

	<h2>Hendon Area Committee Meeting</h2> <h3>4 December 2017</h3>
<p style="text-align: center;">Title</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Colindeep Lane – Pedestrian Improvements (Initial Assessment) – Road Safety Audit</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Report of</p>	<p>Strategic Director For Environment</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Wards</p>	<p>Colindale</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Status</p>	<p>Public</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Urgent</p>	<p>No</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Key</p>	<p>No</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Enclosures</p>	<p>None</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Officer Contact Details</p>	<p>Lisa Wright - HighwaysCorrespondence@barnet.gov.uk</p>

Summary

This report details further considerations by Officers following Committee's Resolution to proceed with a modified version of Officers' proposals presented in a previous Hendon Area Committee meeting on 24 July 2017.

Recommendations

1. That the Hendon Area Committee note the results of the Stage 1 Road Safety Audit carried out on proposals presented at the 24 July 2017 Hendon Area Committee meeting, as follows:
 - Measure 1** – Improve signage
 - Measure 2** – Remove excess vegetation
 - Measure 3** - Reduce dual carriageway section to one lane in each direction
 - Measure 4** - Traffic islands/ refuges
 - Measure 5** - Changes to junction of Colindeep Lane with Colin Crescent
 - Measure 6a** - Vertical speed deterrents (cushions)
 - Measure 7** - High friction coloured surface
 - Measure 8b** – Refresh and improve road markings

And on proposals approved for implementation by said committee at the 24

July 2017 meeting, as follows:

Measure 1 – Improve signage

Measure 2 – Remove excess vegetation

Measure 3 - Reduce dual carriageway section to one lane in each direction

Measure 4 - Traffic islands/ refuges

Measure 5 - Changes to junction of Colindeep Lane with Colin Crescent

Measure 7 - High friction coloured surface

Measure 8b – Refresh and improve road markings

2. That the Hendon Area Committee adopts vertical speed deterrents (Measure 6a from the 24 July 2017 Hendon Area Committee Meeting) in addition to the measures referred to in Recommendation 1.
3. That if the Hendon Area Committee does not adopt Recommendation 2 (vertical speed deterrents), that Measure 4 (traffic islands/refuges) as adopted at the 24 July 2017 meeting is removed from the adopted improvements on public safety grounds.
4. That the Hendon Area Committee, gives instruction to the Strategic Director for Environment to carry out a statutory consultation on the approved measures.
5. That subject to no objections being received to the statutory consultation on proposals approved, the Hendon Area Committee instruct Strategic Director for Environment to introduce the approved measures.
6. If any objections are received as a result of the statutory consultations, the Hendon Area Committee directs that the Strategic Director for Environment consider and determine whether the approved measures should be implemented or not, and if so, with or without modification.
7. That the Hendon Area Committee note that the scheme is funded by the Local Implementation Plan (LIP) 17/18 funding to design and carry out statutory consultation and, subject to the outcome of that consultation, introduce the approved Scheme.

1. WHY THIS REPORT IS NEEDED

- 1.1. Officers carried out preliminary investigations including a site meeting with Ward Councillors and the School, with input from Officers in the Safe and Sustainable Travel Team, pedestrian and traffic surveys and Personal Injury Accident data analysis and are summarised below. The findings of these surveys were presented to Committee in a report on 2nd May 2017 and are summarised below:
 - Traffic speeds exceed the road's speed limit;
 - Traffic speeds exceed the maximum speed deemed safe for an uncontrolled pedestrian crossing;
 - There are high volumes of traffic on Colindeep Lane, with low contributions from Colin Crescent;

- Pedestrian volumes in the area are low. In particular, demand for a crossing on this section of Colindeep Lane appears to be extremely low, with the busiest section of Colindeep Lane studied having a peak of under 5 pedestrians crossing per hour. This may be caused by the very apparent danger of crossing, and should a safe facility exist, the demand may have been higher;
- Demand for a pedestrian crossing facility is slightly higher on Colin Crescent, with a peak of 16 pedestrians crossing per hour;
- A total of 13 accidents resulting in personal injury were recorded in the 5 year period ending August 2016. Eleven of these were slight, one severe and one fatal;
- There appears to be little conflict between vehicles and pedestrians, and the majority of accidents appear to be a result of vehicles travelling over the speed limit and not being able to react to hazards (e.g. the sharp bend of the road or vehicles exiting Colin Crescent onto Colindeep Lane);
- The most appropriate way to improve pedestrian safety on this road can only be achieved following the introduction of traffic calming measures that will slow traffic on Colindeep Lane sufficiently to allow pedestrians to travel safely around this area.

1.2. In view of the above, Hendon Area Committee (02/05/2017) RESOLVED
'That the Hendon Area Committee note the findings presented, obtained as a result of a preliminary feasibility study on pedestrian improvements on Colindeep Lane in the vicinity of North London Grammar School. That the Hendon Area Committee, having noted the above, gives instruction to The Commissioning Director for Environment to proceed to develop a traffic calming proposal within the premises set out in this report.'

