



## Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee

13 June 2018

<b>Title</b>	<b>Road Safety measures around Menorah Primary School, NW11- Review of Consultation responses February 2018 and new proposals</b>
<b>Report of</b>	Strategic Director for Environment
<b>Wards</b>	Golders Green and Childs Hill
<b>Status</b>	Public
<b>Urgent</b>	No
<b>Key</b>	No
<b>Enclosures</b>	Appendix A – Consultation Drawing Appendix B – Summary of objections Appendix C – Uncontrolled Crossing Options Appendix D – 20 mph zone proposal
<b>Officer Contact Details</b>	Jamie Blake – Strategic Director for Environment <a href="mailto:Jamie.blake@barnet.gov.uk">Jamie.blake@barnet.gov.uk</a>

## Summary

This report details the results of the consultation for the Road Safety measures around Menorah Primary School Scheme that was approved by the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee on 14 November 2017. This proposal was developed to introduce an uncontrolled crossing at Woodstock Avenue near to junction with The Drive, One Way system at The Drive (southbound flow) between Montpelier Rise and Woodstock Avenue and a 20 mph zones around Menorah Primary School.

Statutory consultation has been undertaken and this report set outs summary of objections received and investigates alternative options.

## Recommendations

1. That the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee notes the results of the statutory consultation as set out in Appendix B in this report.
2. Having considered the objections, the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee notes the alternative options set out in this report.
3. That the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee approves that the preferred Option 1 for the uncontrolled crossings at The Drive and 20 mph speed zone and authorises that the Strategic Director for Environment should instruct officers to progress to public consultation and detail design.
4. That the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee agree that if any objections are received as a result of the statutory consultations, referred to in recommendation 3, the Strategic Director for Environment will consider and determine whether the agreed Options should be implemented or not, and if so, with or without modification.
5. That the Committee notes that the funding for the agreed Option is included in the Local Implementation Plan (LIP) 2018/19 budget to introduce the approved Option.

### 1. WHY THIS REPORT IS NEEDED

- 1.1 The 2 August 2017 Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee considered the Members Item from Councillor Dean Cohen relating to road safety in and around Menorah Primary School, NW11.

Following discussion of the item, the Committee RESOLVED:

*To approve funding for 2 Vehicle Activated Signs at a cost of £4,000 each, and a feasibility study at a cost of up to £5,000 to consider options for other measures that may be appropriate.*

- 1.2 School Travel Plan Issues:

As part of this feasibility study the following issues raised in the School Travel Plan have also been considered:

- Visibility is poor at the junction of The Drive and Woodstock Avenue;
- Request for a 20mph zone implemented in the roads surrounding the school site – Woodstock Avenue, The Drive, Sandringham Road, Hamilton Road & Montpellier Rise. Vehicle speeds have been reported as excessive.

- 1.3 A feasibility study was presented on the 14 November 2017 Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee.

Following discussion of the item, the Committee RESOLVED:

1. *That the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee note the detail of the feasibility study as outlined in this report in relation to an uncontrolled crossing and introducing a 20 mph speed around Menorah Primary School.*
  2. *That the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee notes that the preferred Option is option 1A for the uncontrolled crossings and the 20 mph zone and requests that the Strategic Director for Environment should instruct officers to consult with the school on the scheme and then if appropriate progress to public consultation and detail design, but at the same time notes that the scheme cost is in excess of the maximum budget available to the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee but may be eligible for LIP funding.*
  3. *That the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee notes that if any objections are received as a result of the statutory consultations, referred to in recommendation 2, the Strategic Director for Environment will consider and determine whether the agreed Options should be implemented or not, and if so, with or without modification, subject to LIP funding being made available.*
- 1.4 Statutory consultation was undertaken on the scheme, between 18 January 2018 and 8 February 2018. Press and on-street notices were provided for the statutory changes proposed and a letter and plan distributed to 656 properties inviting comments or objections.
- 1.5 The scheme as consulted is shown on Appendix A-Consultation Drawing and incorporated the following measures:
- A. Uncontrolled Crossings at Woodstock Avenue and The Drive with kerb build outs.
  - B. Permanent introduction of One Way at The Drive (southbound flow) between Montpelier Rise and Woodstock Avenue.
  - C. 20 mile per hour zone covering the following roads:
    - Elmcroft Crescent,
    - Montpelier Way,
    - Montpelier Rise,
    - Sandringham Road,
    - Hamilton Road (starting at the junction with Elmcroft Crescent),
    - Woodstock Avenue (starting at junction with The Grove).
    - The Drive (starting at junction with Limes Avenue)

1.6 A total of 378 responses were received.

- 337 residents signed the same letter objected to provision of whole scheme.
- 28 objected to provision of whole scheme.
- 9 objected to provision of the One Way system and uncontrolled crossing and supported 20 mph zone.
- 1 Supportive.
- 2 Required additional information.
- 1 Suggested studying additional area around Wessex School.

