

AGENDA MANAGEMENT SHEET

Name of Committee

Cabinet

Date of Committee

26th May 2005

Report Title

Best Value Review of Traffic Management - The Final Report

Summary

The Environment and Rural Affairs Overview and Scrutiny Committee on the 22 March 2005 considered a report by the Director of Planning, Transport and Economic Strategy setting out the Final Report of the Best Value Review of Traffic Management including an Outline Service Improvement Plan. The Overview and Scrutiny Committee endorsed the Review and commended the Outline Service Improvement Plan to Cabinet for approval.

For further information please contact:

Jean Hardwick
Principal Committee Administrator
Tel: 01926 412476
Jeanhardwick@warwickshire.gov.uk

Would the recommended decision be contrary to the Budget and Policy Framework?

No.

Background papers

Warwickshire County Council's Best Value Performance Plan for 2003/04.

Warwickshire County Council's Best Value Review Guidelines.

Warwickshire's Local Transport Plan.

The Traffic Management Act 2004.

CONSULTATION ALREADY UNDERTAKEN:-

Details to be specified

Other Committees

Environment and Rural Overview and Scrutiny Committee...

Local Member(s)

.....

Other Elected Members

.....

Cabinet Member

.....

- Chief Executive
- Legal I Marriott
- Finance
- Other Chief Officers
- District Councils
- Health Authority
- Police
- Other Bodies/Individuals

FINAL DECISION YES

SUGGESTED NEXT STEPS:

Details to be specified

- Further consideration by this Committee
- To Council
- To Cabinet
- To an O & S Committee
- To an Area Committee
- Further Consultation

Agenda No

Cabinet - 26th May 2005.

Best Value Review of Traffic Management - The Final Report

Report of the Chair, Environment and Rural Affairs Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Recommendation

The Environment and Rural Affairs Overview and Scrutiny Committee recommend that Cabinet approve the Final Report of the Best Value Review of Traffic Management and the Outline Service Improvement Plan.

1. Background

- 1.1 The Environment and Rural Affairs Overview and Scrutiny Committee, at its meeting on 22 March 2005 considered the attached report of the Director of Planning, Transport and Economic Strategy, which set out the Final Report of the Best Value Review of Traffic Management including an Outline Service Improvement Plan.
- 1.2 Following consideration of the report the Overview and Scrutiny Committee endorsed the Final Report of the Best Value Review of Traffic Management and commended the Outline Service Improvement Plan to Cabinet for approval.

COUNCILLOR MARTIN
HEATLEY
Chair, Environment and Rural
Affairs Overview and Scrutiny
Committee

Shire Hall
Warwick

04 April 2005

AGENDA MANAGEMENT SHEET

Name of Committee Environment and Rural Affairs Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Date of Committee 22nd March 2005

Report Title Best Value Review of Traffic Management - The Final Report

Summary The report sets out the Final Report of the Best Value Review including an Outline Service Improvement Plan.

For further information please contact Graeme Fitton
Head of Transport Planning
Tel. 01926 735675
graemefitton@warwickshire.gov.uk

Would the recommended decision be contrary to the Budget and Policy Framework? Yes/No

Background Papers Warwickshire County Council's Best Value Performance Plan for 2003/04.
Warwickshire County Council's Best Value Review Guidelines.
Warwickshire's Local Transport Plan.
The Traffic Management Act 2004.

CONSULTATION ALREADY UNDERTAKEN:- *Details to be specified*

- Other Committees
- Local Member(s)
(With brief comments, if appropriate)
- Other Elected Members Councillor L W Forsyth)
Councillor Mrs E M Goode) for information
Councillor M Heatley)
- Cabinet Member Councillor C K N Browne – for information
(Reports to The Cabinet, to be cleared with appropriate Cabinet Member)
- Chief Executive T Morrison, B Basra, Corporate Review Team – no comments

- Legal I Marriott – comments incorporated.
- Finance
- Other Chief Officers
- District Councils
- Health Authority
- Police
- Other Bodies/Individuals

FINAL DECISION **NO** *(If 'No' complete Suggested Next Steps)*

SUGGESTED NEXT STEPS :

Details to be specified

- Further consideration by this Committee
- To Council
- To Cabinet Approval to be sought for the proposed Outline Service Improvement Plan.
- To an O & S Committee
- To an Area Committee
- Further Consultation

**Environment and Rural Affairs Overview and Scrutiny
Committee - 22nd March 2005**

**Best Value Review of Traffic Management
The Final Report**

**Report of the Director of Planning, Transport and
Economic Strategy**

Recommendation

That the Committee endorses the Final Report of the Review attached as **Appendix A** and commends the proposed Outline Service Improvement Plan to Cabinet for approval.

1. Background

- 1.1 The Council's programme of Best Value Reviews included a 'Key Service Review' of 'Traffic Management'. The Council's Best Value Review Guidance defines 'Key Service Reviews' as "reviews requiring a lighter touch where there may be less scope for major change but a need to ensure continuous service improvement by adjusting the approach to changing circumstances".
- 1.2 The Terms of Reference were agreed by the Environment and Rural Affairs Overview and Scrutiny Committee at its meeting in April 2004. These Terms of Reference stated that the Review's objectives were to be the identification of any improvements that need to be made to the strategy (including policies and resources) and the processes in place for the implementation of the following traffic management activities:-
- (i) The regulation of traffic speed.
 - (ii) The regulation of the movement of larger vehicles e.g. the introduction of weight limits on lorries.
 - (iii) The regulation of on-street parking (not off-street parking which is not regulated by the Council).
 - (iv) The provision of new traffic signal installations and pedestrian crossings.

2. Review Management and Methodology

- 2.1 As a 'Key Service Review', the Review was led by the Planning, Transport and Economic Strategy (PTES) Department.
- 2.2 The Environment and Rural Affairs Overview and Scrutiny Committee agreed that a Members' Steering Group should be convened. This met at key stages of the Review. Its members were Councillors K Browne, L Forsyth, Mrs E Goode and M Heatley.
- 2.3 The Review included:-
- (i) Extensive consultations involving the public, community representatives and other organisations .
 - (ii) Comparisons of the Council's activities with the activities of other local authorities and the Highways Agency.
 - (iii) Consultations with other parts of the PTES Department that are engaged on related activities as well as the Legal Services and Policy and Performance sections of the Chief Executive's Department.

