

	<p style="text-align: center;">Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee</p> <p style="text-align: center;">3 February 2020</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Title</p>	<p>Rosemont Avenue, N12 - Proposed Point No Entry – Consultation Results</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Report of</p>	<p>Executive Director, Environment</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Wards</p>	<p>Woodhouse</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Status</p>	<p>Public</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Urgent</p>	<p>No</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Key</p>	<p>No</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Enclosures</p>	<p>Drawing No. BC/001609-05-01_SC_100-01</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Officer Contact Details</p>	<p>Geoff Mee – Interim Executive Director, Environment Geoff.Mee@barnet.gov.uk</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Summary</p>	
<p>This report details the outcome of the statutory consultation undertaken on a proposal to install a 'point no-entry' in Rosemont Avenue, N12.</p>	

<p style="text-align: center;">Officers Recommendations</p>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That, the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee notes the results of the statutory consultation as set out in this report. 2. That, having considered the objections received during the statutory consultation on the proposals outlined in this report, the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee delegate authority to Officers to proceed with the implementation of the 'Point No Entry' in Rosemont Avenue as illustrated in Drawing No. BC/001609-05-01_SC_100-01.

3. That, the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee agree to allocate the funding of £16,000 from the Finchley and Golders Green CIL budget in 2021 to design and introduce the approved Option (subject to available funding).

1. WHY THIS REPORT IS NEEDED

- 1.1 In response to concerns raised in a Member's Item to the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee in February 2019 about traffic flow and congestion on Rosemont Avenue, it was agreed at the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee meeting in July 2019, to carry out a public consultation on the proposal to install a 'point of no entry' in Rosemont Avenue.
- 1.2 The purpose of this report is to consider the objections and comments received to the statutory consultation on this proposal in Rosemont Avenue and decide whether the measures should be introduced.

2. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 The scheme as consulted is shown on Consultation Drawing No. BC/001609-05-01_SC_100-01 and includes a point of no-entry on Rosemont Avenue at the junction with High Road and incorporates the following engineering measures ("the proposal"):
- 'No Entry' signs and revised road markings on Rosemont Avenue at its junction with High Road with an exemption for cyclists;
 - Improved road markings on Rosemont Avenue at the junction with Woodberry Grove.
- 2.2 Public consultation on the Proposal was carried out for three weeks from 26 September 2019. Consultation letters outlining the Proposals were hand delivered to 380 properties in the local area. The Proposal was published in the local press and London Gazette and notices were put up on street.
- 2.3 Only seven responses to the consultation were received and of these:
- 1 expressed support for the Proposal and also suggested additional measures;
 - 6 objected to the Proposal.
- 2.4 The responses received and officer comments are summarised in the table below:

Number of similar responses	Consultation response (summarised)	Officer comment
1	Supports the proposal as believes that it will alleviate the traffic congestion problems in the road. Additional suggestion to make the road one way. Also noted a concern about motorists parking across the access to their parking at the rear of the property and	The option to install a one-way was considered during the design stage, however the 'point no entry' was the preferred option to improve traffic flow, reduce vehicle conflicts whilst minimising any inconvenience for residents. Installing a one-way could

	suggested the existing waiting restriction is upgraded to 'at any time'.	potentially increase speeds in the road.
1	Objects to the scheme as believes it could cause inconvenience to residents. Concerned that there could be a bottleneck at the junction of Rosemont Avenue and Woodberry Grove. Also concerned that traffic speeds would be higher as motorists may treat it like a one-way.	The proposal to ban entry to Rosemont Avenue from High Road aims to reduce vehicle conflicts and improve traffic flow. Maintaining two-way traffic flow in Rosemont Avenue aims to minimise any inconvenience to residents and it is not expected that there would be an increase in traffic speeds in Rosemont Avenue.
1	<p>Objects to the proposal as concerned about the impact to their business (based on High Road but with a rear car park in Rosemont Avenue). Concerned about the extra journey time for staff who regularly travel to and from the office and for visitors to the premises.</p> <p>Concerned that the pay by phone parking bays at the High Road entrance to Rosemont Avenue would become redundant.</p> <p>Believes that the sole cause of congestion in the area is due to parking on High Road between Homebase and Rosemont Avenue.</p> <p>Concerned about potential congestion on refuse collection days as there is no space to pass these vehicles due to parked vehicles and there will not be the option to access from High Road.</p>	<p>The proposal is not expected to significantly increase journey times. Motorists travelling north on High Road would be able to access Rosemont Avenue from Christchurch Avenue and Woodberry Grove and southbound motorists via Kingsway and Ballards Lane.</p> <p>Use of the pay by phone parking bays could be assessed if it was considered that that they were being underutilised. Concerns about parking related congestion on the High Road will be referred to Council's Enforcement Team for enforcement of the existing 'At any time' waiting restrictions.</p> <p>Unfortunately, there can be some delays to traffic in residential roads while refuse collections are carried out on designated refuse collection days. This is not uncommon on collection days in other residential roads across the borough and indeed across London.</p>
1	Opposed to the proposal as considers the scheme pointless unless the road is made one way. Concerned that there would be increased traffic in Kingsway and that Woodberry Grove and Christchurch Avenue may be negatively impacted too.	The option to install a one-way was considered, however the point of no entry was the preferred option to improve traffic flow, reduce vehicle conflicts whilst minimising any inconvenience for residents. It is not anticipated that there will be a significant impact to surrounding roads.
3	Objects to the proposal as approval was recently granted to implement a one-way in neighbouring Churchfield Avenue and is concerned about the potential for eastbound traffic approaching from Ballards Lane to cut	Traffic surveys indicated that just under 60% of vehicles using Rosemont Avenue travel in an eastbound direction, however the numbers are not exceptionally large. It is not envisaged that there would

