

AGENDA ITEM: 11 Page nos. 27 - 37

Meeting Finchley & Golders Green Area Environment

Date 23 September 2008

Subject Church Lane, N2 – Movement Investigation

Report of Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport

Summary To present the results of the traffic movement investigations

carried out in Church Lane N2.

Officer Contributors Mike Freestone, Director of Environment and Transport

Status (public or exempt) Public

Wards affected East Finchley

Enclosures Appendix A: Risk Assessment

Appendix B1-B4: Proposals Drawing

For decision by Finchley & Golders Green Area Environment Sub-Committee

Function of Executive

Reason for urgency / N/A

exemption from call-in (if

appropriate)

Contact for further information: Neil Richardson, Highways Group 020 8359 7525

Beacon Council 2002-2003 Improving Urban Green Spaces Libraries as a Community Resource 2002-2004 Community Cohesion

1. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1.1 That the Director of Environment and Transport be instructed to seek to secure appropriate funding from Transport for London in order to progress the measure to improve pedestrian and cycle facilities on Church Lane.
- 1.2 That upon successful securing of the funds, the Director of Environment and Transport be instructed to progress with the design, making of the relevant traffic orders, and implementation of the measures identified in this report and inform elected members and frontagers of the proposals.
- 1.3 That any local objections to the proposals be dealt with by the Director of Environment and Transport in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transportation and the Chairman of this Sub-Committee.

2. RELEVANT PREVIOUS DECISIONS

2.1 Finchley and Golders Green Area Environment Sub-Committee 10 March 2008, decision 7 - instruction to investigate and submit a report on the traffic conditions in Church Lane.

3. CORPORATE PRIORITIES AND POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

- 3.1 The 'Traffic Management Future Strategy' report approved by Cabinet on 5 November 2002 seeks to achieve improvements in traffic movement on the major road network, thus reducing the attraction of alternative, less suitable local roads. Improvements at those junctions that experience heavy congestion, long delays and high levels of personal injury will provide the community with a comprehensive improvement.
- 3.2 The Sustainable Community Strategy for Barnet 2006-2016 has an ambition to keep Barnet moving.
- 3.3 The Council's Corporate Plan 2008/09 –2011/12 'improving transport infrastructure to maximise movement opportunities' confirms the Council's commitment to improve transport traffic flow and roads, to reduce journey times and improve reliability, to improve the transport infrastructure to maximise movement opportunities and to provide a Clean, Green, Safe environment by reducing serious and fatal Personal Injury accidents in road collisions.
- 3.4 The Borough's adopted Unitary Development Plan May 2006 indicates that the Council will seek to improve facilities for pedestrians, to reduce walking times, improve the pedestrian environment and to minimise the risk of accidents to pedestrians, with particular attention to those groups most likely to be at risk, such as the elderly, children and people with disabilities. The Council will encourage improvement of pedestrian facilities for crossing roads, at public transport interchanges and in shopping streets (Policy M6.2). It also states that the pedestrian environment is important to the quality of life of those who live and work in the Borough, in particular those who do not have access to a car or who have mobility problems.

4. RISK MANAGEMENT ISSUES

4.1 A risk assessment has been carried out and is attached (Appendix A).

5. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY ISSUES

- 5.1 The planned programme will include consultation, investigation and design stages and this process is ultimately intended to enhance the quality of life for all within the Borough. An open and fair consultation process will ensure the needs of all sections of the community are taken into consideration, whilst the investigation and design stages will involve the Council formulating solutions for all road users, taking into account legislative and policy restrictions.
- 5.2 The outcomes of the consultation, investigation and design stages should result in a safer, more attractive area to live, work and visit, and provide an improved quality of service. However whether or not a scheme is introduced in any consulted area, all those originally consulted would be advised of the Council's decision.
- 6. USE OF RESOURCES IMPLICATIONS (Finance, Procurement, Performance & Value for Money, Staffing, IT, Property, Sustainability)
- 6.1 The 2008/9 budget for the implementation of traffic management measures at locations not included within the Council's main capital programme initiatives is £46,080. This is divided equally between the areas served by the three Area Environment Sub-Committees, providing £15,360 to fund schemes within the area served by this Sub-Committee.
- 6.2 The cost of the scheme recommended in this report is estimated at £20,000, which cannot be met from the 2008/9 allocation. The above cost is associated with improved cycle facilities and an approach will be made to Transport for London to seek funding from the London Cycle Network budget. On-going costs relating to maintenance of the measures are reviewed annually, along with similar measures as appropriate when assessing annual budget requirements and are confined to Highways Group activities. The introduction of the scheme will be facilitated within existing design, consultation and implementation resources.
- 6.3 The investigation of measures will meet customer aspirations, demonstrating a commitment to listen to the community, and there will be an expectation that any measures progressed will be justified on a value for money basis.
- 6.3 There are no other staffing, ICT or property implications.

