

Haringey Sustainable Transport Commission

Report to London Borough of Haringey

December 2010

Members of the Commission

All members served in their individual capacity. The report does not necessarily represent the views of their respective employers and organisations. We are very grateful for the help given by Council officers.

Phil Goodwin (Chair), Professor of Transport Policy at the University of the West of England, and Emeritus Professor at University College London

Chris Barker Secretary, Campaign for Better Transport London; Convenor Sustainable Haringey Network Transport Group.

David Barry Chair of Consumer Affairs, London TravelWatch.

Cllr David Beacham Liberal Democrat member for Alexandra Ward

Nigel Campbell Transport for London; Director, Policy Analysis and Lead Director, North London

Andrew Campling General Manager for London at BT Group and Chair, Haringey Business Board

Adam Coffman* London Cycling Campaign, Haringey Federation of Residents Associations

Pamela Moffatt Volunteer for Haringey Forum for Older People, Age Concern Haringey and London. Former member of TfL Independent Disability Advisory Group.

Michael Poteliakhoff* Secretary Haringey Cycling Campaign, founder member London Cycling Campaign and conservation architect.

Sue Penny member of Clyde Area Residents' Association, Haringey Living Streets, Tottenham and Wood Green Friends of the Earth and other local groups.

Cllr Stuart McNamara Labour Member for Bruce Grove Ward and Vice Chair, Planning Committee

Lynn Witham Director of Parking Associates; former president British Parking Association

(*Adam and Michael were members as a 'job-share' depending on availability)

HARINGEY SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT COMMISSION

Membership, Terms of Reference and Conduct of Business

1. The Sustainable Transport Commission was set up by the London Borough of Haringey to advise it on issues relating to traffic; accessibility mobility and equalities; investment in the public realm; and the contribution of transport policies and proposals to the reduction in CO2 emissions. We were asked to make recommendations relating to better transport, fairer parking controls, investment in streets, and investment in transport generally. These will be considered by Cabinet, feed into the Council's review of the Local Implementation Plan¹ and influence future transport policy and projects. Although this brief could in principle include almost everything, we have not tried to cover the whole ground, but have focussed on what we see as some key problems and solutions – understanding that this means that some significant topics are dealt with rather briefly or not at all.
2. The Commission has no executive or policy-making authority of its own. It is not a permanent body, but one whose activity is aimed at writing this report: further action will depend on the Council and its partners.
3. A majority of members of the Commission have detailed local knowledge of Haringey, as residents, employees in the area, members of local community organisations, and two Councillors. In addition some members have wider specialist experience in business, transport planning, and parking, in London as a whole, nationally and internationally. Members serve individually, not as representatives, and make their independent contribution as 'critical friends' of the Council's strategy.
4. We have had five full-day meetings, and two roaming visits to inspect traffic conditions in a number of different streets, including both more and less successful initiatives. At the meetings we have been given great assistance by a number of Council officers, and presentations from residents who have been involved in issues of parking and street space.

¹ See separate Annex for this and other relevant documents on policy and evidence that we have consulted

General Background

5. Haringey is a borough of very mixed social composition, transport provision, and traffic conditions. About half of the households in the borough do not own any cars, but 10% own two or more. There is a substantial network of public transport services with a tendency for North-South movements (ie in the direction of central London) to be very much better served than East-West movements. Overall, the latest survey data (London Travel Demand Survey, 2006-09) suggests that 31% of residents' journeys are primarily by car, 31% on foot, 19% by bus, 14% by underground, 3% by other rail, 1-2% by bike and 1% by taxi. Thus we can say that just over two-thirds of the trips undertaken by residents are by methods of transport – public transport, walking and cycling – which successive governments have tried to encourage for reasons of environmental protection and efficient use of road space, while nearly one third are by private car. 68% of car driver journeys are made by the driver alone, with no passengers. In addition of course there are heavy flows of commercial vehicles (ie freight deliveries, service vehicles, etc) which amount to about 15% of the traffic flow. On all the car/van/lorry trips starting and finishing in the borough taken together, 70% has one end outside the Borough, and 30% is entirely within the Borough. The proportion of all traffic in the borough which is entirely through traffic is not known precisely, though current work will estimate this important statistic.
6. The prospects for Haringey in the future will be influenced by how the Borough develops, especially on whether it will become more like the outer boroughs of, say, Barnet and Enfield, or more like the inner boroughs of, say, Camden, Islington and Hackney. Although traffic generally and car use per person are not growing substantially at the moment (partly due to the economic situation), the predicted growth in residential population and employment in Haringey and the region would lead to significant growth in travel overall in the future. If also car ownership and use were to increase to the levels seen in Barnet, that would imply a very large growth in traffic levels, parking, congestion, and emissions. On the other hand, if public transport, walking and cycle use, and car ownership in Haringey become more like Islington, there would be a reduction in traffic levels, congestion, parking and emissions. The point of this comparison is not to say that Haringey would want to emulate any specific other borough, but simply that the future direction of transport

conditions in the Borough could go either way. Car ownership in the east of the borough is significantly lower than in the west, which may tend to lead to upward pressures for increased car use in the east in the future, and more scope for reductions in the west, but both these are uncertain. They will be influenced by the unknown future pattern of changing affluence, and the evolving transport and planning policies adopted, whether such policies are aligned and consistent, and whether they lead to less car use rather than encouraging more.