	<p>through Rosemont Avenue and Churchfield Avenue to avoid the traffic lights at Tally Ho (Kingsway).</p> <p>Concerned that residents of Churchfield Avenue were not consulted on the proposal.</p>	<p>be an increase in westbound traffic re-routing through Rosemont Avenue and Churchfield Avenue and it is not believed there would be a time saving in doing so.</p> <p>380 properties in the immediate vicinity of the proposal were consulted, including those in Rosemont Avenue, Woodberry Grove and a stretch of Christchurch Avenue, High Road and Ballards Lane. The proposal was also published in the local press and similar notices were put up in the local area detailing proposed measures.</p>
--	---	--

- 2.7 Considering the objections received, officers have been mindful of the impact of the introduction of the proposal in the area and although it is acknowledged that it may cause an inconvenience to some residents it is believed that the improvements outweigh any dis-benefits.

3. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND NOT RECOMMENDED

- 3.1 The option to install a one-way in Rosemont Avenue was considered but not recommended as it was believed that this option may not be as well supported by residents due to greater restriction on vehicle movements. This option may also lead to an increase in vehicle speeds in the road.
- 3.2 There are currently no plans to amend the parking layout in Rosemont Avenue however the various parking concerns have been noted for future review.
- 3.3 The only other option at this stage is not to proceed with the scheme, however, this will not address the original concerns raised by Ward Councillors in February 2019.

4. POST DECISION IMPLEMENTATION

- 4.1 If the recommendation is approved, the detailed design of the proposal will be completed and the scheme progressed to implementation.

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 The estimated cost for detailed design and implementation of this Proposal is **£16,000**.

5.2.2 The work will be carried out under the existing PFI (electrical) and LoHAC (non-electrical) term maintenance contractual arrangements.

5.2.3 Future maintenance of electrical apparatus shall pass to Barnet Lighting Services, the PFI Contractor, who will charge a commuted sum for the maintenance – the cost of this can be absorbed within existing Council revenue budgets.

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 Highways Act 1980 provides general and specific powers for the highway authority to make changes or improvements to the highway.

5.4.2 The Council has the necessary legal powers to introduce traffic orders to put the proposal into effect under section 6 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.

5.4.3 Section 16 of 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.

5.4.4 Article 7 of the Council's Constitution states 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".

5.5 **Risk Management**

5.5.1 The issues involved in this report are not likely to raise significant levels of public concern or comment or give rise to policy considerations.

5.5.2 There would be construction risks associated with introducing the scheme which would require management throughout the detailed design, implementation and construction work, assessed as low.

5.6 Equalities and Diversity

5.6.1 Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 outlines the provisions of the public-sector equalities duty which requires public bodies to have due regard to the need to:

5.6.2

- Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Equality Act 2010
- Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;
- Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

5.6.3. The relevant protected characteristics are: age; disability; gender reassignment; pregnancy and maternity; race; religion or belief; sex; sexual orientation.

5.6.4 The Proposal is not expected to be of disproportionate benefit or dis-benefit to members of any particular protected group.

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 on the proposals as set out above and this report deals with the comments and objections received.

5.8 Insight

5.8.1 The responses from the statutory consultation have been reviewed and officers met with a ward councillor on site.

6. BACKGROUND PAPERS

6.1 Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee 4 February 2019.
<https://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=712&MId=9527&Ver=4>

6.2 Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee 9 July 2019.
<https://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=712&MId=9957&Ver=4>