

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
Internal and external	The full consultee responses are set out below this table.	The consultee comments are directly addressed in the body of the report.
Local residents objections		
<u>Objections Material to Planning</u>	The proposal is not a suitable replacement for the HVLB which should be retained and constructed as part of the approved development, due to the benefits to the community and noting the increase in people living in the area (such as Hale Wharf). Benefits cited include uplift in harmonious living, safety, reducing congested traffic.	Points relating to the pedestrian numbers and access to the Station being able to cope with an uplift in numbers due to surrounding development are addressed in paragraphs 6.20-6.22, 6.25-6.29, and 6.31 to 6.32 of the report. Alleviating pedestrian congestion is also commented upon in Section 4 of the TfL response to consultation, in Appendix 5. Existing footpaths along the north side of Ferry Lane will be increased in width from 2.08m to 2.45m, aiding in pedestrian movement and those with disabilities and pushchairs. TfL have also stated that they will work with key stakeholder groups through the detailed design process.
	The Station requires more than one entrance, as it could not otherwise cope with the expansion the plan envisaged.	
	The initial plan upon which Hale Village and other future developments were approved to go ahead was an enhancement on infrastructure such as the remodelling of the station and construction of a new footbridge between the Hale Village and the Station with an alternative direct access.	
	The proposal will not address pedestrian congestion, and may lead to impact on road safety as a result of pedestrians using roadways.	
	The existing pedestrian route over the bridge is inadequate at peak times, and for people with disabilities or with pushchairs or the elderly. This is even worse.	
	The proposed changes to the footpath will not help disabled access, as there will be conflict between other users (cyclists and pedestrians) and will facilitate more accidents.	
	The removal of a barrier between pedestrians and cyclists on the shared footpath raises concerns for safety. Having a shared path for pedestrians and cyclists would lead to conflict.	
	Objection to the reduction in width of the southern footpath and cycleway on Ferry Lane Bridge	The Applicant has revised the indicative design and undertaken a Pedestrian Comfort Level Analysis to assess the suitability of the footpath widths proposed, with both the north and south over the bridge stated to delivery pedestrian comfort levels equivalent of B+,
	Speed reductions on the road to 20mph should be considered to provide additional safety.	Noted. The Applicant addresses this point in Section 5.2 of their response (Appendix 5) where it is understood the principle to reduce the speed limit down to 20mph from Broad Lane through to the boundary of Waltham Forest has been agreed. TfL also recommends that additional consideration of speed reductions in the area will be a matter for LB Haringey.
	The introduction of a floating bus stop will create conflict between pedestrians and cyclists.	Noted. The details of the scheme will continue to be refined as the scheme develops were the application to be approved.
	Additional lighting should be provided on the bridge.	Improved lighting will be provided as part of the detailed design, as noted within Section 5.3 of the Applicant's response (Appendix 5).
	The proposal does not address the escalating crime activity such as phone thefts that occurs on this footpath/ bridge.	Noted. How the design will respond to crime and promote the prevention of crime will be developed further through the detailed design stage, with the Applicant noting that a key outcome of the final design will be to ensure reduced visibility spots across the bridge will be addressed.
	Resurfacing of the footpath/ bridge to be provided.	Noted. The footways and cycleways are proposed to be repaved.

	Another bridge is required, or another such solution if the HVLB is not to be provided.	The matter of consideration of alternatives is commented on in paragraph 6.21 of the report. Improvements to Ferry Lane are proposed to be undertaken in place of the HVLB.
<u>Objection Non-Material to Planning</u>	The proposed changes should have been done years ago, perhaps funded by development that has occurred within the area.	Noted. Council must however assess the proposal as it is presented.
	Cyclists trying to cross from east to west on Ferry Lane use the northern side of Ferry Lane, causing conflict with pedestrians.	Noted. While this describes an existing circumstance rather than related to the proposed changes, the matter of pedestrian/ cyclist conflict is noted above.
	Consultation and the meeting with TfL should have been better advertised and extended to Bream Close and Hale Wharf.	Noted. It is understood that this relates to meetings undertaken prior to submission of the proposal.
	People have invested in the area based on the original plan for the Station development, including the HVLB. Changing this is illegal.	In the context of planning, a condition of planning permission is able to be changed via an application under s73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
	National Rail need to take responsibility for underestimating the traffic needs of the station.	Noted. This is outside the scope of the current application.
	The proposal is an attempt to merge two different projects into one, i.e. the Station development and the need to refurbish Ferry Lane Bridge that was not part of the original project.	Noted. Council must however assess the proposal as it is presented.
	Dissatisfaction with the quality of the pavement outside of the current entrance to the Station	Noted. The proposal primarily deals with works along Ferry Lane, rather than in front of the current Station entrance.