
Meeting	Chipping Barnet Area Environment Sub-Committee
Date	13 March 2013
Subject	The Avenue EN5 – Foulds School Pedestrian Improvements
Report of	Director for Place
Summary	The report outlines findings of the initial investigations regarding a pedestrian improvements feasibility study

Officer Contributors	Themba Nleya
Status (public or exempt)	Public
Wards Affected	High Barnet Ward
Key Decision	Not Applicable
Reason for urgency / exemption from call-in	Not Applicable
Function of	Executive
Enclosures	Appendix A - Drawing No. 60670-2C
Contact for Further Information:	Themba Nleya 0208 359 4198

1. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1.1 That the Committee note the outcome of the investigation into the feasibility of providing a crossing facility at the predetermined location on the Avenue as presented in this report.**
- 1.2 Be mindful of the Council's current approach to traffic management measures**
- 1.3 Decide whether or not the introduction of a Pelican crossing should be progressed on The Avenue at the predetermined location, or**
- 1.4 Decide whether or not an alternative crossing facility should be pursued on the Avenue, and**
- 1.4 Subject to 1.3 or 1.4 above as appropriate, instruct the Director for Place to proceed to a detailed design and public consultation on the preferred outcome with a view to implementation, subject to availability of resources, and subsequent to liaison with local ward members and agreement with the Cabinet Member for Environment.**

2. RELEVANT PREVIOUS DECISIONS

- 2.1 The Chipping Barnet Area Environment Sub-Committee meeting on 16 January 2013 reconfirmed a previous decision that considered a members' item by Councillor Longstaff requesting the installation of a Pelican crossing on The Avenue.

3. CORPORATE PRIORITIES AND POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

- 3.1 Introducing traffic management measures in the borough will contribute to the Corporate Plan priority "A Successful London Suburb" by enhancing Barnet's reputation as a good place to work and live.
- 3.2 The London Mayor's Transport Strategy also addresses these areas through: "Proposal 30: The Mayor, through TfL, and working with the London boroughs and other stakeholders, will introduce measures to smooth traffic flow to manage congestion (delay, reliability and network resilience) for all people and freight movements on the road network, and maximise the efficiency of the network. These measures will include ...c) "... keep traffic moving ..." , e) Planning and implementing ... improvements to the existing road network, ... to improve traffic flow on the most congested sections of the network, and to improve conditions for all road users

4. RISK MANAGEMENT ISSUES

- 4.1 I do not consider the issues involved are likely to give rise to policy considerations as the proposed measures would provide pedestrian access points without having a major impact on traffic flow.
- 4.2 There would be some minor disruption whilst the work is being completed but this would be minimised through traffic management in discussion with contractor undertaking the work.

5. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY ISSUES

- 5.1 The upgrading of pedestrian facilities on The Avenue would facilitate movement of pedestrians across a relatively busy road and particularly benefiting users with mobility impairments and pedestrians with prams and pushchairs.

6. USE OF RESOURCES IMPLICATIONS (Finance, Procurement, Performance & Value for Money, Staffing, IT, Property, Sustainability)

- 6.1 **Finance** The scheme is funded across financial years 2012/13 and 2013/14 from the LIP's Traffic Management and Road Safety allocation. The total estimated cost for the scheme will be £90 000 with feasibility study being prolonged in order to improve the submitted conceptual design.
- 6.2 **Procurement** The highway works would be procured through the borough's highway term contracts.
- 6.3 There are no **Staffing, IT or Property** implications arising out of this report.

7. LEGAL ISSUES

- 7.1 The Traffic Management Act 2004 places an obligation on authorities to ensure the safe and expeditious movement of traffic on their road network.
- 7.2 The Council as Highway Authority has the necessary legal powers to introduce or amend Traffic Management Orders through the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.

8. CONSTITUTIONAL POWERS (Relevant section from the Constitution, Key/Non-Key Decision)

- 8.1 Constitution Part 3 – Responsibility for Functions – Area Environment Sub-committees perform functions that are the responsibility of the Executive including highways use and regulation not the responsibility of the Council, within the boundaries of their areas in accordance with Council policy and within budget.

9.2 BACKGROUND

- 9.2.1 During discussions and a subsequent site meeting, officers have been asked to look at a predetermined location for a desired pelican crossing. This report therefore highlights the findings of the feasibility study undertaken as a result.

