

	<p><b>Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee</b></p> <p><b>2 August 2017</b></p>
<b>Title</b>	<p><b>Friary Road Traffic Management Measures</b></p>
<b>Report of</b>	<p>Strategic Director - Environment</p>
<b>Wards</b>	<p>Woodhouse</p>
<b>Status</b>	<p>Public</p>
<b>Urgent</b>	<p>No</p>
<b>Key</b>	<p>No</p>
<b>Enclosures</b>	<p>None</p>
<b>Officer Contact Details</b>	<p>Jane Shipman, <a href="mailto:Highwayscorrespondence@barnet.gov.uk">Highwayscorrespondence@barnet.gov.uk</a>, 020 8359 3555</p>

<p><b>Summary</b></p>
<p>The report sets out options for a road safety scheme to address concerns principally related to speed of traffic in Friary Road, N12. A proposal for Friary Road did not achieve sufficient priority when assessed for inclusion in the Local Implementation Plan (LIP) 2017/18 funded work programme so a combination of proposals that go some way to meeting local aspirations has been identified that could be delivered within the Area Committee Budget.</p>

<p><b>Recommendations</b></p>
<p><b>1. That the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee approve provision of two additional Vehicle Activated Signs in Friary Road at an approximate cost of £8,000 from CIL Funding</b></p>
<p><b>2. That the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee agree provision of road markings at a cost of up to £5,000 from CIL Funding to encourage drivers to amend their behaviour, the exact detail to be agreed with ward members.</b></p>
<p><b>3. That the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee approve kerb work at the junction of Mayfield Avenue and Friary Road to tighten the radius of the left turn from Mayfield Avenue into Friary Road at an approximate cost of £12,000 from CIL Funding</b></p>

## 1. WHY THIS REPORT IS NEEDED

- 1.1 In January 2017 the Environment Committee, in response to a members item from Councillor Schneiderman, agreed that officers assess Friary Road against the agreed assessment tool for potential inclusion in the Implementation Plan (LIP) 2017/18 programme ('2017/18 LIP') If the road was not assessed as a priority, a report was to be submitted to the appropriate Area Committee (i.e. the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee) outlining a road safety scheme for Friary Road that could be funded through the area committee process. No funding was allocated to permit significant investigations or consider options in any detail.
- 1.2 There have been requests raised over a number of years for measures to be put in place to control speed and reduce road traffic accidents in the road. There have been no Personal Injury Road Traffic Accidents (PIAs) recorded in the road in the five years to 31 October 2016 (most recent data available at time of drafting) and the accidents concerning residents would appear to be incidents resulting in damage only, rather than the injury accident data that is usually used to develop and compare scheme proposals, and for which there is a reasonably consistent reporting system via the Police.
- 1.3 In February 2017 officers from RE (Regional Enterprise) Limited met a resident representing the Road Traffic Steering Group of the Friary Road Neighbourhood Watch who has previously corresponded about this matter. The resident identified- a desire for physical measures to reduce the speed and/or volume of traffic and the stretch between Friary Way and Mayfield Avenue was highlighted as being of particular concern. Measures such as raised junction tables at the junctions of Friary Road with Friary Way and Mayfield Avenue and a 20mph speed limit were requested. The speed with which vehicles could turn from Mayfield Avenue into Friary Road and the potential to tighten the junction kerb-lines to encourage slower turns. In separate correspondence the resident identified that other physical measures would also be of interest including width restrictions.
- 1.4 Concern was also raised that the positioning of existing Vehicle Activated Signs in Friary Road was such that they would not register the fastest vehicles. The existing signs are located near the park (westbound traffic) and opposite Friary Way (eastbound traffic). Both these locations are strictly outside Woodhouse Ward and the boundary of the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee.
- 1.5 Both signs are provided with speed monitoring equipment and samples of recorded speeds are set out below.

### Eastbound

Date range	85th Percentile Speed	Average (mean) Speed
11/11/2016 - 14/01/2017	29.7 mph	25.1 mph
14/09/2016 - 26/10/2016	29.7 mph	25.3 mph

18/07/2016 - 14/09/2016	29.7 mph	25.0 mph
-------------------------	----------	----------

### Westbound

Date range	85th Percentile Speed	Average (mean) Speed
11/11/2016 - 14/01/2017	33.6 mph	27.9 mph
14/09/2016 - 26/10/2016	34.2 mph	28.8 mph
31/03/2016 - 23/05/2016	34.8 mph	29.3 mph

Note:

85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed: 85% of traffic travels at or below this speed

Mean speed: The average taken by summing all vehicle speeds and dividing by the number of vehicles.