7. LEGAL ISSUES

7.1 None

8 CONSTITUTIONAL POWERS

8.1 Constitution Part 3 'Responsibility for Functions' Para 3.10 Area Environment Sub-Committees performs functions that are the responsibility of the

Executive relating to highways use and regulation within the boundaries of their areas in accordance with Council policy and within budget.

9 BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 9.1 Councillor Andrew McNeil submitted the following Member's Item to the March FGG AESC:
 - "I should like to table the following as a Member's Item for the Finchley & Golders Green Area Environment Sub-Committee on 10 March: The need for improved speed control and traffic management in Church Lane N2."
- 9.2 An verbal report was made at the March meeting by the Chief Highways Officer detailing the findings of the initial investigations. Based on the surveys carried out and the accident record available, there was no identifiable speeding issue and related pattern of speeding accidents along Church Lane.
- 9.3 The Sub-Committee subsequently instructed the Director of Environment and Transport to investigate and submit a report to a future meeting in respect of the following:
 - (i) a 20mph speed limit on Church Lane supported by vehicle actuated signs;
 - (ii) signage at either end of Church Lane warning motorists of concealed junctions and the one-way working over the bridge over the tube line;
 - (iii) junction signs at Long Lane and King Street;
 - (iv) liaison with local schools to bring forward complementary pedestrian measures:
 - (v) the extension of the cycle lane from Leslie Road to East End Road; and
 - (vi) any other potential measures.
- 9.4 The result of the Highways Group investigation are presented below:
 - i) The speed surveys carried out between January and March this year showed 85th percentile speeds ranging from 20.7 mph to 29.3mph, and the mean speeds ranging from 17.2mph to 23.3mph.. The Member's item mentions the potential reduction in the speed limit from 30mph to 20mph.

Two options are available in order to legally reduce the speed limit in Church Lane, which are: the introduction of a localised 20mph speed limit, or the introduction of a 20mph zone in the area.

Guidelines only recommend the introduction of 20mph speed limit in areas where the 85th percentile speed is less than 20mph. As shown above Church Lane does not meet this criterion. The introduction of a 20mph zone requires the speed limit to be self-enforceable using an array of traffic calming measures such as speed tables and speed cushions that need to be located approximately every 60 metres to avoid "braking-accelerating" driving patterns. The associated costs with 20mph zones are high since the road layout, drainage and surfacing need to be reviewed at the same time.

The accident records in Church Lane do not indicate a pattern of speed related accidents, with only one recent incident involving a driver under the influence of alcohol. Furthermore, excluding the junctions with the A1000 and

East End Road, no accidents have been recorded over the past three years in Trinity Road, Long Lane (up to Trinity Road), Elmfield Road, King Street, Leslie Road, Leopold Road, and Elm Garden.

Based on the information given above, officers do not recommend lowering the speed limit in Church Lane as there is no value for money return and funding should be diverted to other locations within the Borough where there is greater network management justification. The introduction of a vehicle-actuated sign to support the existing speed limit is also not recommended, as drivers are not travelling in excess of the current speed limit.

ii) An assessment of the signage for the one way working has been carried out. The signs currently erected along Church Lane are shown in Appendix B of this report. One way directional signs (diagram 606) are present at all the intersections within the one-way section of Church Lane and two 'No Entry' signs (diagram 616) are present at the junction with the High Road. In addition, no left and no right turn advance warning signs (diagram 612 and 613) are present in the side roads. Drivers and Riders who are contravening the one-way system are aware of the restriction and it is therefore unlikely that additional signs would increase compliance. Police enforcement appears to be a better option to deal with any contraventions.

