

<b>Meeting</b>	Finchley & Golders Green Area Environment Sub-Committee
<b>Date</b>	25 June 2013
<b>Subject</b>	Squires Lane and Manor View N3 – Review of Traffic and Safety Improvements
<b>Report of</b>	Director for Place
<b>Summary</b>	The report outlines findings of the initial investigations regarding traffic safety and pedestrian improvements feasibility study

Officer Contributors	Themba Nleya, Senior Engineer (Traffic & Development)
Status (public or exempt)	Public
Wards Affected	Finchley Church End, West Finchley
Key Decision	No
Reason for urgency / exemption from call-in	Not applicable
Function of	Executive
Enclosures	Drawing numbers <i>60691 &amp; 2 Conceptual</i>
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;**
- a) providing pedestrian and safety improvements at the vicinity of the Rosemary Avenue junction as presented in this report.**
  - b) enhancing pedestrian and safety improvements at the vicinity of the Etchingham Park Road junction as presented in this report.**
  - c) introducing improvements to the existing pedestrian facilities outside Manorside Primary School as presented in this report, and**
  - d) standardising and regularising signage at all identified junction locations on the rest of Squires Lane.**
- 1.2 That the Committee is minded of the Council's current approach to traffic management measures**
- 1.3 Decide whether or not the introduction of some or all of the above measures in 1.1 above should be progressed, and**
- 1.4 Subject to 1.1 to 1.3 above, instruct the Director for Place as appropriate to proceed to a detailed design and public consultation on the preferred outcome with a view to implementation subject to availability of resources and in liaison with the Cabinet Member for Environment.**

## **2. RELEVANT PREVIOUS DECISIONS**

- 2.1** The Finchley and Golders Green Area Environment Sub-Committee meeting on 26 January 2012 heard a verbal update from the Transport and Regeneration Manager and requested that a 'formal update be reported to the Sub-Committee at its next meeting'.
- 2.2** The Finchley & Golders Green Area Environment Sub-Committee meeting on 16 October 2012 heard a verbal update from the Highways Manager to the effect 'there is no justification for any modifications to the existing traffic management measures based on analysis of traffic speed and personal injury accidents to date'.
- 2.3** Ward members on 12 April 2013 called for a site meeting with officers and a formal review report to be tabled at the forthcoming June 2013 meeting.

## **3. CORPORATE PRIORITIES AND POLICY CONSIDERATIONS**

- 3.1** The Corporate Plan 2013/16 defines the Council's vision (under the priority to promote responsible growth, development and success across the borough) in delivering sustainable growth to ensure Barnet continues to be successful and prosperous place where people want to live and work.
- 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 Squires Lane/Manor View and the introduction of traffic management measures would facilitate a safer 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 2013/14 and 2014/15 from the LIP's Traffic Management and Road Safety allocation. The total estimated cost for the recommended **Option 1** scheme is £21 000 at current prices but the submitted conceptual design requires further development.
- 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. BACKGROUND

- 9.1 Following previous assessments, it was reported to the Sub-committee on 16 October 2012 on the lack of justification for any modifications or changes to be introduced when assessed within the context of the existing traffic management approach that seeks to direct resources towards accident reduction and mitigation.
- 9.2 An incident on 12 April 2013 involving an 11 year-old pupil attended to by an air-ambulance appears to have triggered calls for a review at the location from across a wide cross-section of stakeholders including an e-petition that remains live on the Council website.
- 9.3 Ward members, and in particular Councillors Graham Old and Ross Houston jointly called for a review meeting with officers on site on 22 April 2013.
- 9.4 Some identified 'quick wins' are already being addressed by Barnet's Road Network Maintenance Team as part of routine maintenance including hedge trimming at three locations, fixing dislodged kerbs, renewal of faded road markings and lines, and re-introducing the markings to demarcate between parking spaces and the footpath outside properties 2 to 32 Manor View.
- 9.5 Officers were then asked to consider options as informed by discussions and also taking into account some views/opinions offered by residents and then report back at the next FGGAESC meeting. This report therefore highlights the findings of the feasibility study undertaken as a result.
- 9.6 Site Description - Foreword**
- 9.6.1 Drawing 60691-1 & 2 *Conceptual* highlights the suggested measures being put forward for consideration at the target locations.
- 9.6.2 Tables 1-3 below summarise the existing locations, road layouts and identified concerns at the targeted three main sections of Manor View/Squires Lane that are under consideration

