**Question 1: Widen footways, repave, side road entry treatments**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Issue raised** | **Number received** |
| Narrowing carriageway will cause congestion | 9 |
| Removing parking will adversely affect businesses | 5 |
| Widening and improving the footways by Chestnut Road is essential | 2 |
| Pedestrian improvements will encourage new business/improve business | 2 |
| Introduce parking restrictions to reduce congestion | 1 |
| Don’t make congestion worse by widening footway at Chestnut Road | 1 |
| Parking is already congested | 1 |
| Narrowing the carriageway will make conditions worse for cyclists | 1 |
| Not all footways need to be widened/resurfaced | 1 |
| No need to widen footways | 1 |
| Tight corner radii and steep ramps at raised entry treatments please | 1 |
| Would like wheelchair friendly crossings | 1 |
| Reduce width of Avenue Park Road junction | 1 |
| Raised crossings will reduce traffic danger | 1 |
| Raised crossing lead to pedestrians not looking when crossing roads | 1 |
| Raised crossings are dangerous for the visually impaired | 1 |
| Provide zebra markings on raised crossings | 1 |
| Clarity needs to be provided on right of way at raised crossings | 1 |
| Two way access for cyclists in Harpenden Road | 1 |
| Provide a cycle lane under Tulse Hill bridge | 1 |
| There are no improvement measures for cyclists | 1 |
| A stepped, hybrid cycle track should be provided with bus stop cycle bypasses | 1 |
| The one way in to Harpenden Rd has not been specifically consulted on and will make life worse for residents there. | 1 |
| Harpenden Rd shouldn’t be made 1 way. This will increase speeding & traffic | 1 |
| Extend the scheme to Brockwell Park & include scheme for Tulse Hill gyratory | 1 |
| Improve appearance of Tulse Hill bridge | 1 |
| Add more planting | 1 |
| Concern about type of artwork proposed | 1 |
| Cyclists should not be allowed to use the pavement | 1 |

**Question 2: Footway build out between Chestnut Road and Chatsworth Way**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Issue raised** | **Number received** |
| Removing parking will negatively affect trade | 8 |
| Don’t support either option | 7 |
| Prioritisation should be given to pedestrians and traffic flow over parking | 5 |
| There are no cycling improvements | 5 |
| Widening the pavement will cause congestion | 3 |
| Footway widening/parking relocation will improve retail proposition | 3 |
| Remove parking and provide a cycle track | 2 |
| Removing parking will improve road safety | 2 |
| Remove parking entirely – don’t encourage driving | 2 |
| Footways are impeded by shop clutter as well as width | 2 |
| Removing parking will make conditions better for cyclists | 2 |
| Widening the pavement will make cycling more dangerous | 1 |
| Retain parking and enforce | 1 |
| If parking spaces are lost drivers will park anti-socially | 1 |
| Additional spaces in Waylett Place are not as convenient and uninviting | 1 |
| More parking is needed in West Norwood | 1 |
| Do not find footway too narrow | 1 |
| Parking is more congested than pavements | 1 |
| Restriction of parking is necessary to reduce congestion | 1 |
| Parking restrictions must be enforced if the parking is removed | 1 |
| All pavements in Norwood Road need widening and repaving | 1 |
| Consider providing parking on alternate sides of road on different days | 1 |
| Consider shared parking/footway spaces | 1 |
| Pavements near Chestnut Road need to be narrower to make it easier to turn | 1 |
| Loading should be available along the length of Norwood Road | 1 |
| Loading should be pre morning rush hour | 1 |
| Include stepped or segregated cycle lanes | 1 |
| Cyclists at the workshops were not concerned about the width of the road | 1 |
| Provide cycle tracks and crossing between Palace Road and Elmcourt Road | 1 |
| Remove through traffic from residential roads by preventing entry or by traffic calming whilst maintaining cycle access | 1 |
| Cyclists should not be allowed on the footway | 1 |
| Provide raised entry treatments at Chestnut Road and Lansdowne Hill | 1 |
| Add as much greening as possible | 1 |

