with the insurance industry and vehicle manufacturers to promote and encourage the use of ISA in private vehicles;
- Include ISA on any car club vehicles that aim to operate from a base within the borough.

These actions which enable more residents to walk and cycle safely in the borough, and reduce journeys by motor car.

Liveable Neighbourhoods

- We think this LIP should be more direct in the need to reclaim neighbourhoods from parked vehicles and motor traffic congestion and transform them into the most attractive and liveable neighbourhoods in London. This is a commitment which neighbouring boroughs such as Hackney have made in their draft LIP (<https://consultation.hackney.gov.uk/streetscene/lip/> - page 27)
- We need to commit to reducing the amount of parking for motor vehicles
- We need to be explicit in the need to reduce traffic flows to improve air quality, reduce traffic casualties
- We need to be explicit that the council will take a lead on reallocating road space from motorised to sustainable active modes through: permeable filters, car free streets, on street cycling parking, parklets, play street and school Streets
- On pages 25, 36, and 88 you say you will commit to measures to minimise rat runs. We would like a more direct commitment to creating liveable neighbourhoods by ending motor traffic on residential streets through modal filters and recommend the development of Low Traffic Neighbourhoods as outlined in the links above.

Objectives/Delivery Priorities

- On page 25 you have stated you will get more people walking and cycling by making Haringey a walking and pedestrian 'friendly' borough. Please outline what you mean by 'friendly' so that it can be measured
- Your delivery priorities on page 25 are missing the following:
 - o An explicit commitment to low traffic neighbourhoods, modal filters, widened pedestrian paths, protected cycles lanes, school and play streets
- Pavement Obstructions – this local implementation plan should include a delivery to review obstructions to pavements. This should include a mapping of existing pavement parking across the borough which obstructs the path of pedestrians.

- You include 'managing parking demand' as a way to meet your walking and cycling objective – do you mean bike parking? If so, can you be clearer?

Walking Opportunities - Building on the opportunity you have listed (page 30) on 'Making Streets better places to walk and spend time.' Our members would like to share the following feedback:

- Some useful work has been done to widen pavements e.g. West Green Road and Tottenham High Road and this has much improved the pedestrian experience. More work of this kind would greatly help to encourage people to walk.
 - The biggest obstacle to walking around the borough is trying to cross the road. Crossings should be improved to reduce the time people have to wait to cross and to provide enough time to get across the road
 - The lack of signage for pedestrians to find their way around the borough is also an obstacle. Most signage seems designed for motorists. For example, Tottenham Green is the site of many public buildings: theatre, library, customer services, leisure centre, town hall, college, church, schools as well as business start-up units and yet they are not clearly connected by finger signs and people cannot easily locate them. In addition, it is often hard to find a destination as names of streets and conservation areas are not at all clearly marked and houses and other buildings do not display their street numbers.

School Streets

- Haringey is currently piloting its first school street in Lordship Lane. We would recommend that this pioneering approach to protecting children from the negative effects of traffic in residential areas is referred to in Haringey's LIP and commitments are made to continue its roll-out in other schools across the borough. (there is one mention of school streets on page 72 but it is very brief)

Attractive Town Centres – E.g. Parklets

- In order to increase the numbers of people walking and cycling on our streets, we need to create attractive town centres and high streets – vibrant places where people want to spend their time and shop. We think this ambition should be more clearly outlined in this LIP.
- Would the council be open to exploring parklet schemes like Hackney as part of this ambition?

Haringey Green Grid -This LIP emphasises the use of the Haringey Green Grid to make connections between green spaces (page 31) . Please note as part of this commitment, that if you expect these paths to be used by all residents, including women and young people adequate lighting should be provided on these routes through parks so that they can be used by these groups safely.

Parking for Cars

- This LIP will need to be MUCH bolder on your strategy on parking for motor vehicles
- On page 6, you state 'parking pressures' as a challenge. Can we break this down? We would suggest as part of this plan we are systematically looking at where parking spaces can be reduced, and space be given over to protected cycle tracks, wider pavements, and green spaces
- On page 25, you state 'Managing parking demand' as a delivery priority under the objective for more people choosing to travel by walking and cycling. Can you be clear how this will get more people walking, cycling and using public transport? Do you mean reducing the space for car parking or providing bike parking. If so – please state this clearly

Less Traffic/ Reduction in Car Usage

- Haringey's LIP includes an objective for a 'well maintained road network – which is less congested' (PAGE 25) – we should be explicit that this doesn't mean that Haringey is trying to make it easier for people to travel around the borough by car.
- Under delivery priorities for this objective, you have included a delivery priority to make our road network 'best in class' – what does this mean? Can you make the same commitment for walking and cycling paths?
- In contrast to Haringey – Hackney has committed to having less traffic on them – we would strongly suggest that Haringey looks at making targets for reduction in motor traffic as is required in the MTS.
- We also urge more ambitious targets for lowering car ownership. These should link with clearer and more ambitious targets for car clubs. Car clubs in Haringey should also appeal to families via supply of larger cars and the provision of car seats.
- We would also like to see clearer targets and initiatives that target traffic that does not originate in the borough. City of London's has proposed a Street Hierarchy in its draft Transport Strategy that defines the function of each street in order to encourage drivers to use the right street for the right journey. We believe this could better define which residential streets are not suitable for through-traffic and could be filtered.
- We would like to see an objective to reduce car parking. We would like to see explicit targets to reduce provision of car parking in the borough, increase CPZ coverage and increase in parking charges, particularly for 2nd and 3rd vehicles registered at the same address.
- Alternative uses of parking spaces should be encouraged via the introduction of a parklet scheme and wider roll-out of bike hangars. With affordable bike hanger spaces provided to low income households. Currently demand far outstrips supply, even on streets where hangars are installed.

Electric Vehicles

- We object to the promotion of electric vehicles as part of this plan and believe this is a highly misplaced and damaging focus which will cause considerable damage to the cause of active travel and reducing motor traffic in Haringey.
- EV charge points (EVCP) are already taking too much footway space in Haringey, making life difficult for those walking, with sight impairments, pushing buggies and children. Even lamp post charging creates trip hazards for people walking, particularly disabled people and children.
- We oppose all subsidies for private electric car ownership and believe they will continue to lock us into a future of car dependence. Public funds should instead be directed at shared car use, the use of electric bikes and cargo bikes for delivery and passenger transport.
- London Living Streets calls for councils and TfL to give priority to EVCP locations in the following order:
 1. Off-street locations for overnight charging, such as car parks, supermarkets, shopping centres, leisure facilities and ideally for car clubs.
 2. The carriageway
 3. The footway if a 2 metre clear width remains. Lamp post charging still presents a trip risk to people walking and playing on streets.

Walking & Cycling Plan - Page 18 – The draft Haringey walking and cycling action plan (which will be consulted on in early 2019 and sits alongside this LIP underneath the Haringey transport strategy) will set out a wide- ranging suite of hard and soft actions to meet the overriding vision to deliver a transport system that matches growth and prosperity ambitions.' Great – we expect that Living Streets and HCC should be part of the drafting process?