3. Review Outcome

- 3.1 A copy of the Final Report of the Review is attached as **Appendix A**. *(The full report is attached for Cabinet Members only. It can be viewed on the Committee Administration System and on the Warwickshire Web)*. Its format follows that suggested in Warwickshire County Council's Best Value Review Guidelines, hence it contains:-
- (i) An introduction setting out the Background of the Review, its Aims and Objectives, and its scope.
 - (ii) A summary of the review proposals with a brief explanation.
 - (iii) An analysis of the existing service (How Good is the Existing Service?) - considering its Aims and Objectives, how well does the service meet the aims and how does performance compare.
 - (iv) The list of issues that were identified.
 - (v) A number of options to address those issues e.g. alternative forms of service delivery, alternative processes, structures and strategies.
 - (vi) A list of proposals, explaining the preferred options.
 - (vii) An Outline Service Improvement Plan.
- 3.2 The Report states that the service is performing well in many respects but that the following issues need to be considered:-

- (i) Resources, including the need to make best use of existing resources and the need for additional resources.
- (ii) The possibility of improving mutual understanding with the public, particularly parish councils.
- (iii) The possibility of improving effectiveness.
- (iv) The possibility of expediting the implementation of projects, especially minor projects of 'local' interest.

3.3 Accordingly, the proposals selected for further investigation by the Outline Service Improvement Plan are:-

- (i) The development of an annual planning process for all traffic management activities.
- (ii) An increase in the number of strategic initiatives.
- (iii) The development of a multi-disciplinary 'first stop' shop for the public.
- (iv) The decentralisation of some activities currently carried out at Barrack Street to Area Offices.
- (v) The development of 'fast track' procedures for relatively minor projects.
- (vi) A greater delegation of responsibilities in terms of projects of predominantly local interest; and
- (vii) The adoption of formal procedures for the assessment of project outcomes and project ownership.

3.4 The Committee's views on the Final Report are requested.

JOHN DEEGAN
Director of Planning, Transport and Economic Strategy
Shire Hall
Warwick

8th March 2005

**Environment and Rural Affairs Overview and Scrutiny
Committee - 22nd March 2005**

**Best Value Review of Traffic Management -
The Final Report**

FINAL REPORT

1. REPORT FORMAT

1.1 The format for this report follows that suggested in Warwickshire County Council's Best Value Review Guidelines. Therefore, it contains the following sections:-

- Introduction setting out the Background of the review, its aims and objectives, and its Scope;
- Summary of the review proposals with a brief explanation;
- How Good is the Existing Service? - considering its Aims and Objectives, how well does the service meet the aims and how does performance compare;
- Issues; what needs to be resolved or adjusted?
- Options e.g. alternative forms of service delivery, alternative processes, structures and strategies;
- Proposals, explaining the preferred option; and
- The Outline Service Improvement Plan.

2. INTRODUCTION

Background

- 2.1 The Council's programme of Best Value Reviews included a 'Key Service Review' of 'Traffic Management'. The Council's Best Value Review Guidance defines 'Key Service Reviews' as "reviews requiring a lighter touch where there may be less scope for major change but a need to ensure continuous service improvement by adjusting the approach to changing circumstances".
- 2.2 The Terms of Reference were agreed by the Environment and Rural Affairs Overview and Scrutiny Committee at its meeting in April 2004. These Terms of Reference defined the objectives and scope of the Review. They are repeated below.
- 2.3 The Report demonstrates that the '4Cs' (Challenge, Compare, Consult and Compete) have been considered and addressed within the context of a Key Service Review (see paragraph 2.1). In terms of:-
- **Challenge** - the need for the service is clearly indicated by the Council's Local Transport Plan (LTP) (see section 4) which states why the service is provided, why the Council provides this service, what the objectives of the service are and what the service will look like in five years time;
 - **Compare** - the available information is summarised in section 4 of this report;
 - **Consult** - a summary of the extensive consultations undertaken is given in section 2; and
 - **Compete** - the potential for a further extension of current use of the private sector is discussed in sections 4 and 6.

Review Objectives

- 2.4 The Terms of Reference for the Review stated that its objectives were to identify any improvements that need to be made to the strategy (including policies and resources) and the processes in place for the implementation of the specified traffic management activities that are defined in the following paragraph.

Scope

- 2.5 The scope of the services being covered by the Review is those traffic management activities contained in a July 2003 report to the Committee. These activities were chosen because of their impact on the community and the demand that they make on resources. They were
- the regulation of traffic speed;
 - the regulation of the movement of larger vehicles e.g. the introduction of weight limits on lorries;

- the regulation of on-street parking (not off-street parking which not regulated by the Council); and
- the provision of new traffic signal installations and pedestrian crossings.

2.6 The Terms of Reference also stated that the Review was to address the following issues:-

- i. the adequacy of the level of resources employed on these activities and the use of those resources (in particular there is a need to investigate the allocation of resources between the countywide delivery of LTP objectives and the demands placed upon responses to local issues);
- ii. public opinion (which results in traffic management schemes being high on the political agenda and continuously the subject of discussion at Area Committees); and
- iii. the effectiveness of action undertaken, including the significance of the enforceability of traffic regulation orders which are often associated with these activities.

Review Management and Methodology

2.7 As a 'Key Service Review', the Review was led by the Planning, Transport and Economic Strategy (PTES) Department.

2.8 The Environment and Rural Affairs O&S Committee agreed that a Members' Steering Group should be convened. This met at key stages of the Review. Its members were Councillors K Browne, L Forsyth, Mrs E Goode and M Heatley.

2.9 Extensive consultations were carried out with the public, community representatives and other organisations during the Review. Details of the responses received are shown in **Annex 1**. Those consulted included:-

- all the Members of the County Council;
- the general public (through the Citizens' Panel);
- district councils and town councils;
- a sample of parish councils, parish meetings and town councils;
- Warwickshire Police;
- organisations representing different types of road user;
- organisations representing rural interests; and
- civic societies.

