

	<h2>Chipping Barnet Area Committee</h2> <h3>19 February 2018</h3>
<p style="text-align: right;">Title</p>	<p>The Ridgeway 20mph scheme</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Report of</p>	<p>Strategic Director for Environment</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Wards</p>	<p>Coppetts</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 A – Drawing No. BC/001106-03</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Officer Contact Details</p>	<p>Lisa Wright – Traffic & Development Manager lisa.wright@barnet.gov.uk</p>

<h2>Summary</h2>
<p>This report details the outcome of the statutory consultation undertaken on a proposal to introduce an extension to the Holly Park 20mph speed limit into The Ridgeway, Park Way and Gresham Avenue.</p>

<h2>Recommendations</h2>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That, having considered the objections received to the statutory consultation on the proposals outlined in this report, Officers should proceed with implementation of The Ridgeway 20mph scheme as per the original proposal in Drawing Number BC/001106-03.

1. WHY THIS REPORT IS NEEDED

- 1.1 During the public consultation for the Holly Park School 20mph scheme which was carried out from 8 December 2016 to 6 January 2017, requests, including a petition, were received, to extend the zone to include The Ridgeway and adjacent roads.
- 1.2 The petition was submitted to the Chipping Barnet Residents Forum in January 2017, and the matter was subsequently referred to the Chipping Barnet Area Committee for consideration.
- 1.3 At the Chipping Barnet Area Committee in March 2017 Councillor Coakley-Webb put forward a request on behalf of local residents to extend the proposed 20mph zone to include The Ridgeway. As extending the zone would require additional design and consultation work, it was agreed that a separate consultation should be carried out with residents in the proposed extension area, to avoid potential delays to the implementation of the Holly Park School 20mph scheme.
- 1.4 Ward Councillors were consulted on the proposal to extend the zone and did not raise any objections. Councillor Coakley-Webb questioned the inclusion of Park Way and Gresham Avenue following a resident enquiry. Park Way and Gresham Avenue were included within the 20mph scheme following comments received during the consultation for the Holly Park School 20mph scheme and the extent of the zone could be revised should there be significant opposition from residents of a particular road to its inclusion within the proposed area.
- 1.5 A statutory consultation on the proposal was carried out for three weeks in October 2017, and a letter and plan outlining the proposals was distributed to residents in the proposed extension area. The proposals were also advertised in notices published in the local press newspapers and the London Gazette. In addition, similar notices were erected on-street in the vicinity of the affected roads inviting comments or objections.
- 1.6 Thirteen responses were received from local residents including a response from the Friern Barnet and Whetstone Residents Association. Of the responses received, nine respondents supported the scheme (six of these had additional comments or concerns) and there were four objections to the scheme.
- 1.7 Those residents in favour of the proposals commented that they welcomed the proposed 20mph speed limit as the road is used as a rat-run and they had concerns about traffic speeds throughout the day. A resident of Park Way commented that the road is a major route for children attending St John's CE School and Friern Barnet School and is also a link between Friary Park and Bethune Park and that a reduction in the speed limit would be welcome.
- 1.8 The Friern Barnet and Whetstone Residents Association strongly supported the 20mph zone being extended to The Ridgeway and Park Way (subject to resident support) but did not see the need to include Gresham Avenue as

vehicle speeds were perceived to be low in this road. The Association also requested an extension to the yellow lines at the eastern end of The Ridgeway due to concerns about school time congestion and difficulties with vehicles passing one another. Concerns were also raised with regard to the visibility and safety of the pedestrian crossing on Friern Barnet Lane between the junctions with The Ridgeway and Park Way.