1.3. Officers carried out further investigations and produced five proposals that would improve pedestrian safety and reduce vehicle speeds on Colindeep Lane. A report explaining these proposals was presented to the Hendon Area Committee on 24 July 2017. The preferred proposal included:

- Improve signage;
- Remove excess vegetation encroaching on the footway;
- Reduce dual carriageway section to one lane in each direction;
- Traffic island/ pedestrian refuge;
- Changes to junction;
- Speed cushions (located either side of the island);
- High friction surface on the downhill approach to the bend;
- Refreshing of road markings with improvements.

1.4. In the report it was stated that some of these proposals, including the proposal preferred by officers as presented above, included vertical deflection measures. It was confirmed in the report that the introduction of a traffic island refuge is only recommended in conjunction with other physical measures of slowing traffic, as some pedestrians may be inclined to use this island to cross the road.

- 1.5. The Committee should consider that vertical traffic calming measures are generally not favoured in the Borough but are appropriate in certain situations. This was confirmed in a report on Traffic Calming to the Environment Committee on 14th July 2016. The Environment Committee, having considered the report on the Traffic Calming resolved: *‘That the Environment Committee noted the current approach to Traffic Calming Measures as set out in this report. That the Environment Committee approved the following Policy Wording:*

‘Generally this Council opposes the use of vertical traffic 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, and that Members be consulted with from the earliest opportunity, if required’.

- 1.6. The report to the 24 July 2017 Committee set out the officers’ opinion that on this occasion is an exceptional circumstance and vertical speed deflection should be considered due to the speed of traffic on Colindeep Lane. Ward Members were been consulted on the proposals including the vertical measures in the preferred option (as summarised in point 1.3 above and no responses were received.

- 1.7. The Preferred Officer Proposal 5, reported to Committee on 24 July 2017 included the following:

Measure 1 – Improve signage

Measure 2 – Remove excess vegetation

Measure 3 - Reduce dual carriageway section to one lane in each direction

Measure 4 - Traffic islands/ refuges

Measure 5 - Changes to junction of Colindeep Lane with Colin Crescent

Measure 6a - Vertical speed deterrents (cushions)

Measure 7 - High friction coloured surface

Measure 8b – Refresh and improve road markings”

- 1.8 Following consideration of the item, Councillor Braun objected to measure 6a – vertical speed deterrents (cushions) and moved a motion to amend recommendation 2 and remove measure 6a, which was duly seconded. The committee voted on the amendment and votes were recorded as follows:

For 4

Against 2

Abstain 0

The amendment was therefore carried and Measure 6a was removed by Members from the Committee decision.

- 1.8. In view of the above, Hendon Area Committee (24/07/2017) RESOLVED
“That the Committee note the findings of the preliminary feasibility study on pedestrian improvements on Colindeep Lane in the vicinity of North London Grammar School”

*“That the Committee, noting the Council’s Policy on Traffic Calming, agreed the Officer preferred Proposal 5 which included the following measures below:
Measure 1 – Improve signage*

Measure 2 – Remove excess vegetation
Measure 3 - Reduce dual carriageway section to one lane in each direction
Measure 4 - Traffic islands/ refuges
Measure 5 - Changes to junction of Colindeep Lane with Colin Crescent
Measure 7 - High friction coloured surface
Measure 8b – Refresh and improve road markings”

“That the Committee, having noted the above, gives instruction to The Strategic Director for Environment to proceed to develop a detailed design of the approved measures in recommendation 2 above.”

“That the Committee instructs the Strategic Director for Environment to carry out a statutory consultation on the approved measures.”

“That subject to no objections being received to the statutory consultation, referred to in recommendation 4, the committee instructs the Strategic Director for Environment to introduce the approved measures.”

“That the Committee agrees that if any objections are received as a result of the statutory consultations, referred to in recommendation 4, the Strategic Director for Environment will consider and determine whether the approved measures should be implemented or not, and if so, with or without modification.”

“That the Committee note that the scheme is funded by the Local Implementation Plan (LIP) 17/18 funding to design and carry out statutory consultation and, subject to the outcome of that consultation, introduce the approved Scheme.”

- 1.9. As stated in the report, Officers remain concerned that Measure 4 (traffic island on the downhill approach to the bend) would not be safe if the additional vertical measures (Measure 6a) were not included in the scheme. Prior to any scheme of this nature being implemented on a trunk road a Road Safety Audit Stage 1 (RSA S1) is required. An independent party was commissioned to carry out a RSA S1 on both Officers’ preferred option (including vertical deflection) and on Committee’s approved option (not including vertical deflection).
- 1.10. The RSA S1 (currently at Draft stage) has found that one speed cushion in each direction may not be sufficient to sufficiently reduce traffic speeds, and recommends installing several cushions in each direction instead. It has also found that implementing a traffic island without speed reduction features is dangerous to pedestrians as well as drivers.