Table 1 summarises the existing location and road layout

The Avenue Junction With Marriott Road – PEDESTRIAN CROSSING FEASIBILITY STUDY	
Site Description	The favoured location lies on The Avenue, on a bend between Marriott Road and Wentworth Road. There is an existing pedestrian island with dropped kerbs with traffic lanes

	<p>either side of it at 3.5m and 3.0m wide. Another pedestrian island that could potentially host a formal crossing is nearby and flanked by the Wentworth Road and Salisbury Road junctions. Two crossovers for the adjacent properties are very near the island and while the footway is of sufficient width on the western side, it falls below the required minimum on the east side of the carriageway.</p>
Pedestrian Activity, Traffic and Speeds	<p>The location sits at the junction of Wentworth Road that leads to Foulds School and a high proportion of traffic at school AM and PM peak periods was observed turning into/out of Wentworth Roads.</p> <p>The existing island does not appear to be as well used as the other island. It did not appear an obvious choice for a pedestrian desire line as is evidenced by the pedestrian demand assessment that has since been carried out.</p> <p>High volumes of traffic counts are recorded for the location but the speeds suggest compliance. This could be due to the 'throttling effect' that the islands provide, including the road layout and other features such as the width restriction to the north-east of the location further up the road coming from the A1081 St Albans Road.</p>
Visibility	<p>Forward visibility at the target location is poor in one direction and a specifically tailored design for the location would be required to address this concern.</p>

Preliminary Design Features - Challenges

- 9.2.2 Drawing 60670-2C highlights the footprint of a pelican crossing at the desired location in relation to other features and the existing crossovers.
- 9.2.3 The design so far presents safety concerns that, if not mitigated or designed out, may lead to it failing a road safety audit and/or fail to gain the approval of the Police. Forward visibility between pedestrians and southbound drivers remains a challenge and also means the signal heads/lights may not be seen. This is made worse by the boarded boundary fence for the adjoining properties at Nos 1-3 Avenue Villas
- 9.2.4 The width of the eastern footway is 1.6m at the desired location of the pelican crossing and creates a pinch-point. The installation of a signal head will significantly reduce the remaining available footway width to below the minimum recommended 1.2m.

9.2.5 The preliminary design opts to include an island to host a secondary signal head that if located in the typical design position would not be seen. However this approach, and due to the tight road layout, may interfere with the use of the existing crossover for 2 Marriott Road.

Speed Surveys & Personal Injury Accidents

9.2.6 Speed surveys have been conducted on both approaches to the island the results do not highlight speeding as a concern. However, it is recognised that the road layout and kerb alignment at this location may not be helpful even for the low speeds that are being recorded and improvements or upgrading to the existing pedestrian facilities could therefore be considered.

9.2.7 There are no recorded Personal Injury Accidents for this location in the last 3 years from 01/10/2009 to 30/09/2012, this being the standard assessment period and 30/9/2012 being the latest cut-off date for which data is available.

Improving the Design

9.2.8 Due to the restrictive road layout, more and accurate investigatory work would need to be done in order to improve the design to an acceptable standard. The investigation required would include;

- i) coming up with a joined –up design approach with that of signal equipment for the pelican crossing which TfL are able to offer,
- ii) commissioning a topographical survey to pinpoint highway features/assets,
- iii) reviewing the lighting design,
- v) reviewing lane/footway widths with a view to increase that of the eastern footway, and
- v) identifying buried utility apparatus that will require moving to make way for signals.

9.2.9 It is also likely that the approaches to the proposed crossing may need to benefit from high friction surfacing to aid breaking drivers who have to stop.

9.2.10 The additional identified work highlighted above would significantly increase the level of resource that is required before the pelican crossing design is developed to a sufficient level. These estimated costs including officer time are as highlighted below.

Table 3	Estimated Costs
Design Development	£20,000 (includes signal design by TfL, topographical surveys, trial holes, Utility searches, road safety audits, detailed design and public consultation)
Signal design and installation	£40,000
Civils Works Implementation Cost	£20,000
High Friction Surfacing	£10,000
Totals	£90,000

9.2.11 The costs above would only allow for the design and implementation of the actual crossing facility. However, as previously noted in 9.2.4 the spatial layout is a cause for concern and therefore significant funding would be required and would need to be identified by the Committee in order to effect sufficient re-alignment. This in itself may preclude any further study.

9.2.12 Per the existing council criteria and as described in this report, Officers would not normally be putting forward any recommendations for related measures on The Avenue. The decision to proceed or not will lie with the Committee.

10 **Officers' recommendations:**

10.1 Therefore the Committee are being asked to;

- i) **Be mindful of the Council's current approach to traffic management**
- ii) **Decide whether or not suitable measures ought to be considered for The Avenue,**
- iii) **Instruct, if specific measure(s) or option is preferable, the Director for Place to proceed to a detailed design and public consultation with a view to implement subject to availability of resources.**