<b>Table 1: Manor View Avenue Including Junction With Rosemary Avenue – PEDESTRIAN CROSSING AND TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT FEASIBILITY STUDY</b>	
Site Description	<p>The junctions of Manor View with Lichfield Grove and Station Road are both four-arm located within Finchley &amp; Golders Green Area in the Finchley Church End Ward.</p> <p>As is reflected by the average daily traffic counts in excess of 5000 vehicles, the Manor View/Squires Lane appears to be a more favoured route by drivers and offers a practical alternative route linking the A504 East End Road to the A1000 High Road subsequently giving access to the A406 eastbound and vice-versa.</p> <p>An investigation to review the junctions has been</p>

	<p>requested following speeding concerns and following removal of the mini roundabouts at this location during 2008.</p>
<p>Pedestrian Activity, Traffic and Speeds</p>	<p>Pedestrian activity has been assessed at both junctions and the assessed footfall proves the need for enhanced pedestrian facilities at the Rosemary/Station Road junction. This is thought to be due to both the presence of the nearby surgery/medical practice and the high parking demand by tube commuters and shoppers who park their vehicles on Rosemary Avenue.</p> <p>The average daily traffic counts are consistently in excess of 5000 vehicles during weekday 24-hour periods when the surveys were conducted dropping to just under 5000 for Saturday and Sunday.</p> <p>There is a generous parking space on what is historically believed to have been a moat outside properties 2-32 Manor View that suffers a lack of clear demarcation between parking areas and pedestrian foot walk.</p> <p>For this location, speed surveys were carried out at two locations either side of the railway bridge between 13 and 17 May 2013 inclusive. Although high volumes of traffic counts are recorded for the location, the 85<sup>th</sup>ile speeds suggest compliance when compared to the posted speed limit.</p> <p>The 85th percentile speed is the speed at which 85 percent of vehicles are travelling at or below and is the nationally accepted value used by highway authorities and the police to decide whether remedial action or enforcement is needed.</p> <p>The average figures for the daily peak 85<sup>th</sup>ile speeds measured for;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) location to the east of Rosemary Avenue junction are <b>28mph</b> eastbound, and <b>31.8mph</b> southbound,</li> <li>ii) south of the flyover bridge (near Lakeside) are <b>29.7mph</b> eastbound, and <b>31.7mph</b> southbound.</li> </ul>
<p>Visibility</p>	<p>Forward visibility on Squires Lane at the Rosemary Avenue junction is poor in the westbound direction and although the speeds may be compliant, officers believe there is justification to introduce measures that will help reduce the breaking distance for southbound traffic on squires Lane. This is because southbound drivers are likely to be negatively affected by the blind rise on the bridge over the Underground rail line.</p>

PIAs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There is a total of four 'slight' PIAs in this section during the 3 year period from 1.1.10 to 31.12.12</li> <li>- Two of the incidents are at the Station Road junction and suggest a failure to give way</li> <li>- Other two are at separate unrelated locations involving pedestrians with one accidentally falling onto the carriageway into the path of a vehicle, while the other 'stepped out into side of a moving vehicle'</li> </ul>
Identified concerns	Poor forward visibility for westbound drivers, westbound approach speeds although compliant are too fast for conditions, Inadequate pedestrian facilities, lack of markings to segregate parking spaces from foot-walk, failure to 'give-way' incidents

**Table 2:** Squires Lane outside Manorside Primary School including Junctions with Long Lane and Etchingam Road – PEDESTRIAN CROSSING AND TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENTS FEASIBILITY STUDY

Site Description	<p>The existing pedestrian island is 1.8m wide and located outside 165 Squires Lane with visibility protected on one side by 'School-Keep-Clear' markings.</p> <p>The location is placed midway between the Long Lane signal-controlled junction and Etchingam Park Road and Avondale Road that is a pseudo-staggered Give-Way priority junction.</p>
Pedestrian Activity, Traffic and Speeds	<p>Being directly outside a school pedestrian activity is high.</p> <p>Traffic and speed trends are not dissimilar to those of the three locations at which point surveys were made between 13 and 17 May 2013 inclusive. Parking demand is high and there appears to be poorly-enforced or inappropriate, if not obstructive, parking particularly at a spot outside 39 Squires Lane favoured by delivery goods vehicles at the time of the assessment.</p>
Visibility	<p>Forward visibility at the school and pedestrian crossing point is poor in the westbound direction due to the designated parking bay that literally extends right up to the crossing thereby compromising any inter-visibility between drivers and vulnerable users of the crossing such as children and the mobility impaired.</p> <p>The Long Lane junctions has a stagger and save for the fact it is signalised, it suffers both from poor visibility and poor layout. Notably and despite the irregular layout, the junction lacks markings for right-turning movements that would normally be recommended for cross-road junctions.</p>

