	Chipping Barnet Area Committee **2 July 2015**
Title	**Review of London Cycle Campaign proposals for Chipping Barnet**
Report of	Commissioning Director - Environment
Wards	Brunswick Park, Coppetts, East Barnet, High Barnet, Oakleigh, Totteridge, Underhill
Status	Public
Enclosures	Appendix A
Officer Contact Details	Jane Shipman, jane.shipman@barnet.gov.uk, 020 8359 3555

Summary

A report to the Chipping Barnet Area Committee on 12 February 2015 presented a review of a series of proposals made by the London Cycle Campaign (LCC) to provide 'Space for Cycling' in wards in the Chipping Barnet area. The committee asked that officers return to the next meeting with visual presentation of the cycling proposals being considered. Visual information regarding the more developed ideas and the location of other proposals is provided here.

Recommendations

1. **That the Committee note the contents of the report**
2. **That Members of the Committee provide Officers with views and comments in relation to the proposals in the Chipping Barnet Area**

1. WHY THIS REPORT IS NEEDED

1.1 During the 2014 Local election campaign the London Cycle Campaign (LCC) identified a local cycling improvement aimed at creating 'Space for Cycling' in every electoral ward in London, and invited candidates to support these.

1.2 At the meeting of the 18 June 2014, in response to a member's item, the Committee resolved that the Director for Growth and Environment instruct officers to undertake an initial feasibility study, including cost, looking at the LCC proposals in Chipping Barnet Area.

1.3 At the meeting of the 12 February 2015 a review of the proposals was provided and the committee resolved that officers return to the next meeting with visual presentation of the cycling proposals being considered for implementation.

1.4 The review was of proposals made by the London Cycle Campaign and as such none are explicitly being considered for implementation. However visual information regarding the more developed ideas and the location of other proposals is appended.

1.5 The review of London Cycle Campaign proposed schemes for Chipping Barnet Area as identified in the February report is summarised below.

Ward and LCC proposal	**Officer Comments on LCC proposals and associated costs**
Brunswick Park Ward Protected cycle lanes on Russell Lane and Bestile Circus	**Betstyle Circus** This location is outside the borough and has not been considered in the report **Russell Lane** A lane on the uphill side of the road could be provided at an approximate cost of £47,000 if high cost utility diversion are not required. There would be some impact on parking provision however for much of the road affected residents have off-street parking.
Coppetts Ward Safe routes for cycling to the Colney Hatch/Woodhouse Road shopping area	This proposal would involve a major junction redesign which could also address other issues at the junction. The cost of a study to identify options for a redesigned junction, including surveys, traffic modelling and identifying outline costs for the options is estimated at £25,000.
East Barnet Ward A cycling route along the Pymmes Brook Trail	This is understood to refer to the bridleway that currently runs from Games Road near the boundary with the London borough of Barnet westwards through Hadley Common towards High Barnet. A budget cost of providing an improved track through the current unsurfaced section is about £120,000.
High Barnet Ward Protected cycle lanes along the A1000 Great North Road	See separate A1000 review

Oakleigh Ward Protected cycle lanes along the A1000 & Longmore Avenue under the railway	**A1000** See separate A1000 review **Longmore Avenue** Cycle facilities could be provided through the bridge as a separate cycle path on the existing footways. This would cost in the region of (£85,000 including some contingency items).
Totteridge Ward Protected cycle lanes along the A1000 High Road. (And closure of St. Margaret's Ave to motor vehicles)	**A1000** See separate A1000 review **St. Margaret's Ave** Closure by means of bollards with provision of an emergency gate near Totteridge Lane may be feasible. However potential impacts on the adjacent Whetstone traffic signals would need to be considered. Construction costs would be modest but assessment of the impacts and detailed design mean the overall cost is likely to be in the region of £25,000.
Underhill Protected cycle lanes along A1000 Barnet Hill	**A1000** See separate A1000 review
A1000 The LCC proposals include a series of requests for a superhighway route along the A1000. These note that they are part of a concerted vision for a Cycle Superhighway route along the entire A1000 (the historic A1 / Great North Road) from High Barnet to East Finchley, connecting with TfL's Cycle Superhighway 12 (along the A1) into the City of London	TfL's proposals for Cycle Superhighway 12 from Central London to East Finchley or Muswell Hill are not now expected to proceed in the form originally envisaged. Nevertheless the A1000 is a route well used by existing cyclists and may be a natural route choice for new cyclists as they become more confident. A variety of features to provide a direct continuous route for cyclists might form part of a cycle superhighway but provision of decent width on-carriageway cycle lanes that are not obstructed by parking (ideally available 24 hours a day) with provision for cyclists junctions. Advanced stop line (ASL) reservoirs for cyclists would be expected at all traffic signal junction with provision for cyclists to reach these and particular consideration given to negotiating difficult areas. Coloured surfacing is not required on cycle lanes and the use of this has generally been avoided in Barnet. However in difficult locations it may help to highlight the presence of a route. For much of the route provision of cycle lanes would have an impact on the amount of parking provision that could be retained, with varying impacts on residents and others. Some indicative costings have been included in the main review but essentially costs to introduce lanes away from junctions would be relatively modest, but of limited benefit without addressing the associated challenging junctions. Costs for addressing some of these could be in excess of £1M but a more detailed initial assessment of the options at each location would

	be needed as a first step. Making provision through Barnet High Street might be better considered as part of a wider scheme to provide a 20mph environment through the High Street, although this would again be a high cost option.

2. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1 The report responds to the Committee's previous decision that officer's return to the next meeting with visual presentation of the cycling proposals.

3. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND NOT RECOMMENDED

3.1 An initial brief was developed at an earlier stage to undertake a fuller study across all the proposals made by LCC but this was found to be unaffordable

4. POST DECISION IMPLEMENTATION

4.1 Proposals that the Area Committee would like to see taken further, in terms of implementation, further studies or consultation will be included in reports to be prepared for consideration by the Environment Committee to agree future years work programmes and would help inform the development of the borough's cycling strategy. Views of the Area Committee will be fed back to the London Cycle Campaign.

5. IMPLICATIONS OF DECISION

5.1 **Corporate Priorities and Performance**

5.1.1 Provision of cycle facilities would particularly help delivery the Corporate Plan strategic objective of promoting responsible growth, development and success across the borough, and the priority outcome of maintaining a well-designed, attractive and accessible place, with sustainable infrastructure across the borough.

5.1.2 Making it easier for more people to cycle also helps address health objectives by providing more opportunities for physical activity

5.2 **Resources (Finance & Value for Money, Procurement, Staffing, IT, Property, Sustainability)**

There are no direct resources implications from this report. Local Implementation Plan funding provided by Transport for London provides for work to develop and implement cycle routes and facilities. Proposals to be delivered with this funding would be agreed by the Environment Committee as part of the 2016/17 (or future years') programmes of work in due course.

5.3 **Legal and Constitutional References**

5.3.1 There are no specific legal implications in relation to this report.

5.3.2 The Constitution section 15 Responsibility for Functions (Annex A - Membership and Terms of Reference of committees and partnership boards) provides that Area Committees' functions include "in relation to the area covered by the Committee. Discharge any functions, within the budget and policy framework agreed by Policy and Resources, of the theme committees that they agree are more properly delegated to a more local level. These include but are not limited to: … *Local highways and safety schemes".*

5.3.3 The same annex provides that the Environment Committee has specific responsibilities for commissioning Transport and traffic management including agreement of London Transport Strategy-Local Implementation Plan.

5.4 **Risk Management**

5.4.1 There are no particular risks associated with this decision. However there are potential risks associated with introducing some of the measures that any future decision to do so would need to consider.

- Some proposals would impact on parking which may result in negative customer perceptions and publicity. However failure to make provision for cyclists may also affect perceptions.
- Some proposals could have an impact on road network performance that would need to be mitigated and balanced against the benefits of making the provision.
- Poorly designed cycle facilities may increase the risks of injury to cyclists, however well designed facilities may reduce risks. Increasing cycling levels overall helps to reduce the level of injury risk to individual cyclists.

5.5 **Equalities and Diversity**

5.5.1 The decision is not considered to compromise the authority in fulfilment of its Equality Duty to have due regard to the need to:

- eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Equality Act 2010
- advance equality of opportunity between people from different groups
- foster good relations between people from different groups

Provision of cycling facilities may provide differential benefits to groups more likely to cycle. This includes children and young adults and men and 'White British' ethnic group. However provision may also remove some of the barriers to cycling for other groups. An impact assessment of the borough's Local Implementation Plan identified, based on satisfaction survey responses, that provision of cycle facilities may be a higher priority for minority ethnic groups in the borough than for the population as a whole. Cyclists sharing pedestrian facilities can be a concern and some older and disabled people can be at greater risk if this occurs. Providing facilities for cyclists may introduce shared facilities in controlled situations or reduce uncontrolled use of pavements by cyclists concerned about cycling on a carriageway without facilities.

5.6 **Consultation and Engagement**

5.6.1 Consultation requirements for any proposals that are developed further would vary depending on the scale and impact of these.

6. BACKGROUND PAPERS

6.1 Minutes of the 18 June 2014 Area Committee meeting can be found via this link:
http://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=711&MId=7980&Ver=4

6.2 Minutes of the 12 February 2015 Area Committee meeting can be found via this link:
http://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=711&MId=8189&Ver=4

REPORT CLEARANCE CHECKLIST
(Removed prior to publication and retained by Governance Service)

Report authors should engage with their Governance Champion early in the report writing process and record the date below. If the decision/report has been reviewed at an internal board please record the date and name of the meeting (e.g. SCB). Otherwise enter N/A. All reports must be cleared by the appropriate Director/AD, Legal, Finance and Governance as a minimum. **Legal, Finance and Governance require a minimum of 5 working days to provide report clearance. Clearance cannot be guaranteed for reports submitted outside of this time.**

AUTHOR TO COMPLETE TABLE BELOW:

Who	Clearance Date	Name
Governance Champion		
Director / AD / Lead Commissioner	**18/06/2015**	**Jamie Blake**
Enabling Board / Delivery Board		
Commissioning and Policy		
Equalities & Diversity		
HR Business Partner		
Strategic Procurement		
HB Public Law	**24/06/2015**	**Donna Lee**
Finance	**22/06/2015**	**Ruth Hodson**
Governance	**23/06/2015**	**Paul Frost**