2.10 In addition, comparisons were undertaken of the Council's activities with the activities of other local authorities and the Highways Agency. A summary of the results obtained from these comparisons is shown in **Annex 2**.

2.11 Finally, consultations were undertaken with others within the Council. Other parts of the PTES Department that are engaged on related activities were consulted as well as the Legal Services and Policy and Performance sections of the Chief Executive's Department.

3. SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS

3.1 The service is performing well in many respects but the Review has identified some issues that need to be considered. These are:-

- resources, including the need to make best use of existing resources and the need for additional resources;
- the possibility of improving mutual understanding with the public, particularly parish councils;
- the possibility of improving effectiveness; and
- the possibility of expediting the implementation of projects, especially minor projects of 'local' interest.

3.2 The Report identifies three themes as a means of addressing these issues. These are:-

- the development of a more structured, systematic approach to the planning of traffic management activities;
- the application of subsidiarity principles to the implementation of projects (i.e. the principle of tackling issues at the most appropriate level); and
- the clarification of some current procedures.

3.3 In accordance with these themes, the following proposals have been selected for further investigation:-

- a. The development of an annual planning process for all traffic management activities;
- b. An increase in the number of strategic initiatives;
- c. The development of a multi-disciplinary 'first stop' service for the public;
- d. The decentralisation of some activities currently carried out at Barrack Street to Area Offices;
- e. The development of 'fast track' procedures for relatively minor projects;
- f. A greater delegation of responsibilities in terms of projects of predominantly local interest; and

- g. The adoption of formal procedures for the assessment of projects outcomes and project ownership.

4. THE EXISTING SERVICE - HOW GOOD IS IT?

The Aims and Objectives – Are They Clear and Challenging?

- 4.1 The aims of these traffic management services are clearly defined within the Council's Local Transport Plan (LTP). The LTP sets out the Council's overall aims as local transport authority and also specifies the contribution that traffic management is expected to make to the achievement of those aims with a 'traffic management strategy'. This strategy defines the aims of traffic management as being
- to reduce the impact of traffic on the environment;
 - to reallocate roadspace between different users; and
 - to improve the flow of traffic on the existing road network.
- 4.2 The LTP also contains a clear and challenging range of objectives and targets to which these traffic management services are working.

Aims and Objectives – Are they Met by the Service?

- 4.3 The traffic management activities included in this Review clearly address the Council's LTP aims and objectives. They play a key role in addressing the aims of traffic management outlined in the bullet points in paragraph 4.1.
- 4.4 Much has already been achieved in terms of delivery of the LTP with these services playing a vital role in the delivery of
- The major on-going programmes of improvements for walking and cycling (including the Safer Routes to School initiative);
 - An Urban Traffic Management and Control System for Stratford-upon-Avon;
 - The on-going programmes of town centre traffic management (e.g. Rugby, Leamington and Warwick);
 - The on-going programme of speed reduction in rural areas;
 - The introduction of the decriminalisation of the enforcement of on-street parking restrictions in Stratford on Avon District; and
 - Major schemes (e.g. Nuneaton)
- 4.5 However, delivery of some aspects of the LTP has been slower than originally envisaged in that document - notably in terms of the introduction of

- the decriminalisation of the enforcement of on-street parking restrictions throughout the County;
- town centre traffic management (e.g. in the town centres of Leamington and Warwick); and
- the control of larger vehicles (through the Freight Quality Partnership).

Performance - How does it Compare?

- 4.6 Only limited comparisons can be made of Warwickshire's performance with the performance of others. The performance management information that exists for the activities covered by the Review only covers a few aspects of those activities. This was also a problem experienced in Shropshire County Council's (SCC) Best Value Review of their traffic management services undertaken in 2001 which "experienced some difficulty in measuring the cost effectiveness of the Traffic Management Service". The SCC Review tried to compare the Council's work with other organisations "but did not achieve any meaningful comparisons".
- 4.7 Action is being taken by a number of authorities to remedy this situation. The Council is a member of the Midlands Best Value Group that has Traffic Management and Traffic Signals Task Groups. These Task Groups are now engaged in producing more comprehensive performance management information.
- 4.8 According to the limited information that is available, Warwickshire compares reasonably well with other authorities. The tables below compare Warwickshire with the average of all the authorities that are members of the Midlands Best Value Group i.e. Cheshire, Derbyshire, Herefordshire, Hull, Leicestershire, Lincolnshire, Nottinghamshire Staffordshire, Warwickshire and Worcestershire. The data indicates that Warwickshire's performance is better than the average in terms of these three statistics.

| | WCC | All Authorities |
|--|------------|------------------------|
| Traffic Signals and Pedestrian Crossings | | |
| The revenue budget per traffic signal site in 2002/03 | £1,217 | £1,402 |
| Traffic Regulation Orders | | |
| Average number of months to implement a TRO from the end of consultations | 7 | 12 |
| Number of months taken to implement 85% of TROs from the end of consultation | 10 | 20 |

- 4.9 The only best value national performance indicator for these activities is the percentage of pedestrian crossings with facilities for disabled people. Warwickshire is in the second best national quartile in term of its performance

under this indicator with 94% of crossings having these facilities in 2004. This proportion has increased from 85% in 2001/02 and 87% in 2002/03.

- 4.10 The record of public contacts in the following table indicates a general improvement in performance in terms of response over recent years (and also highlights the high number of public contacts received, especially by telephone). Information about the number of e-mails is limited to that obtained through the web site - a substantial and increasing number of other e-mail contacts are also received from the public and other organisations.

| Public Contacts - Performance | 01/02 | 02/03 | 03/04 | 04/05 April/Sept |
|--|--------------|--------------|--------------|-----------------------------|
| Telephone Calls (Internal & External) | | | | |
| Total number of telephone calls | 52,735 | 52,155 | 51,654 | 23,128 |
| Telephone calls answered within 15 seconds | 75% | 93% | 94% | 96% |
| Letters | | | | |
| Total number of letters | 442 | 418 | 435 | 234 |
| Letters answered within 10 working days | 84% | 86% | 80% | 98% |
| E-Mails (Only External via the Web) | | | | |
| Number of e-mails received | | | 51 | 52 |
| E-mails answered within 10 working days | | | 86% | 96% |

Competition

- 4.11 A substantial proportion of the expenditure on these activities is subject to competitive tendering. Of the total annual £6 million budget of the Group responsible for these activities, £5 million is subject to competition. For example, competitive tendering is used for

- The purchasing of equipment e.g. the equipment used in traffic signals and pedestrian crossings;
- The on-site implementation of projects;
- The on-going maintenance of projects (including the supply of electricity); and
- Specialist professional and technical services.

