

Committee: Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel

Date: 26th November 2008

Subject: Local Safety Scheme - George V Avenue /

Pinner Road / Headstone Lane – signalised

iunction

Responsible Officer: John Edwards – Divisional Director

Environmental Services

Portfolio Holder: Councillor Susan Hall - Environment and

Community Safety

Exempt: No

Enclosures: Appendix A - Details of consultation letter

Appendix B - Pinner Road zebra crossing

proposals

SECTION 1 – SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This report details progress to date regarding proposed safety measures at the George V Avenue / Pinner Road / Headstone Lane junction and seeks the Panel's recommendation to the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety that further investigations be conducted.

Recommendations:

The Panel is requested to recommend to the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety that she authorise Council officers to:

- 1. ask Transport for London (TfL) to reinstate the George V / Pinner Road / Headstone Lane scheme in the Local Safety Schemes programme; and
- ask the Director of Traffic Operations (DTO) of TfL to review our detailed assessment and traffic modelling data of the junction in order to progress the proposals to address the personal injury accident problems at the junction.; and
- 3. report the outcome of the review to a future TARSAP meeting.

SECTION 2 - REPORT

- 2.1 Traffic flows in London are changing year on year as new developments and schemes are introduced on and around the network. In particular the nature of traffic flow is moving away from the traditional morning and evening peaks to more varied demand peaks across the day and, indeed, at weekends. To that end TfL undertakes regular traffic signal timings reviews of junctions on the highway network.
- 2.2 Following the TARSAP meeting in September 2008 it was confirmed that a signal timing review was planned for the George V Avenue / Pinner Road / Headstone Lane junction this financial year. The signal timing review focuses on adjustments to the signal timings to improve capacity at the junction in order to reduce traffic delays on the network. However, it is not designed to address the significant right turn accident problem identified in earlier studies.
- 2.3 DTO has confirmed recently that the revised signal timings are due to be implemented before the end of this financial year. As part of the review, a new traffic signal controller was recently installed at the junction to replace the old damaged one. The traffic signal controller, which contains the signal timing programmes, is a key component in the operation of the traffic signals and is linked to a permanent power supply. The controller has also been relocated to afford it greater protection because it has been hit several times in the past.
- 2.4 It should also be noted that if additional signal timing changes are identified as part of the proposals currently being developed to address the right turning accidents for example, the scheme costs are likely to be reduced because the new upgraded traffic signal controller is in place.
- 2.5 We continually monitor accidents in the borough to identify problem sites and assign priority. As a result, the George V Avenue / Pinner Road / Headstone Lane junction was initially included in the 2004/05 Local Safety Scheme (LSS) programme because of its poor accident record. Statistically the junction has highest rate of personal injury accidents of any junction in the borough and therefore ranks highest in terms of priority.
- 2.6 In 2005 a traffic consultant was commissioned to investigate the personal injury accident record at the junction and to look at the feasibility of introducing a dedicated pedestrian phase, especially given the close proximity of Nower Hill School. The consultant developed proposals which involved significant changes to the junction to accommodate larger pedestrian islands, a dedicated pedestrian phase and signal timing changes to allow for the segregation of right turning traffic. The scheme also incorporated advances stop lines for cyclists and a bus priority system to improve bus flow though the junction.
- 2.7 Following amendments to the scheme, agreement was reached in principle with DTO on a detailed design in June 2006; however the scheme needed to be evaluated in terms of its benefits to pedestrians and possible disbenefits to vehicular traffic. Modelling of the junction predicted that traffic queues at peak times would increase on all arms of the junction.