- 1.6 It is possible that the different road environment in the part of Friary Road between Mayfield Avenue and Friary Way may result in higher speeds than those recorded on the existing vehicle activated signs although there is no data currently held to confirm this.
- 1.7 National guidance recommends that 20mph speed limits are only installed where they will be self-enforcing. If the recorded speeds of the roads are currently below 24 mph then signage only may suffice but otherwise physical measures would be needed to achieve suitable levels of compliance with the speed limit. Police enforcement of 20mph speed limits that do not follow this guidance cannot be expected.
- 1.8 A proposal to introduce a scheme in Friary Road including physical traffic calming measures of a scale that could support introduction of a 20mph speed limit was assessed for inclusion in the 2017/18 LIP funded traffic management programme but achieved only joint 139th place out of the 236 general traffic management and accident reduction requests being considered and as a result was not included in the LIP programme. A more minor (undefined) proposal was also assessed but this did not result in a significant change to the ranking.
- 1.9 In July 2016 the Environment Committee agreed policy wording in relation to traffic calming measures. This identified that the Council opposed the use of vertical measures and these should only be proposed in exceptional circumstances. As there have been no Personal Injury Road Traffic Accidents in the road in recent years it is difficult to demonstrate any quantifiable road safety benefit that might result from introducing physical measures into this road and consequently there do not appear to be grounds to consider this an exceptional case.
- 1.10 Arrangements for Area Committee funding of schemes place a limit of £25,000 on funding to be allocated to individual projects. The cost of installing certain measures, either alone or in combination, would exceed this limit.
- 1.11 Width restrictions that limit the maximum width of vehicles that can pass along a road are not appropriate as a traffic calming measure and may have wider impacts. Although they are likely to reduce speed at the point of the restriction

they restrict movements entirely for certain vehicles (which may include vans and larger passenger vehicles well as lorries). Introduction of more than one restriction could prevent necessary access. However narrowing of the carriageway that requires priority working is a potential traffic calming measure (although other constraints may apply).

- 1.12 Additional Vehicle Activated signs displaying a 30mph roundel might be introduced in the road. Such signs can be introduced on lighting columns at relatively low cost. The stretch of road between Mayfield Avenue and Friary Way has been particularly highlighted as a concern and site observations suggest that use of Mayfield Avenue and Friary Way is common between as a route between High Road and Friern Barnet Lane or to access premises in these roads. Therefore if additional signs are to be installed it appears to be appropriate to install them in this part of the road.
- 1.13 This part of Friary Way has lighting columns on one side of the road. Installation other than on a lamp-column would increase the cost significantly so installation of any sign for eastbound traffic on the offside of the road would need to be considered. While it is preferable to install vehicle activated signs on the nearside of the road, installation on the off-side may sometimes be more appropriate. Tree locations are another constraint as these may obscure signs but in the part of Friary Road between Mayfield Avenue and Friary Way it is considered that signs could be installed for traffic in both directions on one of the lamp columns near the middle of this stretch, although these would be relatively close to the existing eastbound sign opposite Friary Way.
- 1.14 In June 2017 it was noted that the sign opposite Friary Way was obscured by foliage, however this appears to be an intermittent issue that can be remedied. Relocating this sign (so only one eastbound sign would be provided) but since it is on the approach to the park entrance retention is considered appropriate.
- 1.15 Some road markings may cause drivers to travel more slowly. SLOW road markings may have limited effect but other markings might be considered. There is a risk of overuse and that familiarity may lead to them being ignored, but marking such as 'dragon's teeth' or markings that produce an optical illusion such as the 'speed cushions' in the image below which are actually flat road markings might be considered.



“Dragons Teeth” Totteridge



Flat “speed cushion” road marking in Southwark Street

- 1.16 Existing parking bay markings in Friary Road may limit the scope to effectively introduce these type of markings but some provision is likely to be possible.
- 1.17 The table below summarises potential measures that might be adopted and the advantages and disadvantages in the context of Friary Road

