

| | |
|---|---|
|  | <p>Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee</p> <p>27 April 2017</p> |
| <p style="text-align: right;">Title</p> | <p>Westbury Road- Traffic Islands</p> |
| <p style="text-align: right;">Report of</p> | <p>Commissioning Director- Environment</p> |
| <p style="text-align: right;">Wards</p> | <p>West Finchley</p> |
| <p style="text-align: right;">Status</p> | <p>Public</p> |
| <p style="text-align: right;">Urgent</p> | <p>No</p> |
| <p style="text-align: right;">Key</p> | <p>No</p> |
| <p style="text-align: right;">Enclosures</p> | <p>Appendix 1 - Drawings:</p> <p>Option 1 C2016_BC001030-09-DESIGN-01 (Informal Crossing)</p> <p>Option 2 C2016_BC001030-09-DESIGN-02 (Traffic island)</p> |
| <p style="text-align: right;">Officer Contact Details</p> | <p>Jamie Blake – Commissioning Director for Environment Jamie.blake@barnet.gov.uk</p> |

| |
|---|
| <h2>Summary</h2> |
| <p>The aim of this report is to detail the results of the feasibility study which involves providing traffic islands on Westbury Road at the junction with Holden Road and at the junction with Argyle Road. It puts forward two options for consideration to address the traffic safety concerns at these locations.</p> |

| |
|---|
| <h2>Recommendations</h2> |
| <p>1. That the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee note the review of safety improvements on Westbury Road, as outlined in this report and the Appendices to this report and shown on drawings C2016_BC/001030-09-DESIGN_01 and C2016_BC/001030-09-DESIGN_02</p> |
| <p>2. That the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee decides if one or both of the Traffic Islands should be progressed to detailed design and public</p> |

| |
|--|
| consultation. |
| 3. That the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee give instruction to the Commissioning Director for Environment to carry out a statutory consultation on the island(s). |
| 4. That subject to no objections being received to the statutory consultation, referred to in recommendation 3, the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee instruct officers to introduce the island(s). |
| 5. That the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee agree that if any objections are received as a result of the statutory consultations, referred to in recommendation 3, the Commissioning Director for Environment will consider and determine whether the approved island(s) should be implemented or not, and if so, with or without modification. |
| 6. That the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee agree to allocate the funding for the approved islands(s) CIL from this year's CIL Area Committee budget of £25,000) to design and carry out statutory consultation and, subject to the outcome of that consultation, introduce the agreed option. |

1. WHY THIS REPORT IS NEEDED

- 1.1 Concerns have been raised by residents at the Finchley and Golders Green Residents Forum regarding the speed of traffic on Westbury Road. On 30 November 2016, the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee discussed the options for reducing vehicle speeds on Westbury Road including reducing the speed limit to 20mph and installing two traffic islands to slow vehicles down.
- 1.2 Following discussion of the item, the Committee unanimously agreed and it was therefore resolved that:
1. *That the Committee noted the summary of the monitoring of the VAS in Westbury Road.*
 2. *That the Committee confirmed that the speed limit of the road remain at 30mph and is not reduced to 20mph and that the 30mph VAS remain in situ.*
 3. *That the Committee approved the £5,000 from the Area Committee budget to undertake a feasibility study to insert traffic islands on the corners of Westbury Road and Holden Road and Westbury Road and Argyle Road.*
- 1.3 This report is required to investigate the viability of installing traffic islands on Westbury Road at the junction with Holden Road and at the junction with Argyle Road.

2. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 This particular approach to calm traffic speeds is informed by i) speed survey data, and ii) site observations.
- 2.2 At the request of residents on Westbury Road two 30mph Vehicle Activated Signs (VAS) were installed in 2015, one in the northbound direction and one in the southbound direction. Following the installation of the signs, the speeds were monitored for a 6 month period with a view to assessing whether the reduction in the speed limit would be appropriate.
- 2.3 Following the monitoring of vehicle speeds, a review of the collision information and after considering the current road environment, it was decided that the speed limit would not be reduced. However, it was agreed that the vehicle activated signs would remain in place, vehicle speeds will continue to be monitored and a feasibility study to look at the possibility of installing traffic islands on the approach to Holden Road and Argyle road will be carried out.
- 2.4 As part of the feasibility study, the personal injury accident data was analysed investigating the most recent 60 months of accident data from 1 September 2011 to 31 August 2016 within the study area. During this time, there were no accidents within the study area.
- 2.5 Following the review of available data, and a comprehensive site survey, two options have been developed Informal pedestrian crossing point and a standalone traffic island.
- 2.6 Option 1 involves the provision of informal crossing points on Westbury Road at its junctions with Holden Road and Argyle Road these will include associated dropped kerbs, tactile paving and safety bollards.
- 2.7 Option 2 involves the provision of traffic islands constructed using a 125mm kerb upstand, asphalt infill and two 'keep left' bollards.
- 2.8 The proposed location has been reviewed on site by Officers and there are benefits to installing either option. The preferred option is Option 1, the introduction of the informal pedestrian crossing points.
- 2.9 The potential advantages/ disadvantages of implementing the scheme are summarised in table 1 below:

Table 1: Summary of Potential Advantages/ Disadvantages

| Option | Benefits | Disbenefits |
|---|--|--|
| Option 1. Informal Pedestrian Crossing | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Enhanced pedestrian safety; safe crossing point with advantages for mobility impaired users. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Possible increase of traffic and bus journey times.- There have been no |

| | | |
|-----------------------------|---|--|
| Point | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improved pedestrian experience (crossing located at the pedestrian desire line). - Reducing the carriageway width can help to reduce vehicle speeds and reduce crossing distances. | accidents within the study area in the last six years so any subsequent accidents following the introduction of the proposals can be seen as resulting to an increase to accidents within the study area. |
| Option 2. Traffic island | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The traffic island will improve safety by reducing the carriageway width thus reducing vehicle speeds. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There have been no accidents within the study area in the last six years so any subsequent accidents following the introduction of the proposals may be considered as a result of the proposals in the study area. |

2.10 The cost of the two options is detailed in paragraph 5.2 below for Option 1, Informal Pedestrian Crossing Points a cost of £24,200 and for Option 2, Traffic Islands, a cost of £18,700.

3. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND NOT RECOMMENDED

3.1 In addition to the two options above, the only alternative option at this stage is to not proceed with any of the proposed improvements to the scheme; however, this will not address the original concern raised regarding vehicle speeds on Westbury Road.

4. POST DECISION IMPLEMENTATION

4.1 Once the recommendation is approved, detailed design of the preferred option will be undertaken. Ward members and residents living close to the proposed location would be notified of the intention and comments invited. Implementation would follow once any issues have been considered and resolved where possible with a view to implementation subject to funding being made available.

5. IMPLICATIONS OF DECISION

5.1 Corporate Priorities and Performance

5.1.1 This scheme will help to address the Corporate Plan delivery objectives of ‘a clean and attractive environment, with well-maintained road and pavements, flowing traffic’. Barnet’s children and young people will receive a great start in life”, “Barnet will be amongst the safest places in London” and “a responsible approach to regeneration, with thousands of new homes built” by helping

residents to feel confident walking to school, helping to reduce traffic congestion.

5.1.2 Improvements that encourage walking or other active travel will help to deliver the active travel and recreation opportunities identified in the Health and Wellbeing Strategy for children and the population generally.

5.1.3 The Joint strategic Needs also identifies that encouraging travel by foot, bicycle or public transport could drive good lifestyle behaviours and reduced demand for health and social care services.

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

5.2.1 **Costs** for the installation of the informal crossing (table 2 below) or the traffic island (table 3 below) are indicative and if one of them is chosen it would be Area committee funded;

Table 2

| Option 1- Informal Crossing | Estimated costs |
|--|------------------------|
| Detailed Design Fees (Includes statutory processes, Topographical survey procurement, STATS searches, advertising, public consultation, safety audits etc.) | £7,000 |
| Build Cost | £15,000 |
| Sub-TOTAL | £22,000 |
| Implementation & post implementation fee @ 10% | £2,200 |
| GRAND TOTAL | £24,200 |

Table 3

| Option 2- Traffic Island | Estimated costs |
|--|------------------------|
| Detailed Design Fees (Includes statutory processes, Topographical survey procurement, STATS searches, advertising, public consultation, safety audits etc.) | £7,000 |
| Build Cost | £10,000 |
| Sub-TOTAL | £17,000 |
| Implementation & post implementation fee @ 10% | £1,700 |
| GRAND TOTAL | £18,700 |

5.2.2 Procurement of the works would be via the existing London Highways Alliance Contract (LOHAC) and the Council’s Street Lighting provider as appropriate.

5.3 Social Value

5.3.1 As procurement is via existing term or framework arrangements there are no relevant social value considerations in relation to this work.

5.4 Legal and Constitutional References

5.4.1 The Council’s Constitution, in section 15 headed “Responsibility for Functions”

(Annex A) states that Area Committees may take decisions within their terms of reference provided it is not contrary to council policy and can discharge various functions, including highway use and regulation, within the boundaries of their areas in accordance with council policy and within budget.

5.4.2 The Traffic Management Act 2004 places obligations on authorities to ensure the expeditious movement of traffic on their road network. Authorities are required to make arrangements as they consider appropriate for planning and carrying out the action to be taken in performing the duty.

5.5 Risk Management

5.5.1 The introduction of either option can result in accidents within the scheme extent. This will be mitigated by selecting a location that serves the pedestrian desire line and discourages crossing close to but not on the crossing. Also, as part of the design development a road safety audit will be commissioned.

5.6 Equalities and Diversity

The 2010 Equality Act outlines the provisions of the Public Sector Equalities Duty which requires Public Bodies **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

5.6.1 The proposals are not expected to disproportionately disadvantage or benefit individual members of the community. In fact, the recommendations specifically seek to reach out to vulnerable users such as the disabled and the visually impaired.

5.7 Consultation and Engagement

5.7.1 A public consultation will be carried out on the proposals and details of the proposals will be outlined on the council's website.

5.8 Insight

5.8.1 The options have been informed by traffic surveys and a comprehensive site survey within the study area.

6. BACKGROUND PAPERS

6.1 Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee 30 November 2016

<https://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/documents/s36281/Westbury%20Road%20Vehicles%20Activated%20Signs%20VAS%20-%20Monitoring.pdf>

<http://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/documents/g9085/Printed%20minutes%2030th-Nov-2016%2019.00%20Finchley%20Golders%20Green%20Area%20Committee.pdf?T=1>