- 2.8 In an effort to reduce the predicted increase in queuing EnterpriseMouchel (EM) were commissioned in 2007 to review the junction to investigate whether the previous proposals could be modified. EM prepared two options; one which dealt primarily with the right turn accident problem; and the other which included a dedicated pedestrian phase with physical alterations to the junction layout similar to that included in the previous consultants report.
- 2.9 In March 2007 EM estimated the cost of the scheme, which included physical alterations to the layout of the junction, to be in the order of £203,500. This did not take into account any costs associated with the diversion of public utilities apparatus. At that time no firm bid for funding was put forward to TfL for the implementation of the proposals in the subsequent financial year. The scheme was therefore not included in the LSS programme.
- 2.10 Inevitably if this scheme (see para 2.6) were to be progressed to detailed design it would cost significantly more. A draft estimate suggests that the scheme would cost in the region of £250,000, not including the cost of any public utilities diversions. This figure far exceeds the current 2008/09 LSS budget.
- 2.11 TfL funding is scheme specific and based on an agreed programme submitted by the boroughs. This can limit the council's ability and freedom to alter the programme and to respond to changing circumstances and events. Some schemes currently under investigation, or ones that arise during the year, may be added to the programme at the expense of other schemes in the list if priority treatment is considered appropriate subject to TfL agreement. Priority is determined by a consideration of a number of factors: the estimated number of accidents (principally, killed and serious injury accidents) that can be saved; the cost of remedial measures and particularly the estimated first year rate of return; and co-ordination with other works in the vicinity.
- 2.12 Personal injury accidents continue to occur at this junction. In the 5 years to December 2007 there have been 24 reported personal injury accidents at the junction, resulting in 35 casualties. Of these, 22 accidents resulted in 32 people being slightly injured and 2 accidents resulted in 3 people being seriously injured. Only 1 accident involved a pedestrian, who was slightly injured. These figures do not include the recent case in which a young pedestrian was slightly injured. The others were vehicle occupants, mainly resulting from accidents involving right turning manoeuvres at the junction; there is also anecdotal evidence of a large number of damage only collisions.
- 2.13 It is clear from the evidence that there is a significant accident problem at this junction which needs to be addressed. It is extremely unlikely that TfL would fund significant alterations to the junction from the LSS budget to accommodate a dedicated pedestrian phase because there is no statistical evidence to justify it; i. e there has been only 1 personal injury accident involving a pedestrian at the junction in the last five years. However, it is more likely that TfL will fund a scheme that will address the significant right turn accident problem (10 accidents in the last three years).
- 2.14 On the basis of the benefits to be derived from a scheme that will address the right turn accident problem by incorporating changes to the signal timing and/or

- early cut offs to the signal phasing, it is recommended that this option be progressed further.
- 2.15 A scheme to reduce the right turn accident problem can be achieved without extensive amendments to the layout of the junction and at lower costs, which are estimated to be in the region of £50,000. This takes into account the reduced costs because of the new traffic signal controller (See para 2.4). Modifications to the signal timings and phases will address the right turning accidents problem and improve safety at the junction. There will also be a "window of opportunity" for pedestrians to cross the junction, albeit it without a dedicated pedestrian phase within the revised timings. It is anticipated that if this scheme is taken forward traffic queues will increase on all arms of the junction. Until detailed traffic modelling has been undertaken, however, the extent of the queue lengths and delays has not been quantified.
- 2.16 It is therefore recommended that a LSS to address the personal injury accident problems at the junction be taken forward and that this junction be included in the LSS programme at the earliest opportunity. There is no cost in reinstating the scheme on the TfL LSS programme however the cost of the analysis of the traffic modelling data undertaken by DTO will need to be met from this years LSS budget. Details of the results and the outcome of the modelling assessment will be reported to a future TARSAP meeting for consideration.
- 2.17 For information, you will recall it was reported at the last TARSAP meeting in September that an investigation to consider whether it is feasible to convert the existing pedestrian island outside the Nower Hill school entrance in Pinner Road to a zebra crossing was underway. It is felt that this would help to encourage more pupils to cross the road at this location rather than at the George V Avenue junction and that a formal crossing would improve pedestrian facilities immediately outside the school.
- 2.18 The proposal was discussed recently at a site meeting with a representative of the school and a scheme has now been designed. A consultation leaflet was distributed to the school and the immediately affected properties to seek their views regarding the proposal. **Appendix A** gives details of the consultation letter and **Appendix B** shows details of the scheme.
- 2.19 As the George V Avenue / Pinner Road / Headstone Lane junction is on the Strategic Road Network for London, whatever scheme is progressed at this location will have to be submitted for independent appraisal and approval to the TfL's Network Assurance Team (NAT) before it can be implemented.
- 2.20 A meeting with local stakeholders was held on 29th October to discuss progress to date and the options available to take a scheme forward that will reduce the number of personal injury accidents at the junction.

