

	<p>Finchley & Golders Green Area Committee</p> <p>25 March 2015</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Title</p>	<p>Review of London Cycle Campaign proposed schemes for Finchley & Golders Green</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Report of</p>	<p>Interim Commissioning Director - Environment</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Wards</p>	<p>Childs Hill, East Finchley, Finchley Church End, Garden Suburb, Golders Green, West Finchley, Woodhouse</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Status</p>	<p>Public</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Enclosures</p>	<p>Appendix A – Finchley & Golders Green Area LCC proposals Review</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Officer Contact Details</p>	<p>Jane Shipman, jane.shipman@barnet.gov.uk, 020 8359 3555</p>

<p>Summary</p>
<p>This report presents a review of a series of proposals made by the London Cycle Campaign to provide ‘Space for Cycling’ in wards in the Finchley & Golders Green area.</p>

<p>Recommendations</p>
<p>1. That the committee note the contents of the report</p>
<p>2. That members of the committee provide officers with their views and comments in relation to further development of the proposals in the Finchley & Golders Green Area.</p>

1. WHY THIS REPORT IS NEEDED

- 1.1 During the 2014 Local election campaign the London Cycle Campaign (LCC) identified a local cycling improvement aimed at creating 'Space for Cycling' in every electoral ward in London, and invited candidates to support these.
- 1.2 At the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee meeting of the 18 June 2014, in response to a member's item, the Committee resolved that "the Strategic Director for Growth and Environment instruct officers to undertake an initial feasibility study to include engaging with the LCC, including cost, looking at their proposals in Finchley and Golders Green."
- 1.3 It was noted that a report will be brought back to the Committee to determine which schemes should be progressed to public consultation.
- 1.4 Similar resolutions were made by the other area committees in relation to LCC proposals in their areas.
- 1.5 The review of London Cycle Campaign proposed schemes for Finchley & Golders Green Area is set out in appendix A but is summarised below.

Ward and LCC proposal	Officer Comments on LCC proposals and associated costs
<p>Childs Hill Ward Protected lanes on Hendon Way, Finchley Road and Cricklewood Lane</p>	<p>TfL are considering a route along A41 Hendon Way as part of cycle superhighway 11 and the section of Cricklewood Lane from the junction with the A5 Cricklewood Broadway up to and including the junction with Claremont Road is included within the boundary of the Brent Cross Cricklewood planning application boundary and major changes are expected to the road environment in this area as a result. Consideration of proposals therefore focuses on the part of Cricklewood Lane between Claremont Road and Hendon Way and on the A598 Finchley Road.</p> <p>Cricklewood Lane (Claremont Road to Hendon Way) A cycle lane and a general traffic lane in each direction could be provided on Cricklewood Lane but this would not leave space for on-street parking. Currently parking is restricted in much of the road only between 10 and 11am and provision is made for residents during these hours too. Cycle lanes operational only at peak hours might be an alternative, but the impact on resident parking would still be significant. Provision of cycle lanes and associated adjustments through this length could be expected to cost in the region of £100,000.</p> <p>Finchley Road (Hendon Way to Golders Green Road) A cycle lane and a general traffic lane in each</p>

	<p>direction could be provided on this stretch of Finchley Road if on street parking were prevented. Much of the parking provision on this road is tidal – that is parking is restricted on the southbound side of the road in the mornings and on the northbound side of the road in the evenings. Cycle lanes also operating tidally could be a compromise solution that could retain much of the existing parking provision. Adjustments to kerblines at the Cricklewood Lane junction would be needed to accommodate cycle lanes and advance stop lines. At Dunstan Road the retention of two general traffic lanes at the signals will probably not be possible and the impact on the junction operation would need to be assessed and mitigated if possible.</p> <p>Provision of cycle lanes and associated adjustments through this length could be expected to cost in the region of £150,000.</p> <p>Finchley Road junction with Golders Green Road. The gyratory road layout is not a good arrangement for cyclists. Previous studies to consider a plain cross-road arrangement (that would be better for cyclists) were not able to overcome issues of impact on traffic movement. A study to establish the best achievable layout and provision of a major junction scheme at this location could cost in excess of £250,000.</p> <p>Finchley Road north of Golders Green Road (to Ravenscroft Avenue) As further south on the Finchley Road, tidal cycle lanes in conjunction with retained tidal parking may be appropriate. The signalised junction at Hoop Lane provides little scope to introduce cycle lanes without impacting on junction operation. Alternatives such as making cycle use at this location prominent by the use of cycle carriageway signing in the centre of each lane and possible coloured surfacing might be considered together as part of a junction redesign and adjustments to the pedestrian refuge and protected turning areas just south of the junction. Addressing this section could be expected to cost around £100,000</p>
<p>East Finchley Ward Protected cycle lanes on the A1000 High Road</p>	<p>A1000- borough boundary to Fortis Green signals The A1000 south of Fortis Green is generally wide, and provision of cycle lane in both directions would be feasible while retaining parking on one side of</p>