The concerns are set out in more detail in Appendix B.

1.7 After the consultation period and having considered the comments from residents, it is recommended that the following:

- Not progressing with the One Way System at The Drive;
- Not progressing with the uncontrolled crossing kerb build outs at Woodstock Avenue;
- Re-study the 20 mph area;
- Look at a feasible new location for a safe crossing at The Drive.

### **Proposed new alternative options. General Details**

#### **1.8 General**

1.8.1 In light of the consultation results, different alternatives have been studied.

- Uncontrolled crossing at The Drive.
- Review of the 20 mph zone/limit.

#### **1.9 Uncontrolled Crossing options**

Because of The Drive layout between Woodstock Avenue and Montpelier Rise, where there is a predominance of driveways, parking bays and trees, and trying to minimise the loss of parking, only two feasible crossings have been identified.

1.9.1 Option 1: Uncontrolled Crossings at The Drive.

*(Refer to Appendix C-Drawing No C2017\_BC001143-13-02-Option 1-01)*

This option includes the construction of an uncontrolled crossings with new kerb build out at southbound on The Drive, which it is needed to improve the visibility, thus the pedestrians can see and be seen by the vehicles.

The location for this solution is outside properties number 4 and 6.

This new layout shows a total carriageway width of 5.4 metres at The Drive.

Regarding the parking, 4.6 metres would need to be removed at The Drive. This is a resident Resident permit holders only (Mon-Fri 11am-12pm).

Therefore, in order not to lose a resident space, 5.4 metres will be removed from the Payment Parking spaces (Mon-Fri 10am-5pm Max stay 6hrs 30mins) and turned into Resident permit holders only parking.

In addition, new double yellow lines will be introduced at The Drive junction with Woodstock Avenue and at the uncontrolled crossing. Likewise, new layout of School Keep Clear road markings is needed as shown in Appendix C-Option 1.

#### Advantages

- Improved safety provided by uncontrolled crossing,
- Better Visibility than Option 2.
- This location is closer than Option 2 to the pupil's entrance to the school (Gate North at The Drive).

#### Disadvantages

- Loss of one Payment Parking space (5.4 metres).
- New gully drainage is needed around the kerb buildout (higher cost)

#### Cost Estimated

Detailed Design	£3,000
Safety audit, surveys etc	£1,500
Consultation & TMO	£4,500
Construction (works cost)	£14,500
Implementation, supervision and post implementation costs	£2,500
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>£26,000</b>

***Table 1***

#### Option 2: Uncontrolled Crossings at The Drive.

*(Refer to Appendix C-Drawing No C2017\_BC001143-13-02-Option 2-01)*

As Option 1, has been proposed the same layout of kerb build out, in this case outside property number 34 Woodstock Avenue (The Drive side).

This new layout shows a total carriageway width of 5.25 metres at The Drive.

Regarding the parking, 5.4 metres would need to be removed at The Drive. This is a Payment Parking (Mon-Fri 10am-5pm Max stay 6hrs 30mins).

In addition, new double yellow lines will be introduced at The Drive junction with Woodstock Avenue and at the uncontrolled crossing. Likewise, new layout of School Keep Clear road markings and single yellow lines are needed as shown in Appendix C-Option 2.

#### Advantages

- Improved safety provided by uncontrolled crossing.

### Disadvantages

- Loss of one Payment Parking space (5.4 metres).
- Less visibility than Option 1.
- This location is closer to The Drive junction with Woodstock Avenue where the visibility is poor.
- This location is further than Option 2 to the pupils entrance (Gate North at the Driver).
- The carriageway width is narrower than in Option 1.
- New gully drainage is needed around the kerb buildouts (high cost)

### Cost Estimate

As the dimensions are similar to Option 1, the same cost has been estimated.