2.2 Financial Implications

2.2.1 The cost for DTO to assess the latest modelling and traffic data is £2,000 and can be met from this years Local Safety Scheme budget. The cost of the proposed zebra crossing in Pinner Road is in the region of £22,000 and can be met from the TfL Local Accessibility budget.

2.3 Community Safety

2.3.1 The scheme will have a neutral impact on Crime & Disorder.

2.4 Legal Comments

2.4.1 The recommendations in this report can be implemented pursuant to Section 39 of the Road Traffic Act 1988. Traffic Management Orders, if required, will be advertised in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 as amended.

2.5 Performance issues

- 2.5.1 Section 39 of the Road Traffic Act 1988 requires local authorities to carry out studies into collisions and in the light of the studies take such measures as appropriate to prevent collisions. As part of the Comprehensive Spending Review announcement the Government recently published the single set of 198 National Indicators (NI) that will underpin the new performance framework. NI 47 and 48 are included in the National Indicators for local authorities and relate to killed and seriously injury road casualties and Children killed or seriously injured in road traffic accidents respectively.
- 2.5.2 Any reduction in personal injury accidents contributes to the national casualty reduction target of reducing by 2010 the number of people killed or seriously injured in road traffic accidents by 40%, compared with the average for 1994-1998. These indicators are an updated version of the former Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPA) item E12 and E13 and best value performance indicator 99a and 99b. At the start of 2009, it will change to Comprehensive Area Assessment (CAA).
- 2.5.3 In view of this, the new road casualty reduction targets in London set by the Mayor of London are now being used in arriving at our targets for the remainder of the decade. The London targets are more challenging and even those have also been achieved already. Additional investment in road safety education and road safety measures would ensure the significant casualty reductions achieved are maintained and further road safety benefits can be accrued.
- 2.5.4 It should be pointed out that unless we use effective measures to reduce accidents it would adversely impact our ability to maintain and improve our excellent road safety record and maintain our exceptional casualty reduction targets (including our National Indicators NI 47 and 48).

2.6 Risk Management Implications

- 2.6.1 This project is not included on the Directorate risk register.
- 2.6.2 When approved for implementation, however, it will have its own generic risk register as part of the project management process.

2.7 Equalities Impact

2.7.1 A detailed Equalities Impact Assessment is not required however the resulting scheme is expected to have a positive effect in reducing the number of road traffic accidents and casualties and generally improve road safety and pedestrian facilities for all road users within the area.

SECTION 3 - STATUTORY OFFICER CLEARANCE

Chief Finance Officer	✓ Name:Sheela Thakrar
On behalf of the Monitoring Officer	Date: 13/11/08 ✓ Name:Rachel Jones
	Date:14/11/08

SECTION 4 - PERFORMANCE OFFICER CLEARANCE

Performance Officer	✓ Name:Anu Singh
	Date:14/11/08

SECTION 5 - CONTACT DETAILS AND BACKGROUND PAPERS

Contact:

Barry Philips, Traffic Team Leader, Traffic and Road Safety, Tel: 020 8424 1649, Fax: 020 8424 7662, E-mail: barry.philips@harrow.gov.uk

Background Papers:

PCL technical report 2004 Eneterprisemouchel technical report 2007

If appropriate, does the report included the following considerations (select one option YES/NO/NA)

1.	Consultation	NO
2.	Corporate Priorities	NO