

	<h2>Chipping Barnet Area Committee</h2> <h3>8 March 2017</h3>
<b>Title</b>	<b>Referrals from Chipping Barnet Residents Forum</b>
<b>Report of</b>	Head of Governance
<b>Wards</b>	All
<b>Status</b>	Public
<b>Enclosures</b>	Appendix 1 and 2
<b>Officer Contact Details</b>	Sheri Odoffin sheri.odoffink@barnet.gov.uk 020 8359 3104

## Summary

At the meeting of Chipping Barnet Residents Forum, held on 24 January 2017, two petitions and one issue were referred to this Committee for consideration.

## Recommendations

1. That the Chipping Barnet Area Committee consider the two petitions and the issue referred by the Chipping Barnet Residents Forum.

### 1. WHY THIS REPORT IS NEEDED

- 1.1 The Council's Constitution permits the referral of petitions and issues to Area Committees:

Item	Action
<p><b>NO TO A ZEBRA AT THE CHASE WAY/CECIL ROAD CROSSROADS, LONDON N14 (41 signatures at time of publication of Issues list, currently 42).</b></p> <p><b>Lead Petitioner: Petros Georgiou</b></p> <p><b>Ward: Brunswick Park</b></p> <p><b>We the undersigned petition the council to not place any zebra crossing at the Chase Way/Cecil Road N14 junction on the grounds that follow, numbered 1-13. These have been prepared on the basis of: 1) a majority view of Chase Way residents, and views expressed by others; &amp; 2) the Capita Safety Report Nov 16, recommending a SW zebra over a NE zebra. This petition works in conjunction with and is in addition to a petition submitted 8 Aug 2016, seeking ‘no SW of table zebra’ and ‘20mph speed limits in Chase Way north &amp; south of the raised table’. We believe a zebra at this junction will pose serious safety risks rather than contribute to “safe crossing” as intended by Walksafe N14.</b></p> <p>1. There have been no reported pedestrian accidents in Chase Way for over 35 years to our knowledge. We believe Barnet’s (LBBs) attempt to improve access for pedestrians to cross, will increase accident potential if a zebra is placed at a crossroads junction, on a hill, with low visibility, parked cars on the approach, adjacent driveways all around, and no patrol.</p> <p>2. Government statistics show 23.9% of all urban pedestrian traffic accidents arose on or within 50 metres of a crossing. Croydon CC website accept 3 accidents p.a.per zebra, so where accidents in an area are lower, as is the case here, residents may well be better off without one.</p> <p>3. LBB offers zebras without a ‘Lollipop’ assistant – i.e. unpatrolled, so the burden of safety falls on the user.</p> <p>4. There are multiple inconsistencies and compromises in the Capita Safety Report of Nov 2016 and the Highways design, when compared with the Design of Pedestrian Crossings LTN 1/95 and 2/95. The Safety Report steers opinion by</p>	<p>Petition referred to Chipping Barnet Area Committee for consideration.</p> <p><b>See possible decisions to take in issues list at appendix 1.</b></p> <p><b>See Resident Forum Minutes at appendix 2</b></p>

omission of points. It recommends a SW zebra, yet excludes crucial dangers identified in the main body, e.g:

5. The Safety Report recognises a SW zebra imposes risk on 2 homes directly impacted by it, one resident of whom is disabled. It identifies a SW zebra will be “too close” for cars on those driveways to pull out safely. It mitigates the risk, stating homeowners should “be able to anticipate the possibility of pedestrians”. That is not possible as at one of the homes, the driver needs to move 2 metres forward on their driveway to be able to see beyond their party wall.

6. The Safety Report also identifies that “if a vehicle is waiting to pull out of a driveway and is stopped on the vehicle crossover then this could impede visibility to a pedestrian, more specifically a small child, waiting at the crossing point.” Yet this is ignored in its summaries and final recommendations.

7. The Safety Report identifies “random crossing points” in the vicinity of the proposed zebra. LTN 1/95 states once installed, a zebra will become a ‘focus’ of concentration for drivers and the 50 metre approach to it both sides, becomes potentially more hazardous for pedestrians as drivers’ attention is drawn to that ‘focus’. LTN 1/95 states for this reason, the crossing should not be placed at an area with random crossing patterns. The Report seriously fails in its recommendation by not mentioning this.

