	Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee **13 June 2018**
Title	**Hampstead Way, NW11- Feasibility Study**
Report of	Strategic Director for Environment
Wards	Garden Suburb
Status	Public
Urgent	No
Key	No
Enclosures	**Appendix - Drawings:** **BC/001411-DESIGN-01 & BC/001411-DESIGN-02**
Officer Contact Details	Jamie Blake – Strategic Director for Environment Jamie.blake@barnet.gov.uk

Summary

This report details the results of a feasibility study which involves investigating measures to reduce the traffic problems raised on Hampstead Way, NW11 and it puts forward two options for consideration to address the concerns at this location.

Recommendations

1. **That the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee note the review of the improvements on as outlined in this report and the appendices to this report and depicted on drawings BC/001411-DESIGN-01 & BC/001411-DESIGN-02 attached as an Appendix.**
2. **Having considered both options that the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee approve the Officer preferred Option 1 –Installation of informal crossing point, to be progressed to detailed design, as outlined in drawing BC/001411-DESIGN-01.**
3. **That the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee delegates authority to the Strategic Director for Environment to carry out a consultation on Option 1.**
4. **That subject to no objections being received to the consultation, referred to in recommendation 3, the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee delegates**

	to the Strategic Director for Environment to implement the approved proposal.
5.	**That the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee agree that if any objections are received as a result of the consultation, referred to in recommendation 3, the Strategic Director for Environment will consider these objections and determine whether the agreed proposal should be implemented or not, and if so, with or without modification.**
6.	**That the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee agree to allocate the funding of £24,200 for the agreed Option (CIL from this year's CIL Area Committee budget) to design and introduce the approved Option.**

1. WHY THIS REPORT IS NEEDED

1.1 During the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee on the 15 February 2018, Councillor John Marshall introduced his Member's item, which was related to carrying out a feasibility study on Hampstead Way between Meadway and Wellgarth Road including a speed survey and investigating the feasibility of introducing a controlled crossing.

1.2 Following discussion of the item, the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee unanimously agreed and it was therefore resolved:

"To approve funding of £5,000 for a feasibility survey at the above location"

1.3 This report therefore investigates options to address the issues related to traffic problems on Hampstead Way between Meadway and Wellgarth Road.

2. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1 This approach to prioritise traffic improvements is informed by i) site observations on the pedestrian experience, and ii) speed survey data.

2.2 Following the review of the traffic and pedestrian crossing movements, two options were developed.

2.3 As part of this feasibility study, the personal injury data was analysed investigating 60 months of accident data to 31 October 2016. This is the latest data that was available from the police and the 2016 data is provisional and subject to change. There were six collisions in total all coded as slight. Table 1 below shows a summary of the collisions within the study area.

Table 1 – Summary of the Personal Injury Accident Data

Date	Accident Reference	Severity	Summary
24/02/2014	0114SX20135	Slight	This collision involved two vehicles. V2 failed to give way at the roundabout rear of passing V1 at speed causing V1 to spin and face the wrong way.
15/05/2014	0114SX20440	Slight	This collision involved two vehicles. V1 turned left into junction as V2 was turning right out of junction which resulted in the collision.
04/12/2014	0114SX21122	Slight	This collision involved two vehicles. V1 stopped to turn left and was hit in the rear by V2.
31/01/2015	0115SC20200	Slight	This collision involved two vehicles. V1 lost control on a bend, possibly on ice and hit parked V2
06/03/2017	01170023238	Slight	This collision involved two vehicles. The driver of V1 failed to look properly.
14/05/2017	01170037268	Slight	This collision involved two vehicles. V1 was travelling too fast for conditions and lost control while V2 failed to look properly.

2.4 Hampstead Way is currently subject to a 30mph speed limit and serves bus route H3. A traffic speed survey was conducted from 16/04/2018 to 22/04/2018 opposite Property No. 107 (Site 1), 71 (Site 2), 51 (Site 3) & 5 (Site 4) Hampstead Way.

The figures in the tables below indicate the 24 hour mean and 85th percentile (free flow) speeds for each day at both locations.

Table 2 – Speed Data (Site 1)

Date	Northbound		Southbound	
	85th Percentile Speed	Mean Speed	85th Percentile Speed	Mean Speed
16/04/2018	25.1	20.5	24.4	20.3
17/04/2018	24.1	19.3	23.9	19.7
18/04/2018	24.8	20.3	23.8	18.8
19/04/2018	23.4	18.5	22.6	18.0
20/04/2018	23.1	18.4	23.0	18.8
21/04/2018	25.2	20.9	25.2	21.3
22/04/2018	25.2	20.9	25.4	21.0

Table 3 – Speed Data (Site 2)

Date	Northbound		Southbound	
	85th Percentile Speed	Mean Speed	85th Percentile Speed	Mean Speed
16/04/2018	30.2	26.1	28.5	24.8
17/04/2018	30.3	26.2	28.6	24.8
18/04/2018	30.5	26.4	28.9	25.2
19/04/2018	30.6	26.7	29.2	25.2
20/04/2018	30.1	26.1	28.7	24.8
21/04/2018	29.4	25.1	27.9	23.8
22/04/2018	29.4	24.8	28.2	23.8

Table 4 – Speed Data (Site 3)

