

**MEETING****FINCHLEY & GOLDERS GREEN AREA COMMITTEE****DATE AND TIME****WEDNESDAY 30 NOVEMBER, 2016****AT 7.00 PM****VENUE****COMMITTEE ROOM 1, HENDON TOWN HALL, THE BURROUGHS, LONDON NW4 4BQ**

Dear Councillors,

Please find enclosed additional papers relating to the following items for the above mentioned meeting which were not available at the time of collation of the agenda.

Item No	Title of Report	Pages
1.	PUBLIC COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS (IF ANY)	3 - 14

Iphigenia Christophoridou 020 8359 3822 Iphigenia.Christophoridou@barnet.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Question Number	Item Number	Raised by	Question Raised	Answer
1	9	Tim Fearn	Since the signs were installed, how many vehicles passed along both roads? Ideally, I would like a breakdown of the number of recorded movements from each of the 4 signs (northbound/southbound on Etchingam Park Road, and eastbound/westbound on Park View Road).	Please see tables below.
2	9	Tim Fearn	How many vehicles were recorded at each of these locations travelling in excess of the 30mph speed limit? I have personally witnessed a large number of cars triggering the speed warning lights, even on Park View Road, which is narrow, short, and bounded on both sides by parked cars.	Please see tables below
3	9	Tim Fearn	What is the maximum speed recorded by each of the signs?	Please see tables below
4	9	Tim Fearn	Of the vehicles which have exceeded the speed limit, what is the average speed?	Please see tables below
5	9	Tim Fearn	If it is possible to determine this, what is the average speed of all vehicles recorded by each sign (both staying within and exceeding the speed limit)?	Please see tables below

Question Number	Item Number	Raised by	Question Raised	Answer
6	9	Tim Fearn	<p>The sign on the northbound side of Etchingam Park Road has been placed at a location which is the slowest part of this road - it is shortly after a traffic island, on a bend, and usually has parked cars on both sides of the road. Vehicles which have exceeded the speed limit at the sign are extremely likely to be travelling significantly faster on the stretch between Squires Lane and Park View Road, before they have slowed down for the traffic island and bend, and there is a high chance that those which are within the limit at the sign have exceeded it further back towards Squires Lane. Would the area committee consider relocating the vehicle activated sign to a more appropriate location where the level of speeding can be more accurately judged?</p>	<p>The location of the sign can be discussed at the meeting.</p>
7	9	Tim Fearn	<p>What are the next steps based on the results of the 6 month trial? Do the councillors consider the level of speeding to be serious enough to require investigation of traffic calming measures, reduced speed limits, or active discouragement of through traffic from using these streets as high-speed short cuts? Would it be possible for the council to work with the local police to enforce speed limits more comprehensively?</p>	<p>Response is included within the report to be presented to the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee on the 30 November.</p>

Question Number	Item Number	Raised by	Question Raised	Answer
8	9	Tim Fearn	As well as having concerns regarding the safety of park users during the daytime, I would like to also raise the issue of late-night speeding, which is a considerable problem. I believe some drivers use the fact that they cannot see the lights of any oncoming vehicles as an excuse to travel as quickly as possible along Etchingham Park Road, and the associated traffic noise is having a detrimental effect on my household's ability to sleep.	Noted. The resident has the ability to ask a supplementary question at the meeting if they wish to.
9	11	Wendy Bernardelle	We have noticed the signs on other SKC markings in the area and some are only in force during drop off and collection times and not throughout the day. Is this something that could also be considered? For example, if the children are being dropped off at 8.15am and collected at 2.45pm, is it really necessary to prevent anyone parking (past the access towards 99 Fallow Court Avenue) between say 8.45am and 2.15pm? This would also reduce the cost of the time the Council will need to be monitoring and enforcing regulations.	<p>Following representation from members of the local community, the timings of the School Keep Clear restrictions is recommended to be revised (made shorter) than what was originally proposed.</p> <p>Timings of such restrictions are usually agreed in discussion with the relevant Schools/Nurseries to ensure the markings are in operation during any period where it is considered they would have benefit. Therefore for one location this may be at pick-up and drop-off times only whereas other locations the restrictions could be applicable for the whole day including beyond the usual pick-up/drop-off times to include after</p>

Question Number	Item Number	Raised by	Question Raised	Answer
				school clubs and other activities.
10	11	Wendy Bernardelle	<p>FRS has recently increased the kindergarten hours:-</p> <p>Mondays was 9.15am-12.15pm is now 8.15am-2.45pm  Tuesdays was 8.15am-2.30pm is now 8.15am-2.45pm  Wednesdays was 8.15am-2.30pm is now 8.15am-2.45pm  Thursdays was 8.15am-2.30pm is now 8.15am-2.45pm  Fridays was 9.15am-12.15am is now 8.15am-12.15pm</p> <p>Which means that kindergarten staff are now parked for nearly 6 hours more each week, reducing parking further for residents and their visitors, which we really feel should also be taken into account.</p> <p>As the children attending the kindergarten are aged between 2.5 years and 4 years, they are always accompanied by adults when entering and exiting the site, and there are always security guards on duty at the access during kindergarten hours, so if the request for SKC markings has been made to ensure the children's safety when arriving and leaving, there are adults available to ensure this. If it is</p>	<p>Although they would be an adult presence outside the premises and with the children at pick-up and drop-off times and at other times of the day, these people cannot legally prevent parking in this location. The SKC's would deter motorists from parking in the vicinity of the entrance, which would create a safer environment for those pedestrians to safely travel in the area at the relevant times. The markings would also allow enforcement action to be taken against vehicles which are parked in a way which may affect children's safety.</p>