7. The borough's transport strategy has evolved over the years in the context of the Mayor's Transport Strategy for London and national Government policy and constraints. It is well understood that no London borough has complete control over its own transport arrangements, especially public transport provision where the main decisions are taken by TfL and the operators. For freight and service traffic, the main decisions are taken by commercial companies, and of course the main decisions on individual trips are taken by individuals and households from the opportunities open to them. Any council must be realistic in what it can change, and in ensuring that its policies can win support from the residents and businesses whose lives and livelihood are affected. A borough such as Haringey must also consider the impact of its policies on surrounding boroughs, and indeed vice versa, noting for example that some Controlled Parking Zones were introduced into the borough as a consequence of overspill parking resulting from a CPZ being created by the London Borough of Islington on the boundary with Haringey.
8. Within this context, following a consultation on the draft Local Implementation Plan with residents and local stakeholders, the Borough's declared priorities emphasise the need to provide good access to all groups with special attention to those whose mobility is hindered by age (both young and old) and disability, the importance of efficient transport which can contribute to regeneration of a local economy attractive to local businesses especially small ones, and the reduction of harmful emissions especially (but not only) carbon. Similar language is used in many other boroughs, TfL, and national transport discussions.
9. The Commission broadly supports these priorities, considering that they are achievable and well judged, and we take this as the background to our work.

10. We note that a recurrent theme of the approach favoured by Council officials is the importance of tackling problems which have been spontaneously raised by residents, rather than by the imposition from above of a 'grand plan' devised by transport professionals which might cause division among residents. In principle this would also include response to issues raised by other stakeholders, including businesses, though our impression is that the main focus is on residents. A similar responsive mode applies in principle to council officers' identification of problems with the bus service, though it seems that in practice the structure of discussions lends itself more easily to problems raised by bus operators based on their drivers' experience, than residents. Policy on parking zones is explicitly intended to be based on concerns raised by residents, partly as a way of ensuring that the Council can explicitly demonstrate that it is responding to residents' own concerns, and in so doing contradict the view that CPZs are being produced as a result of a specific Council policy to inhibit parking or with the primary objective of raising revenue. (The latter would anyway be illegal.) In spite of this declared policy, we have heard evidence that those negative views are nevertheless still held by some residents. We make some comments on policy on parking zones below.

The Fundamental Problem of Transport in Haringey

11. Among the many problems of movement around the borough, there is one which we consider is critical, because it affects almost everything. That is that the current demand on road space as a whole (ie including space used for traffic, parking and pavements) is greater than the road capacity can deliver. We see this at its height in residential streets where at present there are attempts to provide pavements on both sides wide enough to walk comfortably, parking on both sides, two-direction traffic, and declared priority for buses and/or cycles. The problem is that it simply cannot be done: this is not a technical failure of the borough traffic engineers' skills and techniques, nor due to insufficient funds. There just is not that amount of space.

12. The result in practice is that one or other of the transport objectives is sacrificed. In some – for example Wightman Road and Park Avenue – the losers are pedestrians, with pavement width greatly eroded by (officially encouraged) parked cars and poorly positioned street 'furniture' ie poles, boxes, bollards etc. In some cases it appears that

poles, posts and bins have encroached needlessly onto the pavement even when it would have been possible to reduce the problem by minor relocation, and putting some signs on lampposts. The paradox here is that in some cases the large number of posts with parking signs on is influenced by the need to avoid appeals from illegal parkers on the grounds that the signing was insufficient. There should be a focus on reducing street clutter where the pavements are narrowest as a priority, which is in line with TfL's approach to Better Streets, acknowledging that improvements can be made with small amounts by rationalising street furniture. However, we recognise that this would not be enough to resolve the problem on its own, and advise that 'reducing street clutter' can only be seen as an early step in a wider focus on pavement quality and space.

13. The current conditions thus include streets where it is quite impossible for a wheelchair user to pass, difficult for a parent to keep hold of a young child's hand while walking, and sometimes difficult even for a single person on their own to pass unless they are both thin and agile. This is intolerable. In other cases what is sacrificed is two way traffic, either by the construction of rather complex one-way networks which residents may ignore or feel trapped by, or by allowing two-way movement in principle but in practice entirely dependent on the self-discipline of waiting for vehicles in the opposing flow to pass, and with cyclists then choosing to use the pavements.
14. Each group of road users – pedestrians, cyclists, parkers, visitors, commercial vehicles – blames the others for being where they should not be, and all feel dissatisfied with the Council for 'allowing' the problem to arise. At the same time it is necessary to stress that streets are not used only for traffic. The main services under the street surface (gas, electricity, sewage, drainage, telecommunications) are just as vital for everyday life as transport is, and access for maintenance and improvement is therefore inevitable. And streets themselves are used by residents for social purposes, meeting, occasional street parties, children's play, traders selling goods, all of which are now recognised to be proper and legitimate functions of urban life. A classic American study in the 1970s found that high traffic flow in residential streets has a great social impact (residents of streets with heavy traffic have less than one quarter of the number of local friends compared with those living on similar streets nearby

with little traffic), and a recent study in Bristol found that the same is now applying to British streets. Really the point at issue is that the attempt to balance the competing demands for road space by trying to satisfy them all is unlikely to be successful, and therefore there have to be clear priorities.