the road where needed. From the Bishops Avenue northwards to Fortis Green past the station the current to lane road layout would need to be adapted to provide a single general traffic lane and a separate cycle lane. The implications of this on traffic movement would need to be assessed. Making ideal provision for cyclists may not be feasible, but redesign of the traffic signalled junction to enhance provision should be possible. Provision of cycle lanes and associated adjustments through this length could be expected to cost in the region of £100,000-£150,000, depending on the scale of changes at the signals.

A1000 – Fortis Green to Creighton Avenue

Provision of high quality cycle facilities in this area would be a challenge. Available space is insufficient to provide cycle lanes in both directions while retaining the current kerblines and parking arrangements, and even with significant modification could only be accommodated if parking were retained on one side of the road only.

A more limited solution providing route continuity for more confident cyclists could be to provide cycle carriageway markings centrally within the general traffic lane.

An alternative approach would be to consider a significant remodelling of the street through East Finchley to provide a lower speed environment still providing for through traffic but in which it is less dominant. The cost of developing and implementing such a proposal would clearly be high (in excess of £1M).

A1000 – Creighton Avenue to North Circular Road

The wide carriageway and more limited parking pressures through most of this length mean that cycle lanes might be provided alongside general traffic lanes in both directions while retaining parking on one side of the road where needed. Provision of cycle lanes and associated adjustments through this length could be expected to cost about £50,000.

A1000 junction with North Circular Road

An outline proposal for crossing the North Circular Road was developed as part of the borough's application for the London Mayor's Cycling mini-

	<p>Holland scheme. Although this did not proceed, the outline design provides for a semi-segregated route on the bridge over the North Circular Road and improved facilities for cyclists at the signalised junctions each end. Further development of the proposal including detailed consideration of traffic impacts would need to be take place before the proposal could be considered for implementation but as a guide the proposal could be expected to cost in the region of £500,000 including development costs</p>
<p>Finchley Church End Ward Protected cycle lanes on the A598 Regent's Park Road / Ballards Lane</p>	<p>Regents Park Road (North Circular Road to Gravel Hill) The wide carriageway 11 to 16m provides scope to provide a cycle lane and general traffic lane in both directions with car parking provided on one or both sides of the road. Space on the northbound approach to the Gravel Hill signals is too limited to provide a lead in lane to an advance stop line for cyclists and alternative measures to highlight the presence of cyclists in the inside lane through cycle symbols and possibly coloured surfacing could be a compromise solution. Development and implementation of proposals for this length might cost in the region of £50,000 and possibly up to £100,000 if more major work were undertaken at the traffic signals.</p> <p>Gravel Hill to Hendon Lane At around 12m -13m wide the road could accommodate general traffic lanes and cycle lanes in both directions but with parking restricted to one side of the road only. Changes might cost in the region of £20,000.</p> <p>Hendon Lane to Nether Street Maintaining provision for cyclists alongside general traffic through this length would be likely to impact on the operation of the signals at Nether Street and on provision made for traffic turning into side roads, increasing congestion. Provision of route continuity markings within shared traffic lanes might provide adequately for more confident cyclists. Alternatives that change the street environment to might be an alternative higher cost option.</p> <p>Changes through much of Ballards Lane (in West Finchley Ward) could be made to accommodate cycle lanes but retaining parking on one side of the</p>

