

**QUESTIONS FOR CHIPPING BARNET AREA COMMITTEE (agenda item 5
refers, Public Questions and Comments) – 8 MARCH 2017**

Item	Question	Response
Design Review – Walksafe N14 Proposals for Chase Way (agenda item 6 refers)	<p>1.The feasibility study showed that there were no pedestrian incidents over a five year period in Chase Way and Hampden Way. When evidence shows such a low traffic or pedestrian incident level why did the council proceed beyond the feasibility project stage?</p> <p>Submitted by: Niall Mitchell</p>	<p>While there were no recorded incidents involving pedestrians, traffic speeds, traffic accidents and frequent crossing of the carriageway by pedestrians (at points where crossing was inappropriate, between parked cars etc) was seen as potentially unsafe in this predominately residential area, with schools. It was therefore apparent that some control of vehicle speeds and the creation of a safe crossing point were highly desirable.</p>
Design Review – Walksafe N14 Proposals for Chase Way (agenda item 6 refers)	<p>2.School pupils in the area are shown to be 1920 (1500 +420) per The Capital N14 Walksafe School Travel Plan 2015/16 Design Review, The Streetwise Survey showed that of those under sixteen only a total 109 journeys (morning or evening) were made in the whole day, Given the evidence , how does the council justify a solution for such a small portion of the school population?</p> <p>Submitted by: Rula Georgiou</p>	<p>The proposals were not intended to be centred on school use. They were intended for the benefits of all users of the highway throughout the day. The pedestrian surveys indicated a wide range of ages of pedestrians and did not focus on school age pedestrians.</p>
Design Review – Walksafe N14 Proposals for Chase Way (agenda item 6 refers)	<p>3. Your own statistics (Streetwise Survey) for pedestrian flow shows 64% NE and 34% SW (2% other) . Note : Due to the selection of zoning the NE statistics does not include the Burleigh Gardens /Chase Way pedestrian flow. The SW zone is more than 3 times the road length of the NE section. Why did the council pursue a SW solution based on overwhelming bias to the NE?</p> <p>Submitted : Petros Georgiou</p>	<p>The original study identified three locations, one north, one south and one at the junction. The location at the junction was considered to offer the greatest benefit to all users of the highway. In regards to its location either immediately north or south of the actual junction. It was considered that the creation of the raised table would slow traffic approaching the crossing from the north, while traffic from the south is travelling uphill and may more easily slow on the approach to the crossing point. There were also several minor benefits such as proximity to the junction and driveways, and the loss of trees that favoured the positioning to the south of the junction. It was also further from the crest that impedes forward vision to the junction and any crossing</p>

		<p>north of it.</p> <p>The numbers crossing the carriageway are higher to the north, but there was no suitable location to place the crossing, it is considered that the proposal offered the safest location and would more likely attract pedestrian use. The location was also considered best by the road safety audit team and the police.</p>
<p>Design Review – Walksafe N14 Proposals for Chase Way (agenda item 6 refers)</p>	<p>4. The LTN 1/95 Assessment guidelines (esp. 3.1.2 and 3.5.2) state that the most dangerous area is within 50m of a zebra crossing. The pedestrians have a desire line NE of the junction and will continue to do so, whilst drivers focus is now on the junction table, side roads and zebra. How does the design justify with evidence that it can change pupils behaviour to traverse three roads instead of one?</p> <p>Submitted : Bronwyn Mitchell</p>	<p>Regrettably there is no means to control pedestrian movements. Placing a crossing anywhere will not ensure it is used by all pedestrians. Extensive guardrailling would be required to ensure all pedestrians cross at a specific point. The provision of the raised table has already been seen to reduce vehicle speeds, the creation of a controlled crossing will ensure a safer crossing place is available for pedestrians. It is hoped that such provision will encourage all pedestrians (not just children) to use it.</p>
<p>Design Review – Walksafe N14 Proposals for Chase Way (agenda item 6 refers)</p>	<p>5. The Capita Design review states “the telegraph pole does not significantly impact on visibility for or to pedestrians”. A driver cannot see pedestrians waiting to cross the road. This single major hazard (per your photographs your report) will lure pedestrians into a false sense of security to cross at the worst place. How did all these experts in design , build and audit review not NOTICE such a blatant hazard? Submitted : Olga Chrisostomou</p>	<p>The issue was noted, the diameter of the pole and its set back from the kerb means pedestrians can see and be seen by traffic – the issue was not considered significant by either the road safety audit team or the police. While its position is not desirable it is not considered a major hazard as stated. Location 1 makes allowances for the pole to be relocated.</p>
<p>Design Review – Walksafe N14 Proposals for Chase Way (agenda item 6 refers)</p>	<p>6. The location is at the bottom of a downward incline, at one of the more complex junctions in the area with 2 side roads of Cecil Rd,. Why, of all the options available, did they still perceive that the evidence would want to put school pedestrian crossing at</p>	<p>It is agreed the position is on a downward incline and it is for that reason the speed table was introduced. There is regrettably no level area where the crossing could be located without substantial impact on roadside parking and where no use of the lofacility would be anticipated. The gradient is a key reason for placing the crossing downhill</p>

	<p>this most vulnerable of spots?</p> <p>Submitted : Niall Mitchell</p>	<p>of the speed table.</p>
<p>Design Review – Walksafe N14 Proposals for Chase Way (agenda item 6 refers)</p>	<p>7. The impact of unintended consequences should be part of a review. We urge the council to reflect that these drivers (especially the top 10 percentile which started the concerns for a petition) and consider that will they not now follow the “rat run” of least resistance and use Cecil Rd and Arlington Rd instead?</p> <p>Submitted: Bronwyn Mitchell</p>	<p>“rat running” is probably taken by drivers wishing to avoid the traffic associated with the school . The provision of a crossing is unlikely to impact. Any potential additional “rat running “ due to the construction of the table may already be occurring and again will not be impacted by the provision of a crossing.</p>
<p>Design Review – Walksafe N14 Proposals for Chase Way (agenda item 6 refers)</p>	<p>8. The residency consultation was flawed in its distribution of documents. We have sampled 100 residents and established that 33% did not get the consultation documents. Council puts this down "to resident being unable to recall" but as the documents were only addressed to occupier council have no way of establishing which addresses the document were delivered to. This was brought to their attention by email before June 2016 but not redressed. Can a consultation really be declared valid when the council own procedures cannot validate deliver?</p> <p>Submitted : Petros Georgiou</p>	<p>While this particular informal consultation might have been undertaken by post, requirements for service of formal notices under the Highways Act give less weight to delivery by post than they do to delivery by hand unless registered or recorded delivery is used. Hand delivering a standard document is also a more cost effective way of delivering. We are however making changes to the envelopes used for traffic consultations to reduce the risk that some residents may discard these without opening them.</p>
<p>20 mph zone on Cecil Road</p>	<p>When is the 20mph zone on Cecil Road going to be installed? It was agreed that flashing signs would be installed and timed to go on during school drop off and pick up.</p> <p>Submitted by Cait O’Riordan</p>	<p>Response to follow.</p>