15. The fact that there are more claims on road space than it can deliver is not the Council's fault. It applies to most other Boroughs, being widespread in London and most other large towns and cities, and will probably continue to be so in the future. It does not arise because of stupid policies that a clever approach would have avoided. It is an inevitable consequence of a substantial proportion of people wanting the advantages of car-based mobility in an urban street network of high population density. Therefore the Council, and its partners, have to take decisions about the relative priority of different claims, and how to respond to them. In most cases, any decision will have both winners and losers. Here the problem seems to us that this puts great pressure on the Council to be clear about the 'joined-up thinking' that can make different aspects of policy consistent with each other; for example policy on parking can undermine policy on pedestrians, as above, and new developments may be located in places where the extra traffic they create makes things worse rather than better. There has to be very sharp analysis to ensure that objectives – however clearly stated – are then followed through into the allocation of resources: the budgets, relative size of different departments and teams, and spending must be consistent with the objectives. The Council does not have a completely free hand in deciding what to spend, but even so our feeling is that there is a danger that budgets can be influenced too much by past practice and not enough by intended outcomes.

16. *Our view is that both for reasons of economic efficiency and of environmental and social quality of life, there is little or no possibility to provide for an increase in car-based mobility in the borough (whether by residents or through traffic), and indeed the reverse is necessary: there have to be policies targeted on a reduction in traffic, and on levels of car ownership when these require more parking than the street space can provide.*

17. Thus priority for public transport, and provision for cyclists and walkers, are not only derived from social and health objectives but also are essential for the efficient delivery of mobility (freight as well as personal) and environmental improvements.
18. This implies that the Council does need to have a long term view on how it sees future trends in the volume of traffic, car use, parking and other modes. This is currently the case in terms of the broad direction of change, but is not yet explicit in terms of traffic volumes and numbers. Without heading off into huge consultancy forecasting exercises (which can cause great delay and cost a lot) nevertheless a strategic view, with approximate numbers attached, is necessary. The question of whether these are expressed as 'targets' or 'indicators' or 'expected trends' can be controversial, but the underlying common point is that there must be a clear conception of the traffic levels which can be supported by the available infrastructure, and how to manage them.
19. To put it starkly, the Council's plan for traffic reduction is not an optional extra to be pursued when conditions are favourable, but a necessary condition for successful delivery of all its other transport policies; it will also need to be considered in the context of other policies, for example for regeneration and economic development, carbon reduction etc . In order to have any chance of success in this, it will need support from Transport for London, and above all its own residents and businesses. This is an area where cross-party support would be valuable, and should, in our view, be possible. It will also depend on recognition among the public that the demands of car owners for parking space must be balanced against the demands (by both car owners and their families, and non-owners) for walkable pavements.

Can traffic be reduced without risking political division and economic efficiency?

20. We have considered some of the experience in other areas, other cities, and other countries, and judge that provided it is done with great care (for example in ensuring that parking policy for shopping centres does not undermine their public transport and pedestrian policy), there are methods of reducing traffic which result in people having better standards of access to activities not worse, reduced emissions, and more efficient movement. In broad terms these include the following instruments of policy.

- (a) *Reducing the need for a certain proportion of unnecessary travel* (for example by some internet shopping, home deliveries, home-working, 'teleworking' for meetings and work); There is a clear opportunity for the Council to show leadership here, with the added benefit that the adoption of such measures within the Council should allow it to reduce the size of its property estate, thus saving costs, as under the Council's 'Smarter Working' programme. There may be a case for the Council considering using vacated space to establish smart working hubs within the borough to help residents reduce their need for work-related travel. The provision of "virtual office" facilities could be a positive part of economic regeneration strategies and support for small businesses and start ups. The Council could run these itself, or simply provide some redundant office space for use by a partner. This may also reduce the need to travel of its residents as Haringey has a daily out-migration of workers, and hence help to relieve transport pressures on adjoining boroughs and transport networks. The aim should be for this to be reciprocal, of course, by discussion and agreement with neighbouring boroughs being encouraged to do the same thing. The approach can go beyond the Council's own responsibilities/activities, and also include leadership and support to other organisations (public and private sector) and people in the borough.
- (b) *Consistent control of location of new employment opportunities*. Location of new opportunities in the north of the borough can make use of some available capacity on the public transport radial routes northwards in the morning and southwards in the evening. An alternative argument is to locate new employment opportunities in the south of the borough, and seek to attract eg Islington residents to them. The point of principle is that the location of opportunities must take into account their impact on travel and traffic not only in terms of the immediately surrounding streets, but also in terms of the overall amount and pattern of movement. In general it will be preferred to encourage local travel over longer distances (for leisure, shopping and other purposes as well as work) and encourage the location of facilities and transport provision to facilitate this.
- (c) *Smarter Choices*. An important policy approach now beginning to be used in many towns is generally called 'Smarter Choices', often with a strong local