Sightlines as provided by current parking restrictions, are in line with Borough wide practice and are adequate for this type of road. Illegal parking has however been observed to restrict sight lines and this will be addressed through increased enforcement by the Council's Civil Enforcement Officers to resolve this issue.

- iii) No accidents have been recorded at either junctions with Long Lane and King Street. It was however noted that some of the road markings are faded and that foliage is obscuring a road sign over the bridge. These two items will be addressed through regular maintenance. Additionally, it is recommended that a reflective bollard (similar to those already present) be erected at the corner of King Street to highlight the junction layout and enhance safety at this location.
- iv) Complementary pedestrian measures have recently been implemented as part of the School Travel Plan for Martin Junior and Martin Infant & Nursery Schools. The measures included the widening of the southern footway in Church Lane from outside number 15 to The Walks. An additional one-way directional sign was also provided opposite Trinity Road as part of these proposals.
- v) The London Cycle Network (LCN –route no. 54) makes use of Church Lane over the bridge. It is not legal for cyclists to proceed contra-flow along the entirety of the eastern part of Church Lane from the A1000 junction. They are required to access Church Lane via Trinity Road if coming from the north east, or Leslie Road if coming from the southeast.

Councillor McNeil had requested the potential extension of the advisory cycle lane markings from the bridge to the junction with East End Road. Unfortunately, due the road width in that section, additional road markings would need to contained within the existing westbound lane and would

therefore make little or no difference to the current situation. There have been no accidents involving cyclists on this section and cyclists are not exposed to adverse risk.

There is concern over the layout of the current advisory cycle lane, the lack of forward visibility, and the tendency for vehicles to drive over it. This behaviour is encouraged by the lack of segregation, the current parking arrangement along the northern kerb line of Church Lane, and the position of the existing centre line. All these factors are forcing vehicles to straddle both lanes of traffic when going east and provide little incentive for vehicles to align themselves properly over the bridge. As a result, cyclists have been observed to use the narrow footway over the bridge, leading to conflict with pedestrians.

The issue could be resolved by using the protection of the parked vehicles on the northern side of the bridge and widening the northern footway to accommodate shared use between pedestrians and cyclists. The current road width of 5.7m over the bridge would allow for this widening, which will increase safety and slow down vehicles over the bridge by narrowing the carriageway. An in-slip similar to the one present at the top of Leslie Road should also be built at the top of Trinity Road to assist the movement of cyclists. It is anticipated that up to £20,000 would be required to provide the above and funding will be sought from Transport for London within available LCN funding to Boroughs.

Members may wish to note that an alternative route exists for cyclists coming from Trinity Road using a path and a short subway that links Trinity Road and Manor Park Road. This alternative is however less attractive than the option over the bridge because of environmental factors, required cycle dismount, and safety concerns due to the isolated location.

vi) The carriageway on the eastern section of Church Lane has been noted to be in poor condition. This issue will be addressed when this section of Church Lane is resurfaced later in the financial year.

Appendix B of this report contains a drawing of the above proposals.

10 LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 10.1 Email from Councillor Andrew McNeil dated 20 February 2008.
- 10.2 Various traffic surveys linked to above requests.
- 10.3 Technical note dated 07/03/08.
- 10.4 Any persons wishing to inspect the background papers listed above should contact Neil Richardson, Telephone 020-8359 7525.

Legal: JM CFO: MG

Appendix A

Risk Assessment Form				
Scheme:	Traffic Management Budget requests			
Objective:	To report requests made by public, members and other bodies.			
Risk Category	Description	Likelihood of not being met	Impact	Response
Strategic	Informing the public of decisions made by committee	L	Н	Reduce – Approval of report will allow public to be informed
Operational	Processing of requests	L	М	Reduce – Report requests made by public
Staffing & Culture	Lack of awareness of targets and objectives	L	Н	Reduce – Regular promotion and communication of key objectives and corporate values with all staff
Financial	Unable to maintain works within budget	L	L	Accept – No financial implications to this report
Compliance	Work outside of relevant legislation and Council policies	L	L	Accept – No work identified in this report.

Key to risk or impact H=high M=Medium L=Low