- 4.12 The proportion of expenditure not subjected to competitive tendering covers aspects of work that are better conducted by in-house staff than consultants. For example, a substantial element of the work involved in these traffic management activities involves contact with the community and its representatives (e.g. Members and Parish Councils). There are advantages in these contacts being conducted by in-house staff rather than consultants. In-house staff are more directly accountable to the community and also have local

knowledge/experience of both the area and the authority. Therefore, this element of work is generally (but not exclusively) retained in-house and not subjected to competition.

5. ISSUES

General Overview

- 5.1 The evidence that has been collected indicates that the service is performing well in many respects. It is performing well in terms of the limited performance information that is available (see paragraphs 4.6 to 4.10). It is also generally performing well in terms of public satisfaction – the returns in **Annex 1** exhibiting a positive ‘net satisfaction’ (i.e. substantially more responses expressing satisfaction than dissatisfaction) in many cases. However, there are exceptions to this, notably the concerns expressed by most about the control of lorries and on-street parking and the concerns expressed by some about traffic speeds in villages.
- 5.2 Some issues have been identified by the Review and are described below. They reflect the issues identified in the Review’s Terms of Reference described in paragraph 2.6, being:-
- resources, including the need to make best use of existing resources and the need for additional resources;
 - the possibility of improving mutual understanding with the public, particularly parish councils;
 - the possibility of improving effectiveness; and
 - the possibility of expediting the implementation of projects, especially minor projects of ‘local’ interest.

The Deployment and Adequacy of Resources

- 5.3 The outcome of the Review suggests that current resources are being reasonably well deployed at present. The public and other organisations have indicated that all current activities are of relatively high importance. There are none of them that enjoy such little support that questions the level of resources allocated to them.
- 5.4 However, better use of resources might be possible if amendments are made to some of the current constraints under which these traffic management activities are provided. For example, the use of resources is affected by the constraints imposed by the procedures that are followed (including procedures for involving Members) and the way that work is currently allocated within PTES. Options for improving the use of resources by amending such constraints are reviewed in section 6 of the Report.

- 5.5 There is also a danger of conflicts within the Authority in terms of the use of the limited staff resources that are available. The Council, Committees and Members must share a common set of priorities and policies if the best value is to be obtained from those resources. Otherwise, there is a danger that staff resources might sometimes be employed on issues that have a relatively low level of priority in terms of overall Council objectives - delaying progress in tackling other issues that have a higher corporate priority.
- 5.6 There are also current pressures that are not being met because of resource constraints. For example, there is less satisfaction with some aspects of the service than others – notably the control of large vehicles and illegal parking (although these concerns are being addressed by the action that is being taken in terms of the Freight Quality Partnership and the decriminalisation of parking regulation enforcement, progress with these two initiatives could be expedited by allocating more resources to them). In addition, the minutes of the Environment and Rural Affairs Overview and Scrutiny Committee in September 2004 recorded concern over the implementation of the Village Speed Review on “B” Roads and the Safer Routes to School Review. The Committee noted that “further resources would need to be focused to increase either programme”.
- 5.7 The current pressure on resources is also illustrated by the high number of public contacts received which request action requiring investigations and/or surveys including site visits and reporting back. On average, there are approximately 45 contacts of this type per month from the public in connection with traffic management and 7 contacts per month in connection with traffic signals.
- 5.8 As well as these current pressures, there will also be new pressures for increased resources in the future. For example:-
- The Traffic Management Act 2004 will probably substantially increase the level of monitoring and review of Traffic Regulation Orders and traffic signal installations - the DfT Guidance for the Act suggesting a more proactive, general approach to monitoring and review than the approach currently adopted which is largely limited to reaction to particular problems as they arise and that needed to implement major projects e.g. decriminalisation; and
 - The development of ‘Intelligent Transport Systems’ will place pressures in terms of increased workload (the County has already seen some technological developments with the implementation of Urban Traffic Control (UTC) systems and the Urban Traffic Management and Control (UTMC) system in Stratford-upon-Avon - further developments will be required if the Council wishes to make best use of the existing transport system).

Improved Understanding

- 5.9 A general impression of public opinion about these activities can be gathered from the results of the surveys summarized in **Annex 1**. While these results are generally reasonably positive, there were some specific concerns that were widely raised i.e.

- The lack of progress in terms of the control of lorries and on-street parking;
 - A concern by parish councils and others about the control of traffic speeds in villages;
 - Some dissatisfaction with the time taken to implement projects; and
 - Some dissatisfaction with projects that had been implemented.
- 5.10 These concerns could, in part, arise from a lack of mutual understanding between the public and the Council about what is possible and what is not. For example, there could be a misunderstanding about the timescale required to implement projects (including the timescales related to the statutory processes for TROs). The public might also not always be aware of the difficulty in achieving a balance between requests and resources - referred to previously.
- 5.11 In addition, there is a continuing need to build a consensus with the public about the potential implications of projects to limit dissatisfaction once a project is implemented (and to monitor the outcomes of projects to demonstrate the level of success achieved in meeting objectives).

