



Finchley and Golders Green

Area Committee

17 October 2019

Title	Addison Way, NW11 – Width Restriction Feasibility Study
Report of	Executive Director, Environment
Wards	Garden Suburb
Status	Public
Urgent	No
Key	No
Enclosures	None
Officer Contact Details	Jamie Blake – Executive Director, Environment Email – Highways.Correspondence@barnet.gov.uk

Summary

This report details the outcome of an investigation regarding improvements to the width restriction at Addison Way to prevent on-going damage.

Officers Recommendations

1. That the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee notes the review of the width restriction on Addison Way, NW11 outlined in this report.
2. That the Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee authorises the allocation the funding (CIL from this year's CIL Area Committee budget) of £13,200 to implement Option B.

1. WHY THIS REPORT IS NEEDED

- 1.1 During the Finchley and Golders Green Area Resident Forum on 15 June 2018, Gary Shaw on behalf of Hampstead Garden Suburb Resident Association raised the issue of volume and speed of traffic on Addison Way.
- 1.2 Residents in the vicinity of Addison Way NW11 were concerned about the volume and speed of traffic using that road as a link between the A1 at Falloden Way and Finchley Road. Residents would like the damaged width restrictors at eastern end of Addison Way to be replaced with ones of more robust design and to consider also whether priority should be given to eastbound traffic at the width restrictor or at the other points along the road to discourage the use of Addison Way as a relief route.
- 1.3 Councillors and officers from Re met Mr Shaw and members of the residents' association earlier in the year and discussed the type of proposals suggested by residents.
- 1.4 Following discussion, the Committee determined to allocate £3,000 of CIL funding towards investigating improvements which could include the of changes to curbs. Officers were requested to contact Ward Councillors once they had made necessary enquiries. The Committee instructed that if further funding was needed to implement any proposed options, that Officers bring the matter back to a future meeting for the Committee to consider.
- 1.5 This report investigates options to address the issue regarding the width restriction raised by residents.

2. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 Following the Committee instruction, officers have visited the sites and investigate the options to improve the width restriction.
- 2.2 Addison Way is a 20mph speed limit road located in Garden Suburb Ward. There is a width restriction located between property number 68 and 70. The existing width restriction has been measured. The distance between the green posts is 8' or 2.43m and the distance between the kerbs is 6' 6" or 1.98m. Some larger vehicles drove onto the kerbs to get through the width restriction.
- 2.3 Options were considered to analyse the advantages and disadvantages of each option.
- 2.4 Three options have been considered to address the issue raised by residents, which are summarised in Table 1.

Table 1 – Design Options

Option	Summary
Option A - Trief Kerb island	Change existing kerbs to Trief Kerbs including replacing the existing width restriction with a new island and built outs. Trief kerb is a type of high containment kerb system designed to contain and redirect vehicles safety back onto

	carriageway where if vehicles were to stray unchecked, may cause injury to pedestrians, damage to local structures or damage to the vehicles and drivers themselves. In this instance, Trief Kerb is intended to prevent larger vehicles using Addison Way as short cut due to its high containment and prevent vehicles overrun compare to low kerb height.
Option B - Provide more solid post type	Repair existing kerbs, move existing vertical post distance closer to 6' 6" or change to more solid vertical post type and move post distances closer to 6' 6".
Option C - Retain same width restriction features	Repair like for like and retain the same width restriction features.

2.6 The advantages and disadvantages are summarised in Table 2.

Table 2 – Summary of Advantages and Disadvantages

Option	Advantages/Disadvantages
Option A Trief Kerb island	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Advantages</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Trief Kerb may prevent larger vehicles such as vans and discourage some drivers using Addison Way as short cut and slow down. - Reduce on-going damaged to the Width Restriction. <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Disadvantages</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Might be tight for some model of Sport Utility Vehicles (SUV). - Concerned some residents with larger vehicles for example with 4 wheels drive might damage or scratch the vehicle sides. - Alteration would require an additional funding from the Area Committee depending on kerb product and vertical bar material.
Option B Provide more solid post type and move posts closer close to edge of kerbs	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Advantages</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The alternation may discourage and will prevent larger vehicles such as vans using Addison Way as short cut and slow down. - Reduce on-going damage to the width restriction.