8. Given 67% of pedestrians cross at the NE side, the hazard is compounded by the ‘within 50 metres’ hazard not in the drivers ‘focus’. The Safety Report fails to analyse where people cross, or critically analyse it. Children will not turn back on themselves to head towards Chase Side. The pedestrian line will not change.

9. Additionally, multiple distractions add risk to pedestrians with a crossroads: the zebra is at a junction, on a downhill approach, a very nearby immediate left turn, downhill from Cecil Road being only a few metres away, all diluting drivers ‘focus’.

10. The safety risk is made worse from the pedestrian viewpoint, since children are currently attuned to the road risk of Chase Way and so cross

with a high degree of awareness. Place a zebra there and children will lose that awareness, seeing the zebra as their right of way.

11. This is further exacerbated in autumn/winter by the low-sun blinding approaching drivers, especially at school leaving time (3.15pm to 6pm). This too reduces driver 'focus'.

12. LTN 2/95 recommends a crossing should not be too near a left turn junction (with Cecil Road). It also has a telegraph pole obstruction which may or may not be relocated.

13. The Telegraph pole is a serious blind spot and will disrupt drivers 'focus' further.

**Safety at Lyonsdown/Longmore Junction (87 signatures at time of publication of Issues list, currently 88)**

**Lead Petitioner: Nikki Thorpe**

**Ward: New Barnet**

**We the undersigned petition the council to investigate the safety of, and take consequent action to improve the safety of the complex junction at the top of Longmore Avenue, where it meets Lyonsdown Road.**

As residents who live at this junction, we are regular users and appreciate its complexity: mainly the 8 potential different flows of traffic at any one time; and the limited visibility due to the action of the junction taking place both on a steep hill and sharp bend, where there is reduced visibility in each direction.

We are witness to the dangers of the junction as we hear and see many crashes. Whilst the junction may not be flagged by the statistics, it is still of great concern. A friend was recently crashed into by another driver who had simply not seen her. Her children were in the back of the car. Just before this Christmas, the nanny of one of my son's classmates came off her bike coming round the sharp bend and swerved to make space for an on-coming car, which was too near the centre of the road and had not seen her coming. She fractured her arm in 3 places, requiring surgery, broke her nose and had a tooth

Petition referred to Chipping Barnet Area Committee for consideration

**See possible decisions to take in issues list at appendix 1.**

**See Resident Forum Minutes at appendix 2**

knocked out. She is extremely lucky not to have sustained head or spinal injury, or death. She reports her cycling helmet saved her. It is the belief of us and our neighbours that foreseeable accidents will continue to occur: Minor, or major in nature; they could be reduced if a thorough, expert Highways investigation is conducted to address all of the safety issues at this junction and act accordingly.

**Accidents occurring when vehicles turn left out of Southway into Totteridge Lane and out of Hill Crescent into Totteridge Lane.**

**Issue submitted by: Michael Caro**

**Ward:Totteridge**

As a result of concerns about the number of accidents occurring when vehicles turn left out of Southway into Totteridge Lane and out of Hill Crescent into Totteridge Lane, I have been asked to write to you on behalf of the Totteridge Residents Association to explain what I think are the causes and how these junctions might be improved. I have looked at these junctions, watched vehicles turning left out of Southway into Totteridge Lane and turning left out of Hill Crescent and Totteridge Lane, measured the angle of the turns and the looked at the road surfaces at the junctions and the size of the pavements on the left hand side of each junction. Here are my observations. The junctions require any vehicle turning left to make a 90 degree turn into Totteridge Lane. Totteridge Lane at that point is (for an A road) a relatively narrow two lane road.

Southway and Hill Crescent are also narrow two lane roads. Most people making a 90 degree left turn tend to go wide, i.e. they have a tendency to go further beyond the boundary line of the pavement (which is at 90 degrees to them) than they need to before turning their steering wheel hard left. I think this tendency arises because drivers want to avoid their rear wheels hitting the kerb on their left . You can see the same tendency in slow motion if you watch people turning into their own driveways. In my view it is this tendency that is the primary cause of accidents. Coupled with this tendency, the risk of accidents at these points is compounded for the following additional reasons: • when you are turning left out of Southway into Totteridge Lane or out of Hill Crescent into Totteridge Lane your visibility to

The Chairman referred the matter to the Chipping Barnet Area Committee to review trimming trees, review warnings signs with a view to adjusting them if required and to carry out a review of the zebra crossing.