Detailed Design	£3,000
Safety audit, surveys etc	£1,500
Consultation & TMO	£4,500
Construction (works cost)	£14,500
Implementation, supervision and post implementation costs	£2,500
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>£26,000</b>

**Table 2**

#### **1.10 20 mph zone**

- 1.10.1 After reviewing the speed and the accident surveys, it has been decided to reduce the speed limit in the area to a 20 mph zone. *(Refer to Appendix D-Drawing No C2017\_BC001143-13-02-Proposal-01).*
- 1.10.2 The existing 85th Percentile Speeds are above 24mph in the studied area, so it is recommended that the signage supplemented by **at least** one physical traffic calming measures, in order to achieve the aims of a 20mph speed limit.
- 1.10.3 The different options for the uncontrolled crossing set out above, could be considered as a physical traffic calming feature, because both of them propose build out. Therefore the proposals for uncontrolled crossing and the 20mph zone need to be considered in conjunction.
- 1.10.4 The proposal includes the introduction of a 20 mph speed zone covering the following roads or part of them:
- Elmcroft Crescent,
  - Montpellier Rise,
  - Woodstock Avenue and
  - The Drive (starting at junction with Elmcroft Crescent)

A 20 mph zone requires the installation of 20 mph speed zone terminal signs and also the following measures:

- At least one physical traffic calming feature, which would be Option 1-2 above for an uncontrolled crossing proposed
- Combination of the following at 100 m (maximum) intervals:
  - Upright 20 speed limit signs (to diagram 670)
  - 20 mph roundel markings (to diagram 1065).

#### Advantages

- The speed limit signs in 20 mph zones are regulatory,
- There is a link between the introduction of 20mph zones and a subsequent reduction in casualties,
- 20mph zones invites to physical activity (walking and cycling), contributing towards a safer environment

#### Disadvantages

- Some journeys will take a slightly longer due to reduced speeds.

#### Cost Estimate

Detailed Design	£3,000
Safety audit, surveys etc	£1,500
Consultation & TMO	£4,500
Construction (works cost)	£5,200
Implementation, supervision and post implementation costs	£1,800
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>£16,000</b>

**Table 3**

### 1.11 Summary of new proposals

Option	Brief Description	Summary of Potential Advantages/ Disadvantages	Indicative Costs
1	<b>Option 1</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Uncontrolled Crossings at The Drive with kerb build outs (southbound)</li> </ul> <b>20 mph zone</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 20 mph speed zone/End of 20 mph zone terminal signs: 8 no.</li> <li>- Repeated 20 mph roundel road markings.</li> </ul>	<b>Advantages</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Improved safety provided by uncontrolled crossing,</li> <li>- Better Visibility than Option 2.</li> <li>- Location closer than Option 2 to the pupils entrance (Gate North at The Drive).</li> <li>- The speed limit signs in 20 mph zones are regulatory,</li> <li>- There is a link between the introduction of 20mph zones and a subsequent reduction in casualties, 20 mph zone proposed is covering the accident study area.</li> <li>- 20mph zones invites to physical activity (walking and cycling), contributing towards a safer environment</li> </ul>	£42,000

Option	Brief Description	Summary of Potential Advantages/ Disadvantages	Indicative Costs
		<u>Disadvantages</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Loss of parking (4.6 m)</li> <li>- New gully (high cost)</li> <li>- Some journeys will take a slightly longer.</li> </ul>	
2	<b>Option 2</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Uncontrolled Crossings at The Drive with kerb build outs (southbound)</li> </ul> <b>20 mph zone</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 20 mph speed zone/End of 20 mph zone terminal signs: 8 no.</li> <li>- Repeated 20 mph roundel road markings.</li> </ul>	<u>Advantages</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Improved safety provided by uncontrolled crossing,</li> <li>- The speed limit signs in 20 mph zones are regulatory,</li> <li>- There is a link between the introduction of 20mph zones and a subsequent reduction in casualties,</li> <li>- 20 mph zone proposed is covering the accident study area.</li> <li>- 20mph zones invites to physical activity (walking and cycling), contributing towards a safer environment</li> </ul> <u>Disadvantages</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Loss of one Payment Parking space (5.40 metres).</li> <li>- Less visibility than Option 1.</li> <li>- This location is closer to The Drive junction with Woodstock Avenue where the visibility is poor.</li> <li>- This location is further than Option 2 to the pupils entrance (Gate North at the Driver).</li> <li>- The carriageway width is narrower than in Option 1.</li> <li>- New gully drainage is needed around the kerb buildouts (high cost)</li> <li>- Some journeys will take longer.</li> </ul>	£42,000

**Table 5**

## 1.12 Conclusions and Recommendations

1.12.1 The two options for the Uncontrolled Crossing are both considered feasible. However, officers would choose the preferred solution of Option 1, because this provides a safe crossing at the best value and in terms of compliance, and safety. The total estimate cost for this is £42,000.