**Question 3: Diagonal crossing at Lancaster Avenue/York Hill/Norwood Road junction**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Issue raised** | **Number received** |
| Good idea | 13 |
| Will cause traffic delays/congestion/increase air pollution | 7 |
| Will/may cause turning problems for buses/lorries | 6 |
| There are no crossing problems here/unnecessary | 5 |
| Already cross diagonally | 5 |
| Should provide cycle tracks/ASL feeder lanes here | 4 |
| These work well elsewhere | 2 |
| Will increase rat-running in Ullswater/Harpenden Roads | 2 |
| Extend the green time for pedestrians rather than build out footways | 1 |
| Remove through traffic from Lancaster Avenue to York Hill | 1 |
| Timing of signals needs adjusting | 1 |
| Need to be extra aware of drivers jumping red lights | 1 |
| Crossing near South Circular is more problematic | 1 |
| There should be a right -turn filter light for southbound traffic on Norwood Road turning right into York Hill. | 1 |
| Pedestrian lights should be all green or red at same time not allowing diagonal crossing to be on a different sequence to the straight crossing ones. | 1 |
| Consider use of intelligent crossing that adjusts the crossing time according to the speed of the pedestrian crossing | 1 |
| Install alternating traffic lights with turning cars giving priority to pedestrian crossings | 1 |

**Question 4: Provision of zebra (or other crossing)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Issue raised** | **Number received** |
| Will help safe crossing | 8 |
| Will/may increase journey times/cause delays | 6 |
| Making Harpenden Road one-way only would negatively impact residents in Harpenden Road/increase speeds/traffic volumes/access | 5 |
| Do not agree with removal of tree/plant others locally instead | 3 |
| Central island should be retained | 3 |
| Harpenden Road should be exit only | 2 |
| May make Ullswater Road busier | 2 |
| Consider blocking access to Harpenden Road and Ullswater Road from York Hill and creating a one-way loop with access and egress to the two roads from Norwood Road/Put a gate at York Hill entrance to these roads | 2 |
| Removal of traffic island will help cyclists | 1 |
| Entry only into Harpenden Road needs to be rethought for resident’s interests | 1 |
| Locate it where the existing island is or closer to the junction. | 1 |
| Should prevent through traffic in Harpenden Road and provide cycle facilities | 1 |
| The proposed zebra is further from the junction and the desire line | 1 |
| Proposed zebra is unsafe as it is hidden behind a tree. | 1 |
| Footway widening will delay buses | 1 |
| Slowing traffic is a good idea | 1 |
| Proposal is dangerous as vehicles overtaking stationary buses will not see pedestrians travelling eastward. Zebra too close to bus stop. Right turning vehicles would be stopping on zig-zags obscuring views for pedestrians. | 1 |
| Should provide a cycle lane here and not narrow the carriageway | 1 |
| Consider blocking entrance to Harpenden Road entirely | 1 |
| If Harpenden Road is access only from Norwood Road, more traffic will queue down York Hill (already bad queueing here) to the junction | 1 |
| No improvements for cyclists | 1 |
| Cyclists should continue to be allowed to use Harpenden Rd in both directions | 1 |
| Sheffield cycle stands should be provided. | 1 |
| Instead of widening the pavement, a stepped, hybrid cycle track should be provided | 1 |
| Unsure if zebra is safer than existing island crossing | 1 |
| Remove tree on the north corner of Harpenden Road and Norwood Road as this restricts pavement width for pedestrians | 1 |
| Should be more info & question about one way Harpenden Road | 1 |

**Question 5: Zebra, Signals or Do Nothing**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Issue raised** | **Number received** |
| Zebra is the fairest/logical/safer option | 5 |
| School children/people would not wait for green man | 4 |
| The proposal to make Harpenden Road one-way is dangerous and deleterious to the environment/ not thought through/should remain 2-way | 4 |
| Traffic lights would delay journeys on Norwood Road | 3 |
| Pedestrians should be prioritised over traffic | 3 |
| Current crossing is fine | 3 |
| People with learning disabilities are more confident at signals than at zebra | 1 |
| Pedestrian crossing is immediate and short | 1 |
| Zebra crossing is not a safe option | 1 |
| Traffic signals should be linked to those nearby | 1 |
| Traffic lights would give better control and be safer |  |
| Pedestrians are to blame if they cross without waiting | 1 |
| Consider putting crossing on raised table to help reduce speeds | 1 |
| Either signals or zebra is fine | 1 |
| There has not been any direct , specific consultation on this with Harpenden Road residents. | 1 |
| Should be monitored and changes if necessary | 1 |
| A gate at the York Hill entrance to Harpenden Road should be installed | 1 |