Question Number	Item Number	Raised by	Question Raised	Answer
			not for this reason we would like to know the point and what it is expected to achieve.	
11	11	Wendy Bernardelle	We are wondering, bearing this in mind, how much space actually needs to be restricted from FRS's dropped kerb/access towards 99 Fallow Court Avenue? Does it really need to extend as far as (opposite) 110 Fallow Court Avenue? Or could it possibly be shorter and just extend as far as (opposite) the boundary of 114/112 Fallow Court Avenue? It's just that every possible unrestricted parking space is needed, the parking in the streets surrounding the site is frequently saturated and residents are more and more frequently inconvenienced and unhappy. We have been checking the space indicated on the map sent out with the consultation over the past few weeks and it is rare that this space is not completely filled with parked cars.	There are standard lengths for Schools Keep Clear Markings and the restrictions for Fallow Court Avenue are the shortest length permitted by legislation.
12	11	Wendy Bernardelle	Could Councillors also please clarify if the School Keep Clear restrictions will only be operational on the days the kindergarten is actually open. For example, will the regulations still apply on inset days and kindergarten holidays, or just during term-time? And are Blue Badge Holders permitted to park on the SKC markings?	The Operation of all School Keep Clears are through-out the year. This is for consistency and due to the fact that schools have different term-dates. Schools also often have activities that run through the holidays. Blue badge holders are not permitted to park on SKC's.

Question Number	Item Number	Raised by	Question Raised	Answer
13	11	Wendy Bernardelle	<p>Our final point is to ask when residents might hope to have a positive response concerning the junction of Fallow Court Avenue/Montrose Crescent as the SKC markings do not actually address the issues residents have been raising for some years now. Both corners have double yellow lines around them which have recently been repainted but we really do need No Stopping/No Waiting At All Times restrictions on all areas of this junction to improve traffic flow, visibility, safety for all road users and pedestrians, and to ensure access for emergency vehicles, because of the high volume of activities being held at the site, kindergarten and synagogue activities and events often overlapping, and the high numbers of visitors attending including Blue Badge Holders who should, out of respect and consideration of their disabilities, be permitted access to the on-site car park. As you may already know, there was an incident in May this year when there was an event at the FRS site and a fire engine was unable to turn left into Fallow Court Avenue due to visitors having parked on all the double yellow lines on the junction.</p>	<p>As the requestor has noted, there are currently double yellow lines at the junction of Fallow Court Avenue and Montrose Crescent which prohibits waiting (parking) by vehicles at all times.</p> <p>A loading restriction could be added to these which would take the form of kerb markings and signage, and this would have the added benefit of prohibiting loading and disabled badge holders from parking at the relevant times.</p> <p>The Council has noted the request and Officers will assess the request in further detail along with all other yellow line/parking restriction type requests received with a view to seeking to progress the highest priority cases.</p> <p>In this case, additional consideration may need to be given to the impact on those disabled drivers who have become accustomed to parking on the yellow lines.</p>



Question Number	Item Number	Raised by	Question Raised	Answer
14	10	Amelia Hill	<p>Based on council statistics (submitted below), almost 23,000 cars travelling close to or above the 30mph speed limit pelt down Westbury Rd each month: 820 cars every single day.</p> <p>This rat-run of a road is not only a densely packed residential area and cycle route, it is home to a retirement home, sheltered housing and a church, which runs two toddler groups and one seniors' group.</p> <p>If you accept government advice that 20mph is the safe maximum speed for a road like ours, the number of cars driving dangerously fast is far higher than 23,000. Residents here tonight can tell many stories of close shaves, many involving our infant children and vulnerable residents. We can also describe repeated damage to our parked cars.</p> <p>How can Officers justify refusing to discharge their statutory duty to either impose a 20mph speed limit on our road – especially when there are 79 roads or stretches of road in the borough with a 20mph speed limit - or introduce road furniture, such as the road narrowing</p>	<p>The table below sets out the data for Westbury road with the number of vehicles using the road over a 6 month period. This indicates that during the monitoring period that 161 vehicles (two way) a day are travelling above the 30 mph speed limit at an average speed over the limit of 33.9 mph in the southbound direction and 33.7 mph in the northbound direction.</p> <p>Section 39 of the Road Traffic Act 1988 covers a number of points including monitoring accidents, and 'carrying out a programme of measures designed to promote road safety'.</p> <p>In formulating programmes of measure to address road traffic accidents an important factor is the history of personal injury road traffic accidents and the extent to which they may be addressed through engineering measures or by other means.</p> <p>Injury accidents are used as these are most consistently reported between different locations.</p> <p>The Personal Injury Accident records for Westbury Road have been checked and</p>