## 2. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1 The uncontrolled crossing (preferred Option 1) would provide a safe crossing around Menorah Primary School and because of the residential character of the area the preferred option is the introducing of a 20 mph speed zone as proposed.



### **3. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND NOT RECOMMENDED**

- 3.1 Alternative options considered and not recommended were covered in previous report presented on 14 November 2017 Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee.

### **4. POST DECISION IMPLEMENTATION**

- 4.1 Following the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee's agreement, consultation with schools, residents, Metropolitan Police and emergency services would be undertaken and detailed design of the proposal would be completed, with a view to implementing the proposal during the 2018/19 financial year.

### **5. IMPLICATIONS OF DECISION**

#### **5.1 Corporate Priorities and Performance**

- 5.1.1 The proposals here will particularly help to address the Corporate Plan delivery objectives of "a clean and attractive environment, with well-maintained roads and pavements, flowing traffic" and "a responsible approach to regeneration, with thousands of new homes built" by helping residents to feel confident moving around their local area on foot, and in a vehicle and contribute to reduced congestion.

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

- 5.2.1 Transport for London (TfL) provide core funding for implementation of a borough Local Implementation Plan (LIP) 2018/2019 programme, which is in the Council's capital programme at £3.499 million. It includes a "Corridors, Neighbourhoods and Supporting Measures" programme for addressing a range of transport issues.
- 5.2.2 The proposals in this report would be introduced using funding from that programme – specifically, the budget for School Travel Plan schemes, which has a budget of £200,000. Depending on the detail design, the entire scheme would cost an estimate of £42,000. No additional funding is required from the Area Committee Budget to implement this scheme.
- 5.2.3 The works will be carried out under the existing LOHAC (London Highways Alliance) term maintenance contractual arrangements and through the Council's internal DLO contractor.
- 5.2.4 The necessary road markings and associated signage will require on-going routine maintenance.
- 5.2.5 At feasibility stage, detailed cost estimates cannot be provided. Notwithstanding this, indicative costs have been provided based on schemes of a similar nature. These costs are subject to change during the design phase.

### **5.3. Social Value**

5.3.1 None in the context of this report.

### **5.4. Legal and Constitutional References**

5.4.1. The Council's Constitution, in Article 7, states that that Area Committees: "In relation to the area covered have responsibility for all constituency specific matters relating to the street scene including parking, road safety, transport, allotments" parks and trees.

5.4.2. The Traffic Management Act 2004 places obligations on authorities to ensure the expeditious movement of traffic on their road network. Authorities are required to make arrangements as they consider appropriate for planning and carrying out the action to be taken in performing the duty.

### **5.5. Risk Management**

5.5.1. None in the context of this report. Risk management may be required for work resulting from this report.

### **5.6. Equalities and Diversity**

5.1.1 Section 149 of the 2010 Equality Act outlines the provisions of the Public Sector Equalities Duty which requires Public Bodies 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.

5.1.2 The safety elements incorporated benefit all road users equally as they would improve safety and traffic flow at those locations.

5.1.3 The proposal is not expected to disproportionately disadvantage or benefit individual members of the community.

### **5.7. Corporate Parenting**

5.7.1. Not applicable in the context of this report

### **5.8. Consultation and Engagement**

5.8.1. A statutory consultation has been undertaken as set out above and this report deals with objections and comments received.

### **5.9. Insight**

5.9.1. The options developed for the scheme were informed through analysis of injury accident data and on site observations of the issues.

## **6. BACKGROUND PAPERS**

- 6.1. Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee 14 November 2017, Item 15.

<http://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=712&MId=9275&Ver=4>

- 6.2. Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee 2 August 2017, Item 9.

<https://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=712&MId=9273&Ver=4>