	<p>Likewise, visibility to the right for traffic emerging from Etchingham Park Road is considered inadequate, this despite evident attempts to improve it by bringing the Give-way line forward as is shown by the existing road marking layout. At this location, the poor visibility is exacerbated by cars parked at the designated (disabled) parking bay immediately to the west of the junction outside no120 Squires Lane.</p>
PIAs	<p>A total of six PIAs (1 serious, 5 slight) are recorded for the Long Lane signal controlled junction. Notably, half (three) the number are attributed to defective signals or failure by drivers to obey while the other three suggest poor positioning while manoeuvring turns within the junction and on two separate occasions this led to a car and bus both 'clipping' cyclists.</p> <p>Two 'failure to give way' or 'edging out' of junction are recorded for the Etchingham Park Road junction.</p> <p><b>Between the last date for which recorded data is available, this being 31 December 2012 and now, reports of two incidents on Squires Lane allegedly near Manorside School believed to involve a 11 year old pupil in April 2013 and another pupil in May 2013 have been received but no further information is currently held on file. Further details regarding causation are being awaited from the Police.</b></p>
Identified concerns	<p>Parking bay too close to pedestrian crossing, need for review of parking restrictions in locality, need to extend the existing 'SKC' marking, poor visibility to right when emerging from Etchingham Park Road, poor positioning or lack of right-turning movement road markings.</p>

<p><b>Table 3: Squires Lane between Junction with Etchingham Road and A1000 High Road – MINOR TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENTS FEASIBILITY STUDY</b></p>	
Site Description	<p>This section of Squires Lane is subject to 30mph posted speed limit and is characterised by strategic provision of pedestrian islands, Give-Way priority junctions and/or mini-roundabout islands.</p>
Pedestrian Activity, Traffic and Speeds	<p>The existing pedestrian facilities in the form of refuges/islands are thought to be adequate.</p> <p>The speed survey on this section of road was carried out in the vicinity of No. 47 Squires Lane and no speeding concerns are highlighted.</p> <p>The average figures for the daily peak 85<sup>th</sup> percentile</p>

	speeds measured for the location near property No. 47 Squires Lane are <b>26.6mph</b> eastbound, and <b>24.2mph</b> southbound.
Signs Review	A review of signs and existing road markings has highlighted irregularity regarding the signing for the two mini roundabouts at the four-arm Queens Avenue and Clifton Road junctions. To eliminate the conflicting messages to drivers, and also to help maintain legal compliance, there is need to review existing Give-Way signs with a view to remove/de-clutter where they conflict with the mini-roundabout signs.
Visibility	Forward visibility at the various target locations assessed is not thought to be a concern in both directions.
PIAs	One 'slight' incident involving a lone vehicle colliding with a bollard due to light dazzle.
Identified concerns	Non-standard signage at the mini roundabouts.

9.6.3 Conceptual proposals that seek to address directly or indirectly the identified concerns in Tables 1-3 above are shown on attached drawing 60691-1 & 2 *Conceptual* and referred to as **Option 1** in this report.

## 9.7 Review of Mini Roundabouts at Lichfield Grove and Station Road

9.7.1 Traffic measures in the form of humps and mini-roundabouts were removed at this location during 2008 when the road was being resurfaced and it does not appear that the post-evaluation surveys recommended retention of the measures.