	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Disadvantages</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Might be tight for some model of Sport Utility Vehicles (SUV). - Concerned some residents with larger vehicles for example with some model of 4 wheels drive might damage or scratch the vehicle sides. - Alteration would require a higher budget.
<p style="text-align: center;">Option C Retain same width restriction features</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Advantages</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Existing just repair like for like if damaged. - Less alternation and construction work compared to other options. <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Disadvantages</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It will not deter improve the current situation. - Regular maintenance is a on-going cost to the Council

2.7 As part of the consideration Ward Councillors have been consulted and they favour Options A or B. They are not in favour of the Option C which doesn't alter the existing situation and is highly likely to likely to result in on-going maintenance costs.

2.8 All options have been analysed by Officers who recommend either Option A or B with Option B be the Officers preferred option for approval by the Area Committee.

3 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND NOT RECOMMENDED

3.1 Alternative option is no to proceed with any of the proposed improvements as per option C. However, this will not address the original concern raised by residents and Resident Association regarding the width restriction issues raised regarding Addison Way.

4 POST DECISION IMPLEMENTATION

- 4.1 Once the recommendation is approved and subject to funding, detailed design will be undertaken. Ward members, organisations and residents living near the site will be informed. Implementation would follow once any issues have been considered and resolved where possible subject to funding being made available.

5 IMPLICATIONS OF DECISION

5.1 Corporate Priorities and Performance

- 5.1.1 The scheme will help to address the Corporate Plan delivery objectives of “a clean and attractive environment, with well-maintained roads and pavements, flowing traffic”. “Barnet’s children and young people will receive a great start in life”, “Barnet will be amongst the safest place 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 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 An annual allocation of £150k is made to each Area Committee. The Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee balance for 2019/20 is £0.054m. This takes account the amount allocated for the current year together with under and overspends relating to previous financial years. The balance is reduced for 2019/20 due to lack of CIL awards in 2019/20 in the ward.
- 5.2.2 London Highways Alliance (LOHAC) schedule of rates have been used to carry out a preliminary high level cost estimate as shown in Table 3 and Table 4 below, which will need to be refined by LOHAC upon completion of the feasibility design.

Table 3 – Cost Estimate Option A

Activity	Estimated Cost
Detailed Design (includes survey, safety audit etc)	£4,000
Built Cost	£9,500
Sub Total	£13,500
Implementation & post implementation fee @ 10%	£1,350
GRAND TOTAL	£14,850

Table 4 – Cost Estimate Option B

Activity	Estimated Cost
Detailed Design (includes survey, safety audit etc)	£4,000
Built Cost	£8,000
Sub Total	£12,000
Implementation & post implementation fee @ 10%	£1,200
GRAND TOTAL	£13,200

5.3 Social Value

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

5.4 Legal and Constitutional References

5.4.1 The terms of reference of the Area Committees under Article 7 of the Council's Constitution includes 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 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 Risk management may be required for work resulting from this report. Management would be required throughout the detailed design, implementation and construction work.

5.6 Equalities and Diversity

5.6.1 Section 149 of 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 discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Equality Act 2010.
- Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.
- Foster good relations between people from different groups.
- The broader 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 The safety elements incorporated benefit all road users equally as they would improve safety and traffic flow at those locations.

5.6.3 The proposal is not expected to disproportionately disadvantage or benefit individual 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 Garden Suburb Ward Councillors, Hampstead Garden Suburb Resident Association and residents living near the site will be notified for the implementation of the improvement works further to Area Committee's decision. A statutory consultation will not be required for improvement of the existing width restriction.

5.9 Insight

5.9.1 The options developed for the scheme were informed through concern raised by Hampstead Garden Suburb Resident Association and on site observations of the issues.

6 BACKGROUND PAPERS

6.1 Finchley and Golders Green Area Committee 4 Feb 2019.

<https://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CIId=712&MIId=9527>