Improving Effectiveness

- 5.12 Transport activities (including traffic management) are effectively integrated through the LTP process. The LTP sets out an integrated strategy for the transport system with all activities contributing to the achievement of the overall local transport objectives of the Council.
- 5.13 However, a concern was raised through the Review that alternative ways of addressing issues might not always be fully considered. The solution to an issue is sometimes relatively obvious. However, sometimes there may be a need to give consideration to alternative means of achieving objectives. Two examples mentioned during the Review were the possibility of improving conditions for pedestrians by reducing vehicular traffic rather than providing pedestrian crossings and the possibility of limiting traffic speeds by measures other than traditional traffic calming (e.g. by the installation of signals or roundabouts or the lowering of design standards).
- 5.14 The enforceability of TROs is also an issue in terms of the effectiveness of the service. No significant increase in the limited level of resources currently allocated by the police to enforcement is expected in the future. However, there is a need to avoid the development of a general attitude of public non-observance of TROs. Accordingly, the Council has adopted the approach of
- generally implementing TROs that are self enforcing because they are seen as relatively reasonable by the public and/or are associated with complementary engineering measures; and

- expending resources on taking over enforcement activities e.g. the decriminalisation of the enforcement of on-street parking restrictions.

Improving Project Implementation

- 5.15 Compared to other authorities, the information available suggests that the timescale and cost for the delivery of projects in Warwickshire compares relatively well with that achieved in other authorities (see information given previously under 'Performance - How does it Compare?')
- 5.16 However, the prospect of improving the delivery of minor projects of 'local' interest was raised during the Review (e.g. projects such as the provision of lining for minor changes in waiting restrictions which, although small, are often of high profile in terms of local community interest). Minor projects currently follow the same procedure as larger projects, their delivery might be improved by devising different procedures for them providing that proper accountability is preserved – including proper accountability in terms of the statutory processes involved with Traffic Regulation Orders.

6. OPTIONS

Introduction

- 6.1 This section of the report outlines some options that have been identified to address the issues outlined in section 5. The option of adopting an annual planning process is outlined first because it could address a number of the issues. Other options follow, grouped according to the issue that they are primarily designed to address.

An Annual Planning Process

- 6.2 An annual process could be adopted for the planning of all the traffic management activities covered by this Review. At present, requests for some of the traffic management activities covered by the Review (e.g. traffic regulation orders) are considered independently as and when they arise. An annual planning process for those activities could be adopted and integrated with that currently in operation for the minor road improvement programme – which already covers the provision of new traffic signals and pedestrian crossings.
- 6.3 As an example of an annual planning process, all traffic management requests in Derbyshire that are viable and non-urgent are considered by annual area ‘workshops’. The workshops develop an overall annual programme of work for the area that they consider best addresses the targets of the LTP.
- 6.4 An annual process should address a number of the issues outlined in the previous section. It should
- result in a more effective, integrated approach to the management of the highway network - both in terms of providing an opportunity to examine the overall needs of an area and in terms of prioritising requests;
 - facilitate the best possible use of resources, both in terms of finance and staff – including the adoption of a more structured approach to ‘manpower planning’ than is possible with current arrangements;
 - help develop mutual understanding with the public by providing a transparent, readily understandable process and defined timescale for considering requests.

Making Best Use of Existing Resources

- 6.5 **Option: Centralisation vs Decentralisation** – Some of the activities currently carried out at by the PTES Department at Barrack Street might be better undertaken at the local Area Offices. Devolution from Barrack Street to Area Offices might bring benefits in terms of local presence, ownership, knowledge and experience. The local Area Offices already carry out some aspects of traffic management e.g. the implementation of temporary Traffic Regulation Orders, the authorisation of basic two-way temporary traffic signals. The devolving of the implementation of some other activities could be beneficial e.g. minor permanent Traffic Regulation Orders, the provision of disabled parking outside

homes, the approval of temporary signing for normal events and the control of multiple phase temporary signals. Consideration should be given to availability of resources in Area offices and the possibility of transferring some functions from client to contractor.

6.6 Option: Amending Procedures – Savings in the use of resources could be achieved by amending some existing procedures provided changes did not unduly compromise controls accountability, and quality. Examples identified in the Review also address some of the other issues raised in section 5 and are therefore covered elsewhere in this section e.g.

- Adopting an Annual Planning process (see above);
- Identifying a Multi-Disciplinary ‘First Stop’ Service for public contacts; and
- Improving the delivery of Minor Projects by a greater delegation of responsibilities and ‘Fast Tracking’ of their on-site implementation.

Obtaining Additional Resources

6.7 Option: More Use of Consultants – There has already been significant use made of consultants, both in the supply of staff to work in the Council’s offices and in outsourcing work to consultants’ offices. This has resulted in wide experience being gained of the benefits and dis-benefits of using consultants on different aspects of the activities under review. This experience suggests that there is limited prospect of a significantly greater use of consultants. They can offer valuable assistance in some areas of work but not in others. For example, the importance of in-house staff in terms of public contact has been mentioned earlier. In addition, consultants can suffer from the general lack of suitably experienced staff (see below).

6.8 Option: More Council Staff – There is a general shortage of experienced people with adverts for experienced staff attracting limited response. This problem is likely to persist. All the other authorities that were consulted during the Review expected this problem to continue or worsen in the future.

Improving Understanding

6.9 Option: Single Public Contact Arrangements – Not providing a single ‘first-stop’ service for public contacts on local highway matters can cause problems for the public in knowing who to contact. The survey of other authorities indicated that most authorities have several highway contact points for the public but that some have adopted a single contact point.

6.10 Option: Improving Communication about Projects – Communication with the public about projects has been improving but the adoption of some new processes could enable further improvements to be made, for example the adoption of formal processes for the assessment of project outcomes (see paragraph 6.15) and an improvement in project ownership (see paragraph 6.18).