branding (for example, ‘Smarter Travel Haringey’ or such other simple and attractive title as is devised). Smarter choices involve a range of measures to improve the attractiveness of and commitment to walking, cycling and public transport. Important elements are travel marketing targeted at better services, improved information, signage, travel planning (for both workplaces and schools, and major centres of activity such as the new Spurs’ stadium). It also involves personalised travel advice to households making people aware of the existence and cost of sustainable travel possibilities. The experience elsewhere is that very substantial changes in travel choices can be achieved by expenditure in the order of £10-£20 per person in the population per year, built up and sustained over a period of four years or more, with lower continuing expenditure after it is fully bedded in. This would imply an annual expenditure of the order of £2.25m-£4.5m, for full coverage. This is a substantial sum, significantly more than the £500,000 of LIP funding currently labelled for Smarter Choices, and would imply changing priorities from some physical schemes to such a programme, albeit noting that Haringey’s annual council tax revenue overall is £101 million. However, it is difficult to compare precisely with current spending due to the use of different heads of expenditure. We note that this is broadly consistent with the findings and recommendations of the Scrutiny Review of sustainable transport in the borough, which increases our feeling that it should be taken very seriously.

- (d) *Design.* The use of design to make shopping centres and other major attractors pedestrian-friendly, and usable by cyclists with provision for secure cycle parking.
- (e) *Avoiding actions which generate additional travel, especially by car,* when considering parking, planning, development control, and the location of health, education and other social services. In this, development control would seem to be crucial, and will be particularly important if successful regeneration, under current expectations, would lead to increased carbon dioxide emissions (perhaps up to 20%) in Haringey, which would put even greater pressure on the use of other instruments to reduce emissions.
- (f) *Street design following the principles of the Dutch “Woonerf” or British “Living Streets”* where accessibility and directness of possible routes on foot, cycle and

public transport is maximised, while motor traffic through residential areas is discouraged. As already stated, some measures directed to this objective, such as complex one way systems can be resented and some aspects of them may be counter-productive. A less highly engineered approach, with simple consistent signing, area wide speed restrictions and short sections of cycle/pedestrian only, or pedestrian only road, can be more successful. The current pilot project running in part of the borough with Sustrans called “DIY Streets” is of great interest: they are working with residents to design their own scheme which if successful will not use conventional traffic calming but will produce the same outcomes as a home zone, but more cost effectively. It is important to recognise that ‘DIY design’ does not of itself resolve the conflicting demands on road space, and it is not a cheap substitute for professional skilled traffic engineering, though it may kick-start a process for seeking ingenious resolutions in a civil and neighbourly manner.

21. Experience of large scale trials in at least one other London borough (Sutton), three other national trial towns (Peterborough, Worcester and Darlington), and experience abroad in many other European countries suggests that modestly costed and popular improvements of the kind in para 20c can reduce travel by car by 5%-15% in the short run, and perhaps substantially more in the longer run, and increase the use of other methods. For comparison, this achieves a similar effect in terms of traffic reduction as a fuel duty increase of 20%-60%, without the same consequences in terms of costs to low-income drivers or political opposition (though also without producing revenue). Both Sutton and the three Sustainable Travel Towns were at the low end of the recommended range of spending mentioned above, and the evidence is that the higher expenditure will have proportionately greater effects and better overall value for money. Haringey in some ways has very favourable conditions for at least this level of success, and perhaps more. Experience suggests however that when such measures are successful in reducing car use they need to be reinforced by (simultaneous, or nearly so) re-balancing of priorities for different users, as otherwise the benefits can be partly eroded by a proportion of new car users swiftly replacing some of the reduced car use. Thus well-designed smart measures have benefits that need to be ‘locked-in’ by supportive other policies – they are rarely enough on their own. This also means that there has to be close liaison with similar initiatives in

neighbouring boroughs, which will then reinforce and strengthen each other, and help to reduce through traffic as well as residents' traffic.