Measure and scale of cost	Advantages	Disadvantages
Speed tables at junctions of Mayfield Avenue and Friary Way ~£50k	Reduces speed at junctions	Excluded by policy High cost – would exceed Area Committee funding Additional measures likely to be required to reduce speeds over rest of road
Speed cushions between junctions of Mayfield Avenue and Friary Way (4 sets) ~£15k	Reduces speeds between junctions	Excluded by policy May be concerns over parking or driveway access in vicinity
Physical road narrowing / priority working x4 (Mayfield Ave to Friary Way) ~£20k-£25k	Reduces speeds between junctions	Would restrict parking. Careful positioning needed to avoid impact on driveways. Negative impacts for Cyclists.
Road markings to visually narrow road and/or cause drivers to consider they are travelling faster than appropriate. ~£5k	Low cost Raises driver awareness	Options may be constrained by existing parking bay markings. Impact may be limited when drivers are familiar with the route Likely to be insufficient to support 20mph limit

Mini-roundabout at junction of Friary Road with Mayfield Avenue ~£15k-£20k	Reduces speed of turns at the junction on all approaches	Relatively high cost Speed reducing effect limited to junction only Likely to affect parking in vicinity
Kerb realignment at Mayfield Avenue junction ~£10k-£12k	Reduces speed of left turn from Mayfield Avenue into Friary Road.	Effect limited to left turn out of Mayfield Avenue only.
Vehicle Activated signs x2 (assumed located on lamp columns) ~£7.5k-£8k	Relatively low cost Raises driver awareness	Impact may be limited when drivers are familiar with the route. Likely to be insufficient to support 20mph limit

## 2. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 The measures recommended (VAS signs, road markings and kerb work at the junction of Friary Road and Mayfield Avenue) go some way to addressing concerns raised, within the budget available for an Area Committee funded scheme.

## 3. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND NOT RECOMMENDED

- 3.1 Any of the recommendations can be introduced in isolation or omitted
- 3.2 Other combinations of the measures referred to in section 1.17 might be introduced, but affordable measures would either be restricted to a single location or would have other undesirable impacts.
- 3.3 Although there is limited objective need for a road safety scheme at the location, the option of doing nothing has been excluded given the background to the proposal.
- 3.4 The proposals presented have been produced with limited investigation. An alternative approach that has not been recommended would be for the committee to agree funding of £5,000 to carry out a fuller investigations and feasibility study

## 4. POST DECISION IMPLEMENTATION

- 4.1 Following agreement of any of the recommendations the relevant measures would be designed and introduced.

## 5. IMPLICATIONS OF DECISION

### 5.1 Corporate Priorities and Performance

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 manage the impacts of growth on residents of Friary Road and help them feel safe in the local area.

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

5.2.1 Funding of the scheme would be from the Area Committee CIL Budget. The maximum allowance is £25,000 per scheme.

5.2.2 Future maintenance of electrical apparatus shall pass to Barnet Lighting Services who will be expected to charge a commutable sum with the cost fully borne by London Borough of Barnet (allowance made in the estimate).

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 £39,560 minus items agreed at previous Committee meetings.

5.2.4 The work will be carried out under the existing PFI and LoHAC term maintenance contractual arrangements.

## **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 The Council’s Constitution, in section 15 headed “Responsibility for Functions” (Annex A) states that Area Committees discharge any functions, within the budget and policy framework of the theme committees that they agree are more properly delegated to a more local level. These include local highways and safety schemes.

## **5.5 Risk Management**

5.5.1 No specific risks have been identified in relation to this decision.

## **5.6 Equalities and Diversity**

5.6.1 The Equality Act 2010 outlines the provisions of the Public Sector Equality

Duty which requires Public Bodies to have due regard to the need to:

- eliminate 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

The broad purpose of this duty is to integrate considerations of equality into day business and keep them under review in decision making, the design of policies and the delivery of services

The proposals in the report have a similar impact on members of all groups.

## 5.7 **Consultation and Engagement**

5.7.1 No specific consultation is planned on the proposals here.

## 5.8 **Insight**

5.8.1 Accident and available seed data has been referenced in the report.

## 6. **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

6.1 The Environment Committee on 14 July 2016 resolved: “That the Environment Committee approved the following Policy Wording: ‘Generally this Council opposes the use of vertical traffic other calming measures, but acknowledges that calming measures can sometimes be appropriate. Officers should not, though, propose these apart from in exceptional circumstances and with all such decisions reserved for Members.’” (item 15 here)

<http://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=695&MId=8634&Ver=4>

6.2 The Environment Committee on 11 January 2017 resolved “That officers [assess] Friary Road [against] the agreed assessment tool for potential inclusion in the 2017/18 LiP programme. If the road is not assessed as a priority, a report be submitted to the appropriate Area Committee that outlines a road safety scheme for Friary Road that could be funded through the area committee process”. (item 6 here)

<http://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=695&MId=8592&Ver=4>