**See extract from issues list at appendix 1 which contains the response from Highways to the issue.**

**See Resident Forum Minutes at appendix 2**

the right is restricted, firstly because there is curve in Totteridge Lane in the case of the Southway Junction and secondly because in both cases there are bushes and trees with branches protruding over the pavement on Totteridge Lane just to the right of the junctions; • there is a sunken drainage grating on the left corner of Southway which some drivers may seek to avoid causing them to go further into Totteridge Lane than they should in order to avoid sinking into the drainage grating; • although not as bad as the drain grating at the Southway junction there is also a drain near the corner of Hill Crescent and Totteridge Lane and this may have a similar effect; • Totteridge Lane is narrow at both junctions; • Southway and Hill Crescent are both narrow roads; • vehicles travel much too fast along Totteridge Lane and this means that drivers turning left out of Southway and Hill Crescent have a limited time within which to make the manoeuvre and try to do so too fast. I am also concerned about the junction of Longland Drive and Totteridge Lane. I have noticed that drivers turning right out of Longland Drive into Totteridge Lane often do so at speed because there is a limited time within which they can make that turn. Because they have accelerated out of Longland Drive they are going too fast when they reach the pedestrian crossing and often cannot stop in time. You will see this if you spend a few minutes watching drivers there. It is quite likely that a driver is going to hit a pedestrian at some point if it has not already happened.

What action are you asking the Council to take I have the following suggestions to improve the junction to try to reduce the current inevitable risk of accidents: 1. If Southway and Hill Crescent at the junctions could each be widened by about a foot by cutting back the pavement on the left hand (west) side of Southway and Hill Crescent (perhaps in each case for a distance of about 20 feet along Southway and Hill Crescent from the corner) that would make a big difference and considerably reduce the tendency of drivers to go so wide when turning. The pavements are wide enough to allow for that cutting back there. 2. If the pavement along Totteridge Lane at those points could also be widened for a distance of about 20 feet that would also minimise that risk. 3. There is only a dotted white line in the middle of Totteridge Lane at those points. That section of Totteridge Lane and indeed all sections of Totteridge Lane near any junctions e.g. Northcliffe Drive, Pine Grove, The Green really need double

white lines. 4. It is possible that some astute hatching of Southway and Hill Crescent at the intersections could also help to induce drivers to position themselves better for the left turn although I think that, given the narrowness of Southway and Hill Crescent, hatching on its own will not work unless the pavements are also cut back and the sunken drain grating is dealt with. 5. Proper and rigorous enforcement of the 30 mile speed limit on Totteridge Lane in both directions is required. Ideally I would like to see average speed cameras. 6. The bushes and trees must be cut back and all other impediments to visibility must be dealt with. I also wonder whether the current designs of the junctions actually meets the requirements of the Standards for Highways? The risk in re Longland Drive could be minimised if the speed limit on Totteridge Lane were properly enforced, if traffic lights were put in place at that intersection and the pedestrian crossing were moved further to the East along Totteridge Lane.

## **2. REASON FOR REFFERAL**

- 2.1 At the meeting of Chipping Barnet Residents Forum held on 24 January 2017, two petitions and one Issue were referred to this Committee for consideration, as permitted by the constitution.

## **3. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 3.1 As set out above.

## **4. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND NOT RECOMMENDED**

- 4.1 N/A

## **5. POST DECISION IMPLEMENTATION**

N/A

## **6. IMPLICATIONS OF DECISION**

- 6.1 **Resources (Finance & Value for Money, Procurement, Staffing, IT, Property, Sustainability)**

- 6.2 Not in the context of this report.

### **6.3 Legal and Constitutional References**

- 6.3.1 Responsibility for Functions, paragraph 6.2, of the council's Constitution

reads:

*The Council's constitution permits referrals of petitions and Issues from Residents Forums to Area Committees.*

**6.4 Risk Management**

6.5 Not in the context of this report.

**6.6 Equalities and Diversity**

6.7 Not in the context of this report.

**6.8 Consultation and Engagement**

6.9 Not in the context of this report.

**7. BACKGROUND PAPERS**

7.1 None.