Application of these principles to different areas of transport policy

22. The following sections suggest how we see this general principle applying to the different users and methods of travel.
23. **Pedestrians.** Nearly everybody, car owners and non-owners alike, is also a pedestrian, and a very large proportion of vital local movement is on foot. It is of course environmentally the least damaging method of travel, a part of all public transport journeys and (to some extent) most car journeys. The Council has a strong stated policy to give priority for pedestrians, which we support, but to give effect to it in practice pedestrians need safe uncluttered well-lit streets, well-judged arrangements for transfer to other methods of transport (eg location of bus stops, transfer arrangements between bus and rail, and continuous walking networks without barriers and interruptions). There is no difficulty with the Council's policies on this, but the practice can fall short of the principle.
24. We understand the inevitable constraints of funding, but found it very difficult to translate the current rate of progress into a perspective of how long it would take to achieve such standards in all streets, and it would be of great help in monitoring progress if a perspective over say one, five and ten years could spell this out. We found it difficult to judge how the Council sees the longer-term implications of its current approach of trying to deliver as much parking space to residents as there is demand for – in the longer run, is it expected that parking provision will increase, and if so whose facilities will reduce? Or on the other hand, does the need to favour pedestrians, cyclists, public transport use, car clubs and low carbon transport mean that the space for parking needs to reduce, which seems to us to be the implication, and if so what are the mechanisms and timing for doing so?
25. **Older and disabled people.** In Haringey as elsewhere, the proportion of older people (and the ages they live to) is increasing and will be a major social trend for years to come. With increasing age comes an increase in disabling conditions. Car use is diminished for various reasons, including (but not only) parking difficulties, and there

is greater reliance on public transport or even specialist door to door transport. The Freedom Pass is very important to older and disabled people though it is appreciated that it is a considerable cost to the Borough's budget. Similarly London Transport's improved design of buses (and taxis) makes this form of transport a more realistic option now. This highlights the need for safe passage from one's front door to the bus stop and making sure that buses are then accessible to users (no cars parked in bus stops etc).

26. The specialist `door to door` transport mainly in the form of Dial-a-Ride (oversubscribed) or the Taxicard scheme (still too expensive for many, and with a recent announcement of a substantial increase in charges) can be used in conjunction with both Health Service and Community Transport provision, as is happening successfully in other boroughs.
27. As age increases, with mobility outside the home becoming an increasing problem, it is recognized that getting out and about is essential for health, quality of life, and engagement in society. Being trapped in one's own home eventually presents large and growing problems and costs to the health service. Some of these costs may be because of the increase of visits from services such as district nurses, therapists and other health related visitors causing an increasing need for parking outside someone's house. The provision of parking for carers may be as important, or sometimes even more important, than disabled parking bays themselves.
28. A key point from this is that the existing door to door transport services for older and disabled people are provided in a fragmented way by a range of providers, of which the Council is but one among separate agencies, with no-one having overall responsibility for the range of services or their delivery. In principle multiple providers can be a strength in allowing for diversity and some resilience to financial pressure, as in the community transport scheme, and can also fill gaps (e.g black and other minority ethnic people and similarly disadvantaged groups): there is room for improvement in coordination at least.
29. In taking this forward, we suggest that the Council should initially carry out an exercise mapping out all the transport services aimed at older and disabled people, provided by all the relevant agencies in both the transport sector and other sectors.

This would provide a factual basis for drawing up an action plan to improve coordination, quality and delivery of services.

30. **Cyclists.** Cycling presently accounts for only 1.4% of trips undertaken in Haringey. A detailed “Biking Borough Strategy” has been drawn up, and some of its recommendations have been taken forward into the draft LIP (See the companion volume of supporting papers). Some analysis by Transport for London (due to be published shortly) on the types of trips that may be most suitable for cycling indicated that there is very considerable potential for cycling: cycling could potentially replace up to 30% of car trips, in favourable circumstances. The present London policy objective is to increase cycling by 400% between 2001 and 2026. A similar policy in a group of designated ‘cycling demonstration towns’ achieved very substantial increases in cycling, and in Darlington, accompanied by other smarter choice initiatives, the increase in cycling in four years was between 90% and 113% (as shown by different data sources), though some of this was from a shift from bus and walking. Within London, there have also been large percentage increases in cycling in places, for example 75% in three years in the case of Sutton during their Smarter Travel Sutton programme.
31. A survey of Haringey school pupils indicates 25% would like to cycle to school, but do not because of the perceived danger, fear of theft, parents’ disapproval, lack of storage, or they did not have a bicycle. Improvements to the environment for cycling and cycle training for school children and adults are the key to increasing cycle use. The present high levels of cycling in countries such as Germany, Denmark and Holland were achieved by a massive shift in transport policy in the mid 1970’s. It should be observed that cycling in these countries appeals to all regardless of age or gender, with approximately 50% of cyclists being female and approximately 20% being over 60. By contrast a majority of cyclists in Haringey are young males, some of whom disobey traffic regulations either because of what they feel is a hostile cycling environment, or other reasons. This can be contrasted with the relaxed and more socially widespread approach to cycling in some other European countries: cyclists there travel as fast as those in London, but enjoy a cycle-friendly environment and there is less of a problem with cyclists riding through red lights or on pavements.

32. **The Parking Problem.** Both parking controls, and the absence of them, are among the most controversial and sometimes divisive issues in crowded urban areas. The Council has taken the view as a result that it will roll out parking controls, usually CPZs, only in response to resident demand in the affected areas, with a programme of consultation procedures to ensure then that the details of what is done has local popular support.