Improving Effectiveness

- 6.11 **Option: A Multi-Disciplinary 'First Stop' Service** - A multi-disciplinary team could be identified to examine issues (including issues raised by the public) where the solution is not evident to ensure that the optimum solution is adopted. At present, all requests from the public are referred direct to 'specialist' teams. This procedure works well when the optimum solution is evident (as is often the case). However, it could cause problems when a range of options need to be considered.
- 6.12 **Option: Changing the Emphasis on Enforcement** - The current practice that Warwickshire has adopted of generally (but not always) proceeding with projects that are supported by the police should be retained for the present (most other authorities only proceed with TROs that are supported by the police). In the future, the Council could take up opportunities to become the enforcement agency as powers become available (e.g. through the decriminalisation of enforcement of parking restrictions and through the Traffic Management Act 2004). However, the importance of these powers in terms of achieving the LTP objectives of the Council needs consideration. Powers should not be adopted if the resources employed on their adoption and operation cannot be justified in terms of achieving those objectives.
- 6.13 **Option : Increasing the Number of Strategic Initiatives** – There has been a greater emphasis on developing and implementing strategic initiatives with the introduction of the LTP process - notably the decriminalisation of the enforcement of on-street parking regulations, the control of lorries through the development of a Freight Quality Partnership and the control of speeds in rural areas. However, there are a number of other strategic initiatives that the Council should consider adopting in the 2005 LTP such as
- the adoption of an Intelligent Transport Systems (ITS) Strategy, Warwickshire already having several operational Intelligent Transport Systems (e.g. Urban Traffic Control systems, roadside pollution monitors, a Car Park Management system, Variable Message Signs and Automatic Number Plate Recognition system) - the key to delivering effective ITS is the adoption of a strategy to integrate those systems throughout the County to ensure that resources are shared, not duplicated;
 - a more consistent approach to the implementation of measures to control traffic speeds in urban areas (although the Best Value Surveys did not disclose any particular concerns about the control of vehicle speeds in urban areas, on-going public contacts have shown that this is an issue that needs to be addressed); and
 - a strategic approach to the provision of traffic signals, pedestrian phases on traffic signals and pedestrian crossings to ensure that such installations are installed in accordance with the overall LTP strategy (including those installed in response to 'ad-hoc' demands such as land development proposals).

- 6.14 **Option: Allocating Resources to Strategic Initiatives** - Strategic initiatives will be delivered more effectively and efficiently if staff resources are allocated solely to them. Otherwise, staff working on strategic initiatives will be diverted from them by competing demands. However, a balance needs to be struck between proactive and reactive work (i.e. the balance between proactively implementing strategic initiatives and reacting to requests from the community). There is no consensus in other authorities about achieving this balance - some giving priority to proactive work whilst an almost equal number giving priority to reactive work. The annual planning option outlined at the start of this section could provide the means of addressing this issue.
- 6.15 **Option: The Assessment of Project Outcomes** - Some concerns were expressed during the Review about the assessment of project outcomes. These concerns included uncertainty about the policy being followed in project outcome assessment (including the extent to which Members, the public and police should influence which projects are assessed) and concern about the outcomes achieved by some projects (especially some speed reduction projects in villages). Warwickshire's current practice to project assessment is not to assess all projects. Projects are selected for assessment on the basis that the results from them are likely to be of particular interest or significance. A strong majority of other authorities also follow this practice and are satisfied with this approach. However, current practice is not formalised. There is no written procedure for the selection of projects and limited formal reporting of the outcomes achieved. The adoption of formal processes would address concerns.

Improving Project Delivery

- 6.16 **Option: 'Fast Tracking' Minor Projects** – The possibility of reducing the timescale for the delivery of smaller, relatively uncontroversial minor projects could be investigated. At present Warwickshire does not have any 'fast track' procedures for minor projects. It is not alone in this respect - no other authorities making special arrangements. However, improving delivery of minor projects would not just improve delivery but also improve public relations. Fast tracking might involve an increase in the delegation of responsibilities (see below) and special arrangements for ordering on-site implementation (rather than relying on more general contract arrangements).
- 6.17 **Option: More Delegation of Responsibilities** – The delivery of projects that are of relatively local interest might be improved if some powers were devolved from Area Committees. As mentioned previously, any delegation of powers would have to be designed to ensure that proper accountability is preserved, including proper accountability in terms of the statutory processes involved with Traffic Regulation Orders. The possibility of greater delegation to officers of the powers to determine contested Traffic Regulation Orders of purely local interest could be explored. In addition, local Members could play a key role in building community consensus and act as consultees on the use of any delegated powers to officers.
- 6.18 **Option: Improving Project Ownership** - There can be issues of a perceived lack of continued ownership during the delivery of projects because delivery depends upon the performance of a number of different bodies e.g. those

planning the project, those carrying out detailed design and those physically implementing the project on site. The original project planner should maintain some aspects of project management throughout the implementation of the project but those to whom a project is passed also have responsibilities e.g. delivering the project to an agreed time and budget. Responsibilities could be clarified by the adoption of formal, standardised handover documents when a project is transferred that define outstanding issues and on-going responsibilities.

7. PROPOSALS

7.1 The proposals that are itemised below have been selected from the options in the previous section of this report because of their potential significance in addressing the issues identified in Section 5 i.e.

- resources, including the need to make best use of existing resources and the need for additional resources;
- the possibility of improving mutual understanding with the public, particularly parish councils;
- the possibility of improving effectiveness; and
- the possibility of expediting the implementation of projects, especially minor projects of 'local' interest.

7.2 They follow the following three themes:-

- the development of a more structured, systematic approach to the planning of traffic management activities;
- the application of subsidiarity principles to the implementation of projects (i.e. the principle of tackling issues at the most appropriate level); and
- the clarification of some current procedures.

7.3 The following proposals have been selected for further investigation in order to develop a more structured, systematic approach to the planning of traffic management activities:-

- a. The development of an annual planning process (see paragraph 6.2 to 6.4);
- b. An increase in the number of strategic initiatives (see paragraph 6.12);
- c. The development of a multi-disciplinary 'first stop' shop for the public (see paragraph 6.11).

7.4 The following proposals have been selected for further investigation to apply subsidiarity principles to the implementation of projects :-

- a. The decentralisation of some activities currently carried out by the PTES Department at Barrack Street to Area Offices (see paragraph 6.5);
 - b. The development of 'fast track' procedures for relatively minor projects (see paragraph 6.16); and.
 - c. More delegation of responsibilities in terms of projects of relatively local interest (see paragraph 6.17).
- 7.5 In addition, the drafting of formalised procedures should be considered for :-
- a. the assessment of projects outcomes (see paragraph 6.15); and
 - b. project ownership (see paragraph 6.18).