In view of the above, officers recommend vertical speed deterring measures are included in the scheme, and that approval is given to proceed to implementation of the proposal as summarised in point 1.1 (above). If the vertical measures are not included that the officer recommendation is that the

scheme for Measure 4 (Traffic islands/ refuges) does not go ahead as proposed by Committee.

- 1.11. Should Committee decide to implement with no vertical deflection, Officers strongly suggest not including a pedestrian refuge or island at all. This will have an impact on the effectiveness of the other elements of the scheme (Measures 1,2,3, 5, 7 and 8b), but will not increase the risk of vehicle-pedestrian collisions above existing level.

2. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1. The Option preferred by Committee (24/07/2017) is not considered safe by Officers which has been confirmed by an independent Road Safety Audit and therefore officers recommend not proceeding to implementation. Instead, officers recommend the use of vertical speed deterring measures.

3. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND NOT RECOMMENDED

- 3.1. The Option preferred by Committee (24/07/2017), which omits vertical speed deterrents, is not recommended for the reasons stated above.
- 3.2. "No access to Colindeep Lane from Colin Crescent" has also been considered. Colin Crescent and Colin Gardens would be accessible from Colindeep Lane and Crossway but vehicles would only be able to exit via Crossway. This would reduce the risk of collisions at the junction of Colin Crescent with Colindeep Lane, but would not have any effects on the speeding issues on Colindeep Lane. It is therefore not recommended.
- 3.3. Further alternative options were covered in previous reports, presented to the 2 May and 24 July Hendon Area Committees.

4. POST DECISION IMPLEMENTATION

- 4.1. If the report's recommendations are approved the scheme has funding approval from the Local Implementation Plan (LIP) 2017/18 funding and the chosen option would be progressed to consultation, detailed design and implementation stages.
- 4.2. Should this proposal proceed to implementation, a speed survey will be commissioned 6 months to a year after implementation in order to assess effectiveness of measures.

5. IMPLICATIONS OF DECISION

5.1 Corporate Priorities and Performance

- 5.1.1 This scheme will particularly help to address the Corporate Plan 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” by helping residents to feel confident moving around their local area on foot, and in a vehicle and contribute to reduced congestion.

5.1.2 This proposal also helps address road traffic casualties which will also have an impact on Health and Wellbeing.

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

5.2.1 At feasibility stage, detailed cost estimates cannot be provided. Notwithstanding this, indicative costs have been provided bases on schemes of a similar nature.

5.2.2 The cost will be funded from the 2017/18 Transport for London (TfL) Local Implementation Plan (LIP) programme, which has an allocation of £400k for Accident Reduction Schemes. Costs are expected to be up to £68,500 depending on the agreed measure.

5.2.3 The estimated implementation costs of this recommendation are (based on prices contained in Year 4, Volume 4 Adjusted Rates – London Highways Alliance Contract (LoHAC) Northwest.

5.2.4 Future maintenance of electrical apparatus shall pass to Barnet Lighting Services, the PFI Contractor, who will charge a commuted sum for the maintenance.

5.2.5 The work will be carried out under the existing PFI (electrical) and LoHAC (non-electrical) term maintenance contractual arrangements.

5.3 **Social Value**

5.3.1 None in the context of this report.

5.4 **Legal and Constitutional References**

5.4.1 Article 7 of the Council’s Constitution is headed “Committees, Forums, Working Groups and Partnerships”. Article 7.5 states that Area Committees in relation to the area covered have “responsibility for all constituency specific matters relating to the street scene including parking, road safety, transport, allotments, parks and trees”.

5.4.2 Section 16 of the Traffic Management Act 2004 places obligations on authorities to ensure the expeditious movement of traffic on their road network. Authorities are required under section 17 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 None in the context of this report. Risk management may be required for work resulting from this report.

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

5.7 Consultation and Engagement

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

5.8 Insight

5.8.1 The options developed for the scheme were informed through analysis of injury accident data, third party surveys and site observations.

6. BACKGROUND PAPERS

6.1 Planning permission and Section 106 Agreement for North London Grammar School, Planning Reference No. H/02535/12.

6.2 Agenda and minutes - Hendon Area Committee, Wednesday 6th July 2016
<http://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=717&MId=8660&Ver=4>

6.3. Agenda and minutes - Hendon Area Committee Wednesday 26th October, 2016
<http://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=717&MID=8657>

6.4 Agenda and draft minutes - Hendon Area Committee, 2 May 2017;
<http://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=717&MId=9129&Ver=4>

6.5 Agenda and minutes – Environment Committee 14 July 2016
<http://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=717&MId=9129&Ver=4>

6.6 Agenda and draft minutes - Hendon Area Committee, 24 July 2017; At draft stage,
<http://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=717&MId=9323&Ver=4>