33. While we understand this approach, we feel that it has some effects which are different from the intentions:

- Residents do not always understand what the ‘local resident demand for CPZs’ actually means, or where it has come from, or what criteria are applied to judge a sufficient level of demand, and some suspect the Council of a ‘hidden agenda’ rather than real consultation;
- There can be an unintended knock-on effect. Residents in one area, perceiving a parking problem, ask for residents’ parking scheme, which in turn puts pressure on a neighbouring area which itself did not want such a scheme, but now is more or less forced to adopt one out of self protection;
- There is a tendency for residents’ parking to become the highest priority claim on road space, at the expense of other less vocal interests including pedestrians, bus users, cyclists and indeed moving traffic.
- There can be rather unstable views, with hot opposition converting into hot support, which makes difficulties for Councillors who want to express the true views of their constituents.

34. There is an important interaction between CPZs and access (by car) to train stations. For example, at present there is parking around Highgate tube and only on one side of the railway line at Haringey, Hornsey and Alexandra Palace. CPZs in these areas could lead to traffic reduction in Haringey from those who currently drive to these stations from outside the Borough in order to get cheaper annual travel cards the closer they are to London.

35. The whole process can produce solutions which are only temporary, especially if car ownership in the area is increasing or the make-up of housing is such that there are more cars than kerbside space. This raises the question of what sort of policy will need to be developed when the unrestricted demand for parking overall simply cannot be met. At the time of writing, within a CPZ, all resident car owners are entitled to buy permits for all their cars, albeit paying more for second and subsequent cars within the same household for some classes of vehicle, though this is less effective than it might be due to people moving away from an address but still retaining a permit. It may be that there will be pressures to increase the price for all or some vehicles, to restrict the number of permits to one car per household, or to the available spaces with a lottery or waiting list, impose tighter constraints on evidence of residence (and legal ownership, insurance, tax, etc), or on the other hand to offer incentives to households not to have cars, or in some cases to give up those they have. We are aware that there are objections to any of these ideas, but do not see a viable alternative in the longer run.
36. It is not clear where and how the needs of current businesses and other employers are taken into consideration in the consultation process, nor how the introduction of CPZs and related measures fits with the economic plan for the borough. ‘Stop-and-shop’ schemes are likely to help parts of the retail business, but do not address economic activity more widely.
37. All this implies that even when a given CPZ is entirely successful in terms of design, consultation, review and if necessary adjustment, and meeting the needs of car-owning residents without sacrificing the needs of others, it will still be in a position of continuing dynamic changes of pressures and context, and will therefore need periodic further review and amendment. It can be fit for purpose in the short term but within a few years no longer meet the needs it was designed for.
38. We take it as clear that when consulting, on parking as for other policies, the Council will want to adopt ‘best practice’ methods which are open, genuine, fully representative, and do not lead to suspicions of a fix. But however good the consultation is, there is also a case, we feel, for the Council to have a longer vision of where it sees parking provision going over a five to ten year period. Some other

neighbouring Boroughs (eg Camden and Islington) have already extended controlled parking to the whole borough. The experience is that such an idea is rarely popular at the early stages of build-up of parking problems, when there is enough space for everybody. But sooner or later controlled parking becomes unavoidable in some areas, and each time it is implemented the need to do so in a neighbouring area becomes stronger, so that strong opponents are forced to reconsider their opposition, and often become supporters. There seems little to be lost in at least considering what would happen if there would be a policy of planning this deliberately rather than letting it happen in its own time. We note that a borough-wide residents parking policy does not necessarily mean that there should be a single park-anywhere zone for residents covering the whole borough: there could still be local definition of residential areas.

39. **Bus Services.** The borough does not run or pay for the main bus network, although there are liaison arrangements with TfL and local operators about practical problems with the services, garages, etc. Our understanding is that in most cases the agenda of those discussions is made up of issues raised by the operators (passenger representation having a different, London-wide, process through TfL for consultation on routes). These quarterly Public Transport liaison meetings are rather internal affairs among the professionals involved, and the Borough seems to see itself as having a reactive rather than pro-active function.
40. We think there would be a case for the Council to take a rather longer term view on the question of bus services in its Borough. For example, the issue has been mentioned above that North-South movements are better provided than the awkward East-West cross-borough journeys, for which fewer East-West routes are in place, and patterns of demand can change due to both big and small developments; it is worth thinking through and getting the best out of opportunities to influence TfL and the operators, including TfL's regular reviews of bus routes. The case of the W4 bus route is a good example of a service which does not fit the traditional London network pattern, but serves a very useful function and is greatly appreciated by its users. If the Borough had a longer term view of the way in which the bus services would evolve to attract more customers and a wider variety of routes, then it would be in a position to use the operational meetings, over time, to help improve the services and perhaps

reduce the need to drive. We also understand that the equivalent meetings in some though not all other boroughs have a wider participation from users and members of the public, and this might be considered in Haringey also. We note that the Borough also has a quarterly Transport Forum, which is an evening public meeting, but it is unclear whether this is the right forum to develop practical changes to bus routes. A greater pro-active involvement by the Borough in bus improvements would raise the question that currently the Council has limited staff resources and expertise applied to this area, so extending would not be cost-free. Nevertheless, there is an accumulation of professional experience generally about how such matters as bus priority measures (not only bus lanes but also signalling, access and enforcement), signs, bus shelters and count-down timers can make it easier for both bus users and non-users to increase their use of buses, and this needs to be applied locally in a way which fits into the specifics of borough transport plans.