**Question 6: Station Rise Proposals**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Issue raised** | **Number received** |
| Support for proposals | 11 |
| Pedestrianise the whole area with loading/unloading | 6 |
| Is it clear who has priority on the Copenhagan crossing?/do not support confusion caused by Copenhagen Crossing | 4 |
| Cycle parking here should reflect future demand, not current demand/ increase number of cycle spaces | 4 |
| Would help local businesses | 3 |
| More greening | 2 |
| The taxi firm is a useful community resource too, and they need to park nearby/By taking away most car parking the mini cab business on the corner will suffer - is this service important to keep in the area? | 2 |
| Will reduce parking | 1 |
| Taxis may double park, restricting access | 1 |
| Parking needs to be ample for travellers loading and unloading luggage. | 1 |
| Crucial for the parking and waiting restrictions to be properly enforced | 1 |
| Is there a need for loading bays or indeed blue badge bays given the station is not SFA and the option exists to drop at the rear entrance | 1 |
| There needs to be clarity on entrance that access is very limited for motor vehicles | 1 |
| No need to restrict vehicles | 1 |
| Only agree with restricting vehicles contained in the proposals. Opposed to the raised crossing, widening the pavement is not required | 1 |
| Cycle parking should be covered | 1 |
| Move the cycle parking closer to the station entrance. | 1 |
| Allow cycling on footway | 1 |
| Cyclists will plough into pedestrians | 1 |
| Provision should be made for the taxi company to have perhaps two spaces they can use in rotation. | 1 |
| Maybe taxi spaces in the underused coop car park could be negotiated? | 1 |
| Concern for blind/partially sighted people | 1 |
| Ideal location for a "Copenhagen" crossing. | 1 |
| Avenue Park Road junction is dangerous | 1 |
| Remove the pinchpoint on the northern footway beside turning head by paving this recess in flat setts, as the other corners, | 1 |
| Make the entire design step-free | 1 |
| Is there a risk that traffic will block back onto the exit from the gyratory? | 1 |
| Pave the alleyway in a much lighter material to make it a lighter, brighter and less intimidating route to encourage its use. | 1 |

**Question 7: Provision of a market**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Issue raised** | **Number received** |
| Concern about type of goods sold and prices | 8 |
| Concern about local shops being compromised | 4 |
| Don’t mind/no comment | 3 |
| Query about frequency and times | 2 |
| Would prefer to focus on improving local shops | 2 |
| Good idea | 2 |
| It would make a massive difference to the area | 1 |
| Should link with Feast | 1 |
| Yes, and in the Norwood Road junction when one arm of it is closed. | 1 |
| The current market isn't advertised widely enough | 1 |
| Rents have to be affordable | 1 |
| Could provide a much needed hub for Tulse Hill | 1 |
| Station rise is for getting quickly in and out of the station. | 1 |
| The gyratory needs to be redesigned before a market is set up | 1 |
| Probably would not use it | 1 |
| Should be attempted but organised by professionals operating independently. | 1 |
| Concern about litter. | 1 |

**Question 11: Other comments**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Issue raised** | **Number received** |
| Consultation/workshops inadequate | 21 |
| Should provide for cyclists | 11 |
| Support for scheme | 10 |
| Harpenden Road will be negatively affected | 5 |
| Add more greening | 4 |
| Avenue Park Road junction needs attention | 3 |
| Consultation carried out well | 1 |
| Removing parking will be bad for businesses | 1 |
| Make Harpenden Road exit only instead | 1 |
| Consider those with learning disabilities | 1 |
| Don’t think the pavements are that busy, prefer free flowing traffic | 1 |
| Would like to see community based project e.g. greening | 1 |
| Reduce street clutter | 1 |
| Waylett Place improvements should be considered within this project | 1 |
| Norwood high street, St Luke's and south is more in need than this area | 1 |
| Improve bus journey times by encouraging alternative routes and parking restrictions | 1 |
| Make better use of existing parking bays | 1 |
| Full implications of some of the changes have not been fully considered | 1 |
| Litter is a problem | 1 |
| Concern about HGV's at the Lancaster Avenue junction | 1 |
| Lansdowne Hill junction should be traffic light controlled. | 1 |
| Paint the bridge at the bottom of Avenue Park Rd | 1 |
| Priorities should be focussed on shopping area | 1 |
| Improve junction of Chestnut Road/Norwood Road parking arrangements | 1 |
| More parking permit schemes in residential streets | 1 |
| Crossing at Palace Road takes too long | 1 |
| Not radical enough - remove more parking | 1 |
| Improve Tulse Hill Station | 1 |
| Improve Waylett Place and promote parking there | 1 |
| Consider shared footways for loading | 1 |
| Consider how to restrict traffic flow in residential streets | 1 |
| Would like to see proposals for Norwood Road junction with South Circular | 1 |
| The junction of Lancaster Ave and Thurlow Park Road needs to be addressed | 1 |
| Would like to see proposals for Norwood Road Thurlow Park Road junction | 1 |
| Is granite kerbing necessary | 1 |
| Remove road humps in Harpenden Road | 1 |