Question Number	Item Number	Raised by	Question Raised	Answer
			<p>reconstruction on nearby Nether Street?</p> <p>Your proposal to merely continue monitoring speeds on our road is in breach of Barnet's statutory duty under section 39 of the Road Traffic Act 1988 to take steps to reduce and prevent accidents on the roads under its control.</p> <p>This duty is enforced by the Department for Transport's current guidance which "encourages and supports Local Authorities to implement 20mph limits and zones in situations where there is a particular risk to vulnerable road users", specifically on roads where average speeds are already low (below 24mph). Roads, that is, exactly like ours.</p> <p>TIMELINE AND DATA:</p> <p>Spring 2013: Residents wrote to the council, asking for this road to be made into a 20mph zone. We wrote a presentation for a council meeting being held in the summer. We were unable to attend but were told our request had</p>	<p>there have been no Personal Injury Accidents over the last 3 years in this section of Westbury Road.</p> <p>Introducing measures at locations where there is no history of road traffic accidents would inevitably be at the expense of other locations with a worse record that might otherwise be addressed through the resources available.</p> <p>A programme of introducing 20mph speed limits is also being pursued focussed on areas around schools and prioritised based on a range of issues related to safety and the schools' School Travel Plans.</p> <p>In response to the request for measures in Westbury Road, the following response was given at the forum 2013 was:</p> <p><i>Officers confirm they already are in receipt of the request from Ms Hill and that this location is under investigation. Like all such requests, the assessment is being done in line with current guidance that seeks to mitigate</i></p>

Question Number	Item Number	Raised by	Question Raised	Answer
			<p>been granted.</p> <p>May 2014: Vehicle activated signs (VAS) were finally erected. They, however, flashed up a 30mph warning. When contacted, the council said traffic calming measures had been agreed at the 2013 meeting, not a 20mph limit.</p> <p>Residents were furious: our presentation had specifically asked for a 20mph limit and we had been told that had been granted.</p> <p>June 2015: Data from the VAS show 153,083 car journeys along the road for a sample month from April to May 2015.</p> <p>July 2015: Residents attended a meeting asking for a 20mph limit. We were told speeds along the road would be monitored for six months - at a cost of £15,000.</p> <p>September 2016: Speeding data is published,</p>	<p><i>frequency and severity of any recorded accidents in the database and therefore records for this location will be key to informing the investigation and deciding whether or not it qualifies for intervention measures.</i></p> <p><i>Officers noted additional concerns regarding this, and wider traffic problems in this area had been raised via ward councillors. Officers will undertake to investigate all concerns.</i></p> <p>As a result of the investigation Officers implemented VAS on Westbury Road. As the speed limit on Westbury Road was 30 mph. The VAS that were installed are for a 30 mph and not 20 mph.</p> <p>However, it is understood that residents considered that a 20 mph had been agreed.</p> <p>It was therefore agreed that the VAS would be monitored and a report brought back to the F&amp;GG Committee for consideration on the 26 October which was deferred to today.</p>

Question Number	Item Number	Raised by	Question Raised	Answer
			<p>showing 15% of cars travelling on the road are going at 27.2mph or over. Based on the 153,083 figure, that comes to 22,962.5 cars travelling close to and above the 30mph speed limit every month: 820.1 cars every day.</p>	<p>Following the questions and presentation by Amelia Hill, the committee will consider the report.</p>

**Westbury Road 7/02/16- 11/4/16 and 12/4/16 – 15/6/16 and 19/6/16 – 22/8/16 (195 days)**

	Southbound	Northbound
Total Vehicles	276,801 (av per day 1419)	351,527 (av per day 1803)
85% Speed	27.6 mph	26.8 mph
Average Speed	21.2 mph	20.1 mph
% Over Speed Limit	6.1%	4.1%
Average Speed Over Speed Limit	33.9 mph	33.7 mph

**Etchingam Park Road 29/2/16**

**- 14/9/16**

	<b>Southbound</b>	<b>Northbound</b>
Total Vehicles	176101	267682
85% Speed	25.1	26.5
Average Speed	17.3	20.9
% Over Speed Limit	2.2%	3.1%
Average Speed Over Speed Limit	33	33.2
Maximum Speed recorded	50	55

**Park View Road 5/6/16 - 17/9/16**

	<b>Southbound</b>	<b>Northbound</b>
Total Vehicles	64572	56571
85% Speed	27.5	27.1
Average Speed	20.9	20.2
% Over Speed Limit	4.7%	4.4%
Average Speed Over Speed Limit	33.3	33.4
Maximum Speed recorded	65	65

This page is intentionally left blank