- 1.9 Comments were received from several respondents who were generally in support of the scheme but who cited additional concerns or requests, and these included the following:
- Concerns about obstructive parking and related congestion on Bethune Avenue and The Crescent within the vicinity of St Johns School and a request for additional waiting restrictions.
 - A request for a one-way system in The Ridgeway and Park Way.
 - Concerns about speeding on Friern Barnet Lane and a request for traffic calming measures near to the junction with The Ridgeway.
 - Comments that the speeds are already reduced to around 20mph at school peak times due to the volume of cars.
 - A request for the installation of CCTV at the entrance of the car park on Park Way due to concerns about anti-social behaviour.
 - Concerns about driver behaviour outside the schools in the area and a suggestion for a 'no parking' zone to reduce congestion at peak times.
 - A request to install vehicle activated signs that display individual vehicles' speeds to ensure driver awareness.
 - Concerns about enforcement of the speed limit.
 - A request for a yellow box at the junction on Friern Barnet Lane at the junctions with The Ridgeway and Park Way to ease access during peak times.
 - Concerns about the proliferation of signs and a request to attach to lamp columns where possible and remove any unnecessary signs.
- 1.10 Two of those who objected to the proposals questioned the reasons for introducing the 20mph speed limit, and commented that although they can understand the need for speed restrictions within the vicinity of schools, they did not consider the proposed roads to be in close proximity. They were also concerned that drivers would continue to ignore the speed limit and that it would be unenforceable.
- 1.11 One of these objectors also felt that there was a greater issue with excessive speeding on Friern Barnet Lane, and that this poses a danger to local park users and those travelling to and from school as well as other pedestrian and road users. They were also concerned about speeding on Manor Drive particularly of southbound traffic approaching the junction with Gresham Avenue.
- 1.12 Two objectors were of the opinion that the money would be better spent on road safety education in schools or on road maintenance which would benefit drivers, cyclists and pedestrians.
- 1.13 In respect of the requests for additional traffic management or parking measures, these are outside of the scope of this scheme however they have

been identified as potential future schemes to be assessed and prioritised along with other traffic management or parking scheme proposals. The comments about driver behaviour and obstructive parking will be referred to the School Travel Team so that they can work with the schools in the area on initiatives to promote sustainable travel methods and the importance of driving and parking carefully and considerately. Requests for additional enforcement outside schools will be referred to the Enforcement Team for consideration.

2. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 The proposal has been developed in response to concerns raised during the consultation for the Holly Park School 20mph scheme when residents highlighted concerns about speeding in adjacent roads. As traffic and road safety issues have been identified, it was considered that action should be taken.
- 2.2 Park Way and Gresham Avenue have been included as it is considered that these roads provide alternative access routes and there could be a risk of speeding.
- 2.3 The objections to the scheme related to the opinion that the proposed measures were not necessary, to concerns about enforcement and suggestions that the funding should be used elsewhere.

3. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND NOT RECOMMENDED

- 3.1 Alternative options include increasing or reducing the extent of the 20mph area or to introduce other measures to support the 20mph restrictions, however some of these options would require further consultation if they were to proceed.
- 3.2 Another alternative would be to not introduce the speed restriction; however this would not address the residents' concerns about speeding in these roads.

4. POST DECISION IMPLEMENTATION

- 4.1 Once the decision has been approved, the detailed design of the proposal will be finalised and the scheme progressed to implementation by the end of March 2018.

5. IMPLICATIONS OF DECISION

5.1 Corporate Priorities and Performance

- 5.1.1 The proposals here 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 The proposals also help create an environment that encourages an active lifestyle by promoting walking and other sustainable modes of travel so helping to deliver active travel opportunities as identified in the Health and Wellbeing Strategy for children and the population generally.

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

5.2.1 Area Committee funding of £5,000 was agreed to carry out the design and consultation for this proposal. The estimated cost of construction of the scheme is £3,000 and provision can be made within the 2017/18 Local Implementation Plan (LIP) funded work programme to deliver this scheme.

5.2.2 The work will be carried out under the existing PFI and LoHAC 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 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 as the Highway Authority has the necessary legal powers to introduce or amend Traffic Management Orders under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.

5.4.3 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.

5.4.4 Article 7 of the Council's Constitution states that the Council appoints the Area Committees responsibility for all constituency specific matters relating to the street scene including parking, road safety, transport, allotments, parks and trees.

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.

5.6.1 Equalities and Diversity

5.6.1 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

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.

5.6.2 Changes associated with this proposal are not expected to disproportionately disadvantage or benefit members of the community.

5.7 Corporate Parenting

5.7.1 Not applicable in the context of this report.

5.8 Consultation and Engagement

5.8.1 A statutory consultation has been undertaken as set out in section 1.4 and this report deals with the objections and comments received.

5.9 Insight

5.9.1 None in relation to this report

6. BACKGROUND PAPERS

6.1 Chipping Barnet Residents Forum January 2017.
<http://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/documents/s37534/Issues%20List%20-%20with%20Replies.pdf>

6.2 Chipping Barnet Area Committee meeting March 2017
<http://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=711&MId=9130&Ver=4>