9.7.2 The review of the junctions with a view to re-instating the mini-roundabouts is treated as **Option 2** in this report. It would not appear from context of TMB the Council's assessment criteria that 'implementation of a 4-arm mini-roundabout at either of the junctions would present a cost-effective solution as it lacks both the economic and the safety justification'. The officer conclusion is informed by assessments and observations summarised in Table 4 below:

Table 4	Are criteria <b>for</b> mini roundabout met?	
	Lichfield Grove	Station Road
Speed limit 30mph or less	Yes	Yes
Is the 85%ile speed <35mph?	Yes	Yes
Vehicular flows, each arm >500 vehicles?  (AM & PM peak period counts used to predict likely AADT figures)	No	No
Land requirements (site sketch & observations suggest extensive kerb realignment and footway take)	No	Yes (but minimal kerb re-alignment)
Accident prediction – 4-arm mini roundabout when compared to Give	No (Has 1 in 3 years	No (Has 2 in 3 years =



way -junction priority.	= 0.33/yr)	0.66/yr)
Value for Money	No (see comments below)	
User requirements - (Item 4.6 of TD54/07 makes a specific mention of 'routes to schools'). Pedestrians and children, two-wheelers	Yes (there are schools within a 300m radii)	
Traffic calming – as no preliminary geometric design has been produced the assessment has not been done. My comments are based on turning movements data from a 15.5.13 one day survey Forward Visibility	<p><i>A mini roundabout confers priority to right-turning movements out of Station Road but looking at the flow data, this benefit might be minimal.</i></p> <p><i>Since a mini roundabout would confer priority to right-turning movements out of Station Road over Squires Lane southbound traffic approaching the junction, forward visibility on Squires Lane must be adequate for the recorded 85%ile speeds. This is not currently met hence the proposal for a VAS.</i></p>	

9.7.3 At other locations benefitting from mini-roundabouts, there is an added benefit that appears to accrue as traffic speeds get reduced and appear to encourage more cautious driving. They can also fit into limited space.

9.7.4 However, they are not necessarily helpful for pedestrians, cyclists and the mobility impaired.

9.7.5 When looking at the accidents records, at present the Lichfield Grove and Station Road Give-Way priority junctions are actually performing much better than would be the case if mini-roundabouts were to be re-introduced. The current predicted accident rate is 1.35/yr for mini roundabouts in London.

9.7.6 The costs for re-introducing the mini roundabouts are not justified when assessed against the agreed criteria. Barnet will have to consider spending significant costs in altering layout/kerb-realignment, providing electrical for illuminated signing, losing parking bays, converting existing footway to a widened carriageway. **Option 2** is not therefore recommended by officers

## 9.8 Restricting Access on Manor View and Squires Lane

9.8.1 Some local residents have asked for an option to ban through traffic on Squires Lane and only permit buses and emergency vehicles while prohibiting straight-ahead movements on all arms of the Squires Lane / Long Lane junction.

9.8.2 This is in theory treated as **Option 3** in this report although following a desk top study, and also informed by subsequent meeting with the ward members, it has not been necessary for officers to pursue detailed investigation and quantify the impact beyond making the following observations;

- Taking more than 5000 vehicles per day, closing off Squires Lane is likely to be unviable without an alternative practicable route with spare capacity being identified elsewhere
- The likely impact would be on Church Lane N3 which already accounts for significant volumes or the A1000/Fortis Green junction which cannot be expected to accommodate any significant increase.
- A large catchment area is affected and might therefore meet resistance from the public
- Looking at the recorded personal injury accident records, there does not appear to be a compelling reason for such a drastic measure with far-reaching consequences, as localised improvements such as Option 1 can be implemented at a fraction of the price to mitigate the concerns.
- The impact study for Option 3 is likely to be resource intensive due to the large catchment area and is likely to displace the problem to other less unsuitable roads or routes such as the A1000 and A406 that are part of the London Strategic Road Network and might therefore attract resistance from Transport for London.

9.8.3 Therefore **Option 3** in this report is not taken forward for further development and likewise not recommended by officers.

## 9.9 Costing for the Recommended Option

9.9.1 Option 1 costs are summarised in Table 5 and the figures are an estimate including officer time as highlighted below.

<b>Table 5</b>	<b>Option 1 Estimated Costs</b>
Design Development	£5,000  (includes topographical surveys, trial holes, Utility searches, road safety audits, detailed design and public consultation)
VAS and pedestrian Island	£10,000
Pedestrian Crossing and Junction Improvements	£5,000
Section 3: Signs & Road Markings Rationalisation	£1,000
<b>Totals</b>	<b>£21,000</b>

9.10.1 Per the existing council criteria, Officers would not normally be putting forward any recommendations for some of the related measures detailed in Option 1. Therefore the decision to proceed or not lies with the Committee.

## 10. LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS

10.1 None.

<b>Cleared by Finance (Officer's initials)</b>	<b>A.D</b>
<b>Cleared by Legal (Officer's initials)</b>	<b>P.R</b>