Date	Northbound		Southbound	
	85th Percentile Speed	Mean Speed	85th Percentile Speed	Mean Speed
16/04/2018	34.4	29.3	33.2	27.4
17/04/2018	33.9	28.5	32.4	26.7
18/04/2018	34.4	29.1	32.1	26.8
19/04/2018	34.3	28.7	32.3	26.9
20/04/2018	34.1	28.5	32.2	26.4
21/04/2018	33.5	28.1	32.0	26.2
22/04/2018	34.4	29.1	32.1	26.5

Table 5 – Speed Data (Site 4)

Date	Northbound		Southbound	
	85th Percentile Speed	Mean Speed	85th Percentile Speed	Mean Speed
16/04/2018	27.5	23.9	23.8	21.0
17/04/2018	26.9	23.4	23.8	21.0
18/04/2018	27.0	23.4	23.5	20.7
19/04/2018	26.7	23.2	23.3	20.5
20/04/2018	26.8	23.4	23.2	20.5
21/04/2018	26.7	23.1	23.6	20.6
22/04/2018	26.1	22.3	23.0	20.2

2.5 Following the site survey, traffic survey and a review of the vehicle movements, two options to address traffic problems on Hampstead Way have been developed, which are summarised in table 3 below:

Table 6 – Design Options

Option	Summary
Option 1 BC/001411-DESIGN-01	This option proposes to install an informal crossing point on Hampstead Way, install a warning sign on lamp column 42 for southbound traffic, and to refresh the existing road markings.
Option 2 BC/001411-DESIGN-02	This option proposes to install an informal crossing point on Hampstead Way, refresh the existing road markings and to remove 20m of parking.

2.6 The above options have been reviewed on site by officers and option 1 which is detailed on drawing BC/001411-DESIGN-01 is the preferred option.

2.7 Option 2 which is detailed on drawing BC/001411-DESIGN-02 and is not recommended due to the concerns regarding loss of parking raised by residents during the site visit with officers and ward councillors.

3. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND NOT RECOMMENDED

3.1 In addition to the two options set out above, the only other option at this stage is not to proceed with any of the proposed improvements; however, this will not address the original concern raised by residents regarding traffic problems on Hampstead Way.

3.2 The potential advantages/ disadvantages of implementing the scheme are summarised in table 7 below:

Advantages	Disadvantages
- Enhanced pedestrian safety; safe crossing point with advantages for mobility impaired users. - Improved pedestrian experience (crossing located at the pedestrian desire line). - Reducing the carriageway width can help to reduce vehicle speeds and reduce crossing distances.	- Possible increase of traffic and bus journey times.

3.3 Option 1 is the preferred Option and Option 2 is not recommended due to the loss of parking.

4. POST DECISION IMPLEMENTATION

4.1 Once the recommendation is approved and subject to funding being approved, detailed design would be undertaken. Ward members and residents living near Hampstead Way would be consulted on the intention to implement Option 1 and comments invited. Implementation would follow once any issues have been considered and resolved where possible with a view to implement subject to funding being made available.

5. IMPLICATIONS OF DECISION

5.1 Corporate Priorities and Performance

5.1.1 The scheme will help to address the Corporate Plan delivery objectives of “a clean and attractive environment, with well-maintained roads and pavements, flowing traffic”, “Barnet’s children and young people will receive a great start in life”, “Barnet will be amongst the safest places in London” and “a responsible approach to regeneration, with thousands of new homes built” by helping residents to feel confident walking to school, helping to reduce traffic congestion.

5.1.2 Improvements that encourage walking or other active travel will help to deliver the active travel and recreation opportunities identified in the Health and Wellbeing Strategy for children and the population generally.

5.1.3 The Joint Strategic Needs also identifies that encouraging travel by foot, bicycle or public transport could drive good lifestyle behaviours and reduced demand for health and social care services.

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

5.2.1 London Highways Alliance (LOHAC) schedule of rates have been used to carry out a preliminary high level cost estimate as shown in Table 4 and 5 below, which will need to be refined by LOHAC upon completion of the feasibility design:

Table 4 –Cost Estimate Option 1

Activity	Estimated costs
Detailed Design (Includes advertising, public consultation, safety audits etc.)	£ 7 000
Build Cost	£ 15 000
Sub-TOTAL	£ 22 000
Implementation & post implementation fee @ 10%	£ 2 200
GRAND TOTAL	**£ 24 200**

Table 5 –Cost Estimate Option 2

Activity	Estimated costs
Detailed Design (Includes advertising, safety audits etc.)	£7 000
Build Cost	£ 15 500
Sub-TOTAL	£ 22 500
Implementation & post implementation fee @ 10%	£ 2 250
GRAND TOTAL	**£ 24 750**

5.2.2 The estimated cost of installing the recommended Option 1 is £24 750 and is requested from the Area Committee budget.

5.2.3 Prior to any approval of any further requests from this budget at this Committee, the total funding available is £158,711. This balance consists of an in year CIL allocation of £150,000 combined with a carry forward of £8,711, consisting of prior over/underspends and brought forward balances from 2017/18.

5.3 **Social Value**

5.3.1 As procurement is via existing term or framework agreements, there are no relevant social value considerations in relation to this work.

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.

5.1 **Risk Management**

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

5.2 **Equalities and Diversity**

5.2.1 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.

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

5.2.3 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 12 NOV 2017

https://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/documents/g9275/Printed%20minutes%2014th-Nov-2017%2019.00%20Finchley%20Golders%20Green%20Area%20Committee.pdf?T=1