	<p>road. Lanes and associated adjustments might be expected to cost in the region of £100,000. Alternatively high cost (over £1M) public realm changes to provide a lower speed environment in which traffic is less dominant while still providing for through traffic might be considered.</p>
<p>Garden Suburb Ward Protected cycle lanes on the Bishops Avenue and along the Heath.</p>	<p>The Bishops Avenue Cycle lanes in both directions on The Bishops Avenue could be provided alongside general traffic lanes if parking were restricted. This might inconvenience residents close to the High Road (A1000). Reducing the speed limit from the current 40mph south of Falloden Way to 30mph would also be desirable.</p> <p>Provision of cycle lanes, conversion of pedestrian refuges to zebra crossings and parking and speed limit changes could be expected to cost around £100,000 - £150,000.</p> <p>Provision of advance stop lines at the junction with the A1 Falloden Way could affect the capacity of the junction to some extent and detailed consideration of the impact of this would be needed. Assessment of the impacts and adjustments required could cost from around £20,000 and potentially significantly more if major changes are required to mitigate impacts.</p> <p>Hampstead Lane Hampstead Heath itself is outside the borough of Barnet. A short stretch of Hampstead Lane from The Bishops Avenue to The Spaniards is within the borough, alongside Kenwood House grounds. Enhanced cycle facilities in this stretch could be achieved through provision of dedicated lanes in both directions through most of the length. Provision / re-provision of cycle lanes on Hampstead Lane, including adjustments to pedestrian islands and to the traffic signalled junction at The Bishops Avenue could be expected to cost in the region of £50,000.</p>
<p>Golders Green Ward Protected space for cycling on Brent Cross Flyover and access to Brent Cross, regeneration areas and</p>	<p>Improvements in the Brent Cross Area at the Brent Cross Interchange and at Staples Corner flyover are being considered as part of the major development scheme in the area so proposals for this area are not considered separately in this review</p>

local quiet ways	
<p>West Finchley Ward Safe cycle routes to the Ballards Lane & Tally Ho town centre (Close West side of Tally Ho)</p>	<p>Conceptual work has been carried out previously in conjunction with the Outer London Fund work in North Finchley looking at major changes to the Tally Ho intersection. This considered changes that would restrict (but not eliminate) traffic on the Western side of Tally Ho and make the junction of the High Road and Woodhouse Road and Kingsway a more conventional signalised crossroad junction. Traffic modelling work has been undertaken that suggests that such an arrangement could operate successfully.</p> <p>Introducing the changes would involve significant traffic management changes and would probably be undertaken in conjunction with other public realm improvements. The cost would be highly dependent on the scope of associated public realm work, but in any event would be expected to exceed £500,000 and would probably significantly higher (£1M+).</p>
<p>Woodhouse Ward Protected cycle lanes along A1000 High Road</p>	<p>The information above related to West Finchley discusses the treatment of the Tally Ho area. Provision of cycle lanes south and north of the Tally Ho area is considered further below.</p> <p>The wide (over 12m) carriageway of the A1000 between the North Circular Road and Woodhouse Road provide space for provision of cycle lanes with the flexibility to permit parking on one side of the road where needed. Adjustments at the Granville Road/Summers Lane junction would also be needed. Provision of lanes and associated adjustments to parking, refuges and the Granville Road / Summers Lane junction might be provided for £50,000 to £100,000.</p> <p>The provision of improvements at the junction with the North Circular Road is referred to above (see East Finchley).</p> <p>The carriageway between Tally Ho and Woodside Lane is mainly about 12-13m wide with a very wide (over 20m section) section between Mayfield Avenue and Finchley Park. Through most of the length a general traffic lane and cycle lane could be provided with parking permitted on one side of the road only. In the wide centre section parking both sides of the road might be retained.</p>

2. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 The recommendations provide feedback in response to the Committee's earlier decision. The review has attempted to provide information on the feasibility of making the suggested provision noting constraints and potential issues and locations where more detailed investigations would be needed to fully consider the feasibility of the proposals.

3. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND NOT RECOMMENDED

- 3.1 An initial brief was developed to undertake a fuller study across all the proposals but this was found to be unaffordable.

4. POST DECISION IMPLEMENTATION

- 4.1 Proposals for cycle improvements in the borough will inform the developing Cycle Strategy. This is expected to inform development and priority of future cycling schemes. In the meantime proposals that the area committee would like to see taken further, in terms of implementation, further studies or consultation will be included in reports to be prepared for consideration by the Environment Committee to agree future years work programmes.

5. IMPLICATIONS OF DECISION

5.1 Corporate Priorities and Performance

- 5.1.1 Provision of cycle facilities would particularly help delivery the Corporate Plan strategic objective of promoting responsible growth, development and success across the borough, and the priority outcome of maintaining a well designed, attractive and accessible place, with sustainable infrastructure across the borough.

- 5.1.2 Making it easier for more people to cycle also helps address health objectives by providing more opportunities for physical activity.

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

- 5.2.1 There are no direct resources implications from this report. Local Implementation Plan funding provided by Transport for London provides for work to develop and implement cycle routes and facilities. Proposals to be delivered with this funding will be agreed by the Environment Committee as part of the 2015/16 (or future years') programmes of work in due course.

5.3 Legal and Constitutional References

- 5.3.1 There are no specific legal implications in relation to this report.

- 5.3.2 The Constitution section 15 Responsibility for Functions, Annex A, delegates area committees the power to:

“Discharge any functions, within the budget and policy framework agreed by Policy and Resources, of the theme committees that they agree are more properly delegated to a more local level. These

include but are not limited to: ... *Local highways and safety schemes*".

5.3.3 The same annex provides that the Environment Committee has specific responsibilities for commissioning Transport and traffic management including agreement of London Transport Strategy-Local Implementation Plan.

5.4 Risk Management

5.4.1 There are no particular risks associated with this decision. However there are potential risks associated with introducing some of the measures that any future decision to do so would need to consider.

- Some proposals would impact on parking which may result in negative customer perceptions and publicity. However failure to make provision for cyclists may also affect perceptions.
- Some proposals could have an impact on road network performance that would need to be mitigated and balanced against the benefits of making the provision.
- Poorly designed cycle facilities may increase the risks of injury to cyclists, however well designed facilities may reduce risks. Increasing cycling levels overall helps to reduce the level of injury risk to individual cyclists.

5.5 Equalities and Diversity

5.5.1 The decision is not considered to compromise the authority in fulfilment of its Equality Duty 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

Provision of cycling facilities may provide differential benefits to groups more likely to cycle. This includes children and young adults and men and 'White British' ethnic group. However provision may also remove some of the barriers to cycling for other groups. An impact assessment of the borough's Local Implementation Plan identified, based on satisfaction survey responses, that provision of cycle facilities may be a higher priority for minority ethnic groups in the borough than for the population as a whole. Cyclists sharing pedestrian facilities can be a concern and some older and disabled people can be at greater risk if this occurs. Providing facilities for cyclists may introduce shared facilities in controlled situations or reduce uncontrolled use of pavements by cyclists concerned about cycling on a carriageway without facilities.

5.6 Consultation and Engagement

5.6.1 Informal engagement regarding some of the ideas identified by London Cycle Campaign has taken place in conjunction with discussions around development of a borough Cycling Strategy and in relation to proposals for Brent Cross Cricklewood. Consultation requirements for any proposals that are developed further would vary depending on the scale and impact of these.

6. BACKGROUND PAPERS

6.1 The meeting of the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee of 18 June 2014:

RESOLVED: - That the Strategic Director for Growth and Environment instruct officers to undertake an initial feasibility study to include engaging with the LCC, including cost, looking at their proposals in Finchley and Golders Green. It was noted that a report would be brought back to the Area Sub-Committee for the Committee to determine which schemes should be progressed to public consultation. Minutes of the Area Committee meeting can be found via this link: <http://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=712&MId=7983&Ver=4>