8. OUTLINE SERVICE IMPROVEMENT PLAN

8.1 The Outline Service Improvement Plan is tabulated below.

N.B. References to “Committee” in this Plan are to Environment and Rural Affairs Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

| | Action | Responsibility | Timescale |
|---|--|----------------|--------------|
| A | <p>Draft proposals for consideration by the Committee of an annual planning process for the programming of traffic management projects, ensuring that consideration is given</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To the integration of this process with the annual process currently adopted for other integrated transport projects; • The development of priority ranking systems to <u>guide</u> decision making; and • To the possibility of excluding some minor and/or ‘urgent’ traffic management projects from that process. | | October 2005 |
| B | <p>Draft proposals for consideration by the Committee of the development of ‘fast track’ procedures for the implementation of ‘minor’ projects, within the overall context of an annual planning process, ensuring that consideration is given</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To the delegation to officers of the powers to determine contested Traffic Regulation Orders of purely local interest; • To local Members playing a key role in building community consensus and acting as consultees on the use of any powers delegated to officers; and • The introduction of new, discrete arrangements for the on-site implementation of such projects. | | October 2005 |
| C | <p>Draft a formal procedure for consideration by the Committee covering the assessment of the outcomes of traffic management projects, ensuring that consideration is given to the potential role of Members, the public and police in the selection of projects.</p> | | October 2005 |

| | | | |
|---|--|--|--------------|
| D | <p>Draft a formal procedure for consideration by the Committee to ensure there is a clear understanding during all stages of project implementation of project ownership, ensuring that consideration is given</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To those aspects of project ownership that need to be maintained by the original project planner; and • To the responsibilities that need to be adopted by those to whom the implementation of a project is passed and how those responsibilities should be defined – possibly by the adoption of a formal, standardised handover document. | | October 2005 |
| E | <p>Draft a protocol for consideration by the Committee defining the roles and responsibilities of Members and officers in connection with</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An annual planning process for the programming of traffic management projects; • The development of 'fast track' procedures for the implementation of 'minor' projects; • A formal procedure covering the assessment of traffic management projects; and • A formal procedure to ensure there is a clear understanding during all stages of project implementation of project ownership. | | October 2005 |
| F | <p>Include a comprehensive list of strategic traffic management initiatives in the 2005 LTP taking into consideration the possibility of the adoption of strategic initiatives for</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the development of Intelligent Transport Systems; • a more consistent approach to the implementation of measures to control speeds on the main road network of urban areas; • the provision of traffic signals, pedestrian phases on traffic signals and pedestrian crossings (including consideration of the need for a review of the policies for their provision). | | June 2005 |
| G | <p>Investigate the feasibility of a single public contract arrangement for local highway matters including the possibility of establishing a multidisciplinary team which meets as and when required to examine requests for improvement to the highway network when the course of action in response to a request is not immediately apparent.</p> | | October 2005 |

| | | | |
|---|---|--|--------------|
| H | <p>Complete a review for the Director of the PTES Department of the allocation of traffic management activities between the Barrack Street and Area Offices, ensuring that consideration is given</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• To making the best overall use of resources and• Possible benefits from a local presence, ownership, knowledge and experience. | | October 2005 |
|---|---|--|--------------|

TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT BEST VALUE REVIEW

SUMMARY OF SURVEYS

1. INTRODUCTION

The Citizens' Panel Survey – This was carried out in April 2004 and resulted in a total of 644 returns (74 from North Warwickshire, 117 from Nuneaton and Bedworth, 116 from Rugby, 179 from Stratford on Avon and 178 from Warwick District).

The Survey of Organisations – This was carried out in June/July 2004 and resulted in returns from the following organisations:-

- 40 returns from parish councils or parish meetings;
- 5 returns from town councils;
- 5 returns from Warwickshire Police;
- 8 returns from organisations representing different types of road user;
- 3 returns from organisations representing rural interests;
- 3 returns from two district councils (not included in the tables below in view of the relatively low number of responses); and
- one return from a civic society (not included in the tables below in view of the low number of responses).

The Members' Survey – This was carried out in July/August 2004 and resulted in a total of 30 returns.

The surveys (see below) have disclosed that there is:-

- i. general agreement about the level of importance of the various activities (table 2);
- ii. general concern about the control of large vehicles and illegal parking (table 3c);
- iii. less satisfaction amongst parish councils than others surveyed with the control of traffic speeds in villages (tables 3c and 4c) - *but this may have occurred because they were chosen as the most active councils, not as a representative sample.*

A summary of the comments that were received is appended.

2. THE 'IMPORTANCE' OF TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES

Table 2 - "Quite or Very Important"

The percentage of responses that thought each activity was "Quite or Very Important".

| | WCC Members | Citizens' Panel | Parish Councils | Town Councils | Police | Road Users | Rural Orgs |
|--|------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| | % | % | % | % | % | % | % |
| Controlling traffic speeds in villages | 93 | 92 | 100 | 100 | 80 | 75 | 100 |
| Controlling traffic speed in the main urban areas | 90 | 90 | 90 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Controlling the movement of lorries and other large vehicles | 97 | 87 | 100 | 100 | 80 | 87.5 | 100 |
| Reducing the amount of illegal on-street parking | 83 | 84 | 92.5 | 100 | 80 | 87.5 | 66.6 |
| Providing more pedestrian crossings | 73 | 72 | 60 | 100 | 80 | 62.5 | 100 |
| Providing more traffic lights to control junctions | 57 | 66 | 57.5 | 67 | 80 | 75 | 0 |
| Providing more parking spaces for people with disabilities | 63 | 56 | 67.5 | 100 | 80 | 62.5 | 100 |
| The introduction of more residents' parking schemes | 60 | 52 | 62.5 | 67 | 60 | 62.5 | 33.3 |

3. THE 'LEVEL OF SATISFACTION' WITH TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES IN WARWICKSHIRE

Table 3a - "FAIRLY OR VERY SATISFIED"

The proportion of the responses that were "Fairly or Very Satisfied" with these activities in Warwickshire.

| | WCC Members | Citizens' Panel | Parish Councils | Town Councils | Police | Road Users | Rural Orgs |
|--|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|---------------|--------|------------|------------|
| | % | % | % | % | % | % | % |
| Controlling traffic speeds in villages | 33 | 46 | 12.5 | 60 | 60 | 25 | 0 |
| Controlling traffic speed in the main urban areas | 60 | 61 | 65 | 60 | 100 | 50 | 33.3 |
| Controlling the movement of lorries and other large vehicles | 10 | 15 | 30 | 40 | 40 | 25 | 0 |
| Reducing the amount of illegal on-street parking | 13 | 19 | 17.5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Providing more pedestrian crossings | 40 | 49 | 37.5 | 40 | 80 | 25 | 66.6 |
| Providing more traffic lights to control junctions | 47 | 40 | 30 | 20 | 60 | 25 | 33.3 |

Table 3b - "FAIRLY OR VERY DISSATISFIED"

| | WCC Members | Citizens' Panel | Parish Councils | Town Councils | Police | Road Users | Rural Orgs |
|--|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|---------------|--------|------------|------------|
| | % | % | % | % | % | % | % |
| Controlling traffic speeds in villages | 33 | 30 | 82.5 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 100 |
| Controlling traffic speed in the main urban areas | 27 | 19 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 37.5 | 0 |
| Controlling the movement of lorries and other large vehicles | 63 | 53 | 67.5 | 40 | 20 | 50 | 100 |
| Reducing the amount of illegal on-street parking | 53 | 46 | 30 | 60 | 80 | 75 | 66.6 |
| Providing more pedestrian crossings | 20 | 16 | 5 | 20 | 0 | 25 | 0 |
| Providing more traffic lights to control junctions | 10 | 23 | 12.5 | 0 | 0 | 37.5 | 33.3 |

Table 3c - "NET SATISFACTION"

| | WCC Members | Citizens' Panel | Parish Councils | Town Councils | Police | Road Users | Rural Orgs |
|--|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|---------------|--------|------------|------------|
| | % | % | % | % | % | % | % |
| Controlling traffic speeds in villages | 0 | +16 | -70 | +60 | +60 | 0 | -100 |
| Controlling traffic speed in the main urban areas | +33 | +42 | +55 | +60 | +100 | +12.5 | +33.3 |
| Controlling the movement of lorries and other large vehicles | -53 | -38 | -37.5 | 0 | +20 | -25 | -100 |
| Reducing the amount of illegal on-street parking | -40 | -27 | -12.5 | -60 | -80 | -75 | -66.6 |
| Providing more pedestrian crossings | +20 | +33 | +32.5 | +20 | +80 | 0 | +66.6 |
| Providing more traffic lights to control junctions | +37 | +17 | +17.5 | +20 | +60 | -12.5 | 0 |

4. THE 'LEVEL OF SATISFACTION' WITH INVOLVEMENT WITH WCC ON TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES

Table 4a - "FAIRLY OR VERY SATISFIED"

The proportion of the responses that were "Fairly or Very Satisfied" with their involvement with WCC on traffic management activities.

| | WCC Members | Citizens' Panel | Parish Councils | Town Councils | Police | Road Users | Rural Orgs |
|--|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|---------------|--------|------------|------------|
| | % | % | % | % | % | % | % |
| Controlling traffic speeds in villages | 40 | - | 32.5 | 20 | 60 | 12.5 | 100 |
| Controlling traffic speed in the main urban areas | 33 | - | 2.5 | 40 | 60 | 12.5 | 0 |
| Controlling the movement of lorries and other large vehicles | 13 | - | 5 | 0 | 20 | 12.5 | 66.6 |
| Reducing the amount of illegal on-street parking | 10 | - | 0 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 0 |
| Providing more pedestrian crossings | 50 | - | 2.5 | 20 | 40 | 25 | 33.3 |
| Providing more traffic lights to control junctions | 17 | - | 2.5 | 20 | 60 | 25 | 33.3 |

Table 4b - "FAIRLY OR VERY DISSATISFIED"

| | WCC Members | Citizens' Panel | Parish Councils | Town Councils | Police | Road Users | Rural Orgs |
|--|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|---------------|--------|------------|------------|
| | % | % | % | % | % | % | % |
| Controlling traffic speeds in villages | 10 | - | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Controlling traffic speed in the main urban areas | 10 | - | 2.5 | 0 | 0 | 12.5 | 0 |
| Controlling the movement of lorries and other large vehicles | 30 | - | 22.5 | 20 | 20 | 12.5 | 0 |
| Reducing the amount of illegal on-street parking | 7 | - | 5 | 20 | 0 | 12.5 | 0 |
| Providing more pedestrian crossings | 10 | - | 10 | 0 | 0 | 12.5 | 0 |
| Providing more traffic lights to control junctions | 17 | - | 7.5 | 0 | 0 | 12.5 | 0 |

Table 4c - "NET SATISFACTION"

| | WCC Members | Citizens' Panel | Parish Councils | Town Councils | Police | Road Users | Rural Orgs |
|--|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|---------------|--------|------------|------------|
| | % | % | % | % | % | % | % |
| Controlling traffic speeds in villages | +30 | - | -7.5 | +20 | +60 | +12.5 | +100 |
| Controlling traffic speed in the main urban areas | +23 | - | 0 | +40 | +60 | 0 | 0 |
| Controlling the movement of lorries and other large vehicles | -17 | - | -17.5 | -20 | 0 | 0 | +66.6 |
| Reducing the amount of illegal on-street parking | +3 | - | -5 | -20 | +40 | -12.5 | 0 |
| Providing more pedestrian crossings | +40 | - | -7.5 | +20 | +40 | +12.5 | +33.3 |
| Providing more traffic lights to control junctions | 0 | - | -5 | +20 | +60 | +12.5 | +33.3 |

Summary of Comments

The control of traffic speeds in the main urban areas

One Member and three organisations felt that traffic speeds are a general issue throughout urban areas.

Another two members and two organisations felt that lower speed limits were required (20 and 30 mph).

Three Members and three organisations wanted better enforcement of limits.

One Member and one organisation (a Parish Council) mentioned a problem at a specific location.