41. Some specialist bus services are closer to borough responsibilities, especially community bus services catering for local groups and people with special transport needs. They provide vital services that contribute to the wider good not only the users themselves. We do not see it as our role to advocate specific contractual arrangements in this area, but we do want to acknowledge in general term how important they are, especially at a time when their future may be under threat due to funding cuts. In this context a recent announcement that Taxicard charging rates will increase substantially causes its users great concern, which we share.

42. **Freight and Service Traffic.** In some circumstances a net reduction in traffic can be achieved by having more delivery vehicles rather than less (eg when that reduces the need to drive to the shops), and this should be encouraged albeit with emphasis, as is being discussed widely in London, on suitable size vehicles and transhipment depots where practical, with collection of goods from local reception points (currently done by some suppliers using post-offices or their own local branches) where goods can be stored securely and collected conveniently, and avoiding the need for repeated attempts at home delivery when people are out. There is a range of shopping that can be perfectly well bought in local shops using walking, cycling or public transport to buy it, which indeed is the case with a large proportion of current shopping by a majority of residents: there is no environmental advantage in trying to shift this to

home delivery. More generally, there can be reductions in freight emissions reducing consumption of goods, excessive wrapping, using local produce, reuse and recycling and movement of necessary bulk goods and waste by train or water, and this also forms part of a sustainable transport strategy.

43. **Speed.** The Commission has discussed policy of extending 20mph speed limits as the default speed for residential streets. The advantages are that it can increase safety and reduce emissions, with almost no loss of overall door-to-door journey time on average, is consistent with borough priorities generally, and gives a strong signal to drivers generally about the social unacceptability of high speed in residential areas, which many drivers will follow even if not all. The objections are that the Police are generally rather reluctant to enforce such limits apart from in limited specific high priority areas, due to their own pressures and resource constraints, and transport professionals will usually want to support the limits with physical measures on the street so they do not depend solely on moral pressure and enforcement: if these supporting measures are however not affordable there may be long delays before the policy is implemented. Both concerns are valid, though to some extent the task is made easier the more widely implemented the limits are throughout London and the country as a whole. Broadly the balance of opinion in the Commission is to favour going ahead anyway, even in advance of full cooperation from Police and the supporting physical measures, as experience elsewhere suggests that speed reductions do follow. Certainly all members of the Commission would not want Haringey to be less enthusiastic about this policy than is now emerging in transport policy generally.

Matters of organisation, funding, progress checking and consultation

44. We have found it rather difficult to see the precise chain of links which connect the general transport policy objectives with the specific organisational structure of Council Departments and responsibilities, the allocation of budgets (which traditionally use quite different headings than the ones in the policies), the process of progress checking (both on detailed scheme design and on measured achievement of objectives year by year) and the forms and style of consultation. We have heard some criticisms of these aspects, and recognise them without being in a position to judge on their detail. However given that a review of the organisation and functions of the

Council departments is now planned, as we understand, it would be very timely to include a systematic checking of the above aspects in this review. We have discussed some details of these aspects and would be happy to give more information during the review.

Contribution to achievement of objectives

45. Our judgement is that the general approach outlined above is ‘sustainable’ in the full sense of the word, namely that it can be continued into the future without coming against unbridgeable problems of traffic growth. The transport system would be more efficient and less congested, aiding economic activity and regeneration, streets would be more pleasant and safe adding to the quality of life of residents, and emissions would be lower contributing to Borough, TfL and Government carbon reduction objectives. While that should be the case in principle, we stress that the achieved effects of every such policy need to be monitored on a year-by-year basis, against agreed indicators of success and failure, because unintended or unexpected effects always happen and need to be corrected early.
46. One specific area of concern that we noted within the commentary relating to the targets that have been published to date concerns CO2 emissions. Within the Performance Monitoring Plan for the LIP, table 4.6 in section 4.2.5 states that the target of achieving a 20% reduction in CO2 emanating from ground-based transport by 2013/14 is an interim target for the Council’s own target of a 40% reduction in CO2 by 2020. The narrative goes on to comment that the MTS target of a 60% reduction overall (ie including non-transport reductions, which may be bigger) by 2025 is considered challenging in the context of increasing population and employment in the borough. ‘Challenging’ is an ambiguous description, sometimes used to prepare for increased effort and in other cases being a prelude to abandoning a target, and we trust that in this case it means the former, with a careful exploration of evidence and options available such as those discussed here.
47. Furthermore, CO2 is now so important in Borough, TfL , Government and international priorities , that we would have expected to see a clear delivery plan to achieve a 40% and 60% reduction, including the policies, how much savings each will deliver, and regular tracking to make sure they happen. The Council is clear about the

importance of climate change, and aspires to be the “greenest Borough”. These are activities that would help turn these commitments to action.

Is the current time the right time?

48. Everybody knows that money will be tight and economic conditions hard during the coming period, and making improvements to transport conditions is not free. However, that also means that, for a period, there could be some reduction on pressures on road space which would give elbow room on the network for a shift in the allocation of road capacity among competing demands, to assist the Council’s objectives. This is much easier to do than when congestion is so bad that any change at all causes great disruption. By using the breathing space in that way, there is also a good chance of heading off the pressures for increased traffic growth when economic conditions improve, which would lead to great difficulty and choke off revival and regeneration.

A note on considerate behaviour

49. We are all part of the same community and we are aware that the pressures on crowding and life can make people thoughtless of the needs of others, not necessarily with any bad intent. Sometimes this can include illegal but common activity, such as those motorists who use hazard lights as though they were a magic charm to allow parking anywhere, or those cyclists who ride on the pavements. More generally, thoughtless activities can include excessive noise and boisterous behaviour on the upper deck of a bus, failing to notice somebody in a wheelchair on a pavement or with young children, barging in a bus queue, obstructing a bus stop. All these can make a difference, when roads and public transport systems are crowded, between tolerable and intolerable, especially for the more vulnerable. This is not completely within the Council’s gift, but the Council does try to help through educational means, and in raising concerns with bus operators, police, teachers, media, and other agencies sensitive to the same problems. We acknowledge that there is a limit to what the Council can achieve, but on the other hand reject the idea that all effort in this area is wasted.

Summary and Recommendations

1. The Council needs a strategic view on longer term traffic trends, a programme for monitoring what is happening, and policy for dealing with them. This should recognise that available road space in the borough is not enough to meet all the demands on it even now, and this problem would be even greater if car use continues to grow in the future. Therefore at the heart of transport policy is the need to reduce the volume of car traffic, by affecting the balance of use of the different modes of transport, the choice among near and distant destinations, and the choice to travel less by using other types of activity. This requires consistent, systematic action both in terms of the Council's own practices, and the choices made by its partners, local organisations, and residents.
2. Achieving some relief by lower traffic levels gives benefits to business, regeneration and sustainability. It requires that necessary regeneration is developed with supportive policies to ensure that economic growth does not generate so much additional traffic that congestion gets worse rather than better. Development should be particularly encouraged in areas well served by public transport.
3. The approach summarised in para 20c ('Smarter Travel Haringey') would yield large benefits and assist economic, social and environmental objectives. We propose a substantial increase in the proportion of the budget spent on 'Smarter Choices' initiatives aimed at enabling people to choose more sustainable travel patterns and improved access to destinations and activities. These should include improvements to the environment for cycling and cycle training for school children and adults.
4. The objectives for 40% and 60% reduction in CO2 emissions should be energetically pursued by a specific detailed delivery plan, including monitoring and provision for adapting the plan if the monitoring finds shortfalls.
5. The idea of consistent 'joined up thinking' should underpin not only all activities in transport, planning and car parking, but also their interaction with health, education, economic and other policies. This requires continual alertness for problems where policies in other areas have unintended transport effects.

6. Traffic management and other initiatives should be assessed to ensure that they consistently improve accessibility for all sections of the community especially those with additional difficulty of mobility, and the safety and directness for walking, cycling and public transport, these coming first when there are inevitable conflicts of priority among transport users. Local traffic schemes should strive for simple, clear, well-signed, easily enforceable, uncluttered priority for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport.
7. There should be a consistent long term vision for parking policy which is compatible with the availability of road space. This should include consideration of the feasibility of a borough-wide residents' parking policy as an alternative to separate zone-by-zone development driven by a local perceptions, and restrictions on parking to what can be fitted in the available space without undermining other necessary road uses.
8. The Commission broadly favours policy to achieve 20 mph limit on all residential and busy shopping streets, not entirely constrained by views of the police and the feasibility of supportive engineering measures
9. These policies will involve both winners and losers. The need to ensure that policies are understood and supported by residents and other local stakeholders is paramount. For specific schemes and proposals, this requires systematic adoption of 'best practice' methods of consultation which are transparent, accountable and fireproof, following procedures which are well-defined and known in advance, but also subtle enough to understand the complex and many-stranded views that many people naturally hold, taking account not only of views on the specific scheme but also wider views of transport priorities and constraints.
10. Transport and traffic are complex and dynamic, and problems evolve and change. It is unrealistic to expect that all schemes will get it exactly right first time, and therefore there should be a systematic programme of monitoring the early effects of changes (and from time to time later) including consideration of whether there is a need for scheme amendment, and what lessons there are for future schemes. A proportion of the scheme budget should be reserved for fine tuning or amendment if the need arises.