

	Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee 2 August 2017
Title	Parking near Summerside School and Woodhouse Open Space Enhancement
Report of	Strategic Director for Environment
Wards	Woodhouse
Status	Public
Urgent	No
Key	No
Enclosures	Appendix – Sketches Woodhouse Open Space options
Officer Contact Details	Jane Shipman, Highwayscorrespondence@barnet.gov.uk , 020 8359 3555

Summary

The report identifies two options for consultation with Summerside School and residents. One would involve provision of grid reinforcement to allow parking on the side of Woodhouse Open Space and the other would provide measures to prevent such parking. Either would include associated parking restrictions at junctions and work to cut back the kerblineline at some junctions to prevent over-run by larger vehicles.

Area Committee funding to the maximum £25,000 available for a single project is proposed as a contribution to the project.

Recommendations

- 1. That the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee agree that consultation be undertaken with the school and local residents on the two options identified in the report.**
- 2. That the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee delegate authority to the Strategic Director for Environment to consider the consultation results and, in consultation with ward members, decide which option to take forward, with or without amendments.**
- 3. That the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee approve a contribution of £25,000 to the project.**

1. WHY THIS REPORT IS NEEDED

- 1.1 A proposal was provided to the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee in July 2016 identifying the cost of provision of mesh parking reinforcement to the western side of Woodhouse Open Space to help address concerns about obstructive parking in Crossway.
- 1.2 The proposal exceeded the £25,000 Area Committee budget limit for a single scheme and the Committee agreed that officers should update the Chairman of the Committee on what could be achieved with an expenditure of £25,000 in relation to the scheme including any other relevant information.
- 1.3 Subsequently it was identified that the sum of £25,000 could treat around half of the area originally envisaged, but that in itself the benefit did not appear to justify the level of expense.
- 1.4 A subsequent site meeting with Councillors Cooke and Hutton, a representative from Summerside School, the Commissioning Director for Environment and highways and green-spaces officers identified two main alternatives in relation to parking and the open space. One approach would be to prevent the parking on the edge of the Open Space that currently results in the area becoming rutted and muddy. The other would be to provide reinforcement of this area and permit parking, while providing bollards or fencing to prevent vehicles encroaching (deliberately or otherwise) further onto the Open Space.
- 1.5 The officer view was that the level of use of the area was such that the originally suggested mesh parking was likely to be inadequate and that more substantial grid (such as is already provided on the opposite side of the green) would be more suitable. However, the foundation that would be required for this was such that trees in the area would be affected by the work and replacement of a number of these would be required.
- 1.6 Other issues identified related to over-run of corners by refuse vehicles and issues caused by parking at corners.

- 1.7 Based on the above, two options have been identified for consultation, which are illustrated in the sketches in the Appendix.

Option 1 would involve:

- Provide grid parking along west side of green. Extent shown on sketch is the maximum considered feasible without affecting the mature trees at the north-west corner. Other trees would need to be felled and re-provision made, with two trees provided for each tree removed
- Convert south-west corner of green to carriageway. It is assumed that trees on this corner can be avoided but this will need to be reviewed during the design process.
- Provide “at any time” parking restrictions at the junction of Schoolway and Crossway and at the junction of Crescent Way and Garthway.

Option 2 would involve:

- Provide timber bollards along west side of green (or fenced alternative at similar cost) to prevent parking.
- Convert south-west corner of green to carriageway. As for option 1 it is assumed that trees on this corner can be avoided but this will need to be reviewed during the design process.
- Provide “at any time” parking restrictions at the junction of Schoolway and Crossway and at the junction of Crescent Way and Garthway (as for Option 1)

- 1.8 The overall cost of Option 1 is estimated at £77,000 and for Option 2 £44,000. However the intention is that the Area Committee provide funding to the maximum £25,000 available to them, and alternative delivery methods and funding streams would be investigated to reduce costs or deliver parts of the preferred proposal. It is anticipated that it will be possible to use the Area Committee funding to purchase materials and for most works undertaken by the DLO through the rota of work in individual wards that is prioritised by ward members.

2. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 There are two alternative approaches available to addressing the parking and traffic concerns in the area including parking on the edge of the Open Space. One involves preventing this parking; reserving the area for recreation and as a grassed space. The other approach would be to accommodate the parking with measures to reduce some of the impact. Consultation with residents and the school is recommended to help identify local views regarding these approaches.

3. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND NOT RECOMMENDED

- 3.1 The existing kerblines at the junction of Schoolway and Crossway and at the junction of Crescent Way and Garth Way appear to have been designed to accommodate refuse vehicles, but this is only possible if no parking takes

place in the vicinity. An alternative to converting the corner of the green to carriageway could be to provide more extensive parking restrictions at this location, however this would be more likely to impact on parking by residents.

- 3.2 If no changes are made issues of parking and access would continue as currently.

4. POST DECISION IMPLEMENTATION

- 4.1 Following agreement of any of the recommendations consultation with the school and residents would follow, with the outcomes considered by the Strategic Director for Environment and ward members to choose an option for implementation. Implementation or staged implementation would follow depending on availability of other funding or identification of alternative delivery solutions.

5. IMPLICATIONS OF DECISION

5.1 Corporate Priorities and Performance

- 5.1.1 The Corporate Plan includes delivery objectives of “a clean and attractive environment, with well-maintained roads and pavements, flowing traffic” and “a responsible approach to regeneration, with thousands of new homes built”. The proposals here will help make the local area more attractive and manage traffic and parking helping residents feel confident moving around their local area on foot, and in a vehicle and contribute to reduced congestion.

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

- 5.2.1 As identified at paragraph 1.8 the estimated cost of Option 1 is £77,000 and the estimated cost of Option 2 is £44,000. Either option would exceed the maximum £25,000 that the Area Committee can allocate to the project.

- 5.2.2 Additional funding or alternative delivery options will need to be explored to meet the difference but funding of £25,000 is intended from the Area Committee Budget.

- 5.2.3 Prior to any approval of any further requests from this budget at this Committee, the total funding available is £110,791. This balance consists of an in year CIL allocation of £150,000 combined with a prior year carry forward of £71,821 (adjusted for over and underspends on prior year schemes) minus items agreed at previous Committee meetings of £111,030.

- 5.2.4 The work will be carried out under existing Highway or Greenspace contract arrangements, via directly employed labour or other procurement or delivery arrangements to be identified.

5.3 Social Value

- 5.3.1 Not applicable in the context of this report.

5.4 Legal and Constitutional References

- 5.4.1 The Highways Act 1980 provides general and specific powers for the highway authority to make changes or improvements to the highway.
- 5.4.2 The Council has the necessary legal powers to introduce traffic orders to put the proposal into effect under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.
- 5.4.3 The Traffic Management Act 2004 places obligations on traffic 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.
- 5.4.4 Section 15 of the Constitution “Responsibility for Functions (Annex B – Scheme of Delegated Authority to Officers)” provides that Chief Officers can take decisions to discharge the functions allocated to them or dealt with by them or their staff, except for matters specifically reserved to, Committees or Council.

5.5 Risk Management

- 5.5.1 The consultation could raise expectations of introduction of a proposal. As there is a risk that sufficient funding or cost reductions could not be identified to meet the full cost this could lead to adverse publicity. To mitigate this, the consultation documents would make it clear that full funding was not yet identified for the proposals.
- 5.5.2 Otherwise there are no particular risk management issues associated with the decision to consult, although the works proceeding from it will require risk management of construction risks.

5.6 Equalities and Diversity

- 5.6.1 The Equality Act 2010 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
- 5.6.2 The broad purpose of this duty is to integrate considerations of equality into day to day business and keep them under review in decision making, the design of policies and the delivery of services
- 5.6.3 The proposals in the report have a similar impact on members of all groups. Introduction of the measures outlined in the report are likely to benefit pedestrians generally, but in particular children travelling to and from school and those escorting them. Parking restrictions and provision will also impact on most groups to a similar extent but again children travelling to school and their escorts may be more affected than other groups. However it is not considered that these positive or negative effects would compromise the Council in fulfilling its duty

5.7 Consultation and Engagement

5.7.1 Consultation with Summerside Primary School and local residents regarding which of the options in the report they prefer is planned. Statutory Consultation regarding parking restriction changes would also be required.

5.8 **Insight**

5.8.1 Not applicable in the context of this report.

6. **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

6.1 The Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee on 30 March 2016 agreed “That the Committee requested to receive an officer’s Report at its next meeting with approximate funding costs in relation to the proposal for Mesh Parking on the Green Near Summerside School.” (Item 9 here).
<http://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=712&MId=8267&Ver=4>

6.2 The Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee on 6 July 2016 agreed that “officers would update the Chairman of the Committee on what can be achieved with an expenditure of £25,000 in relation to the scheme including any other relevant information.” (item 9 here).
<http://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=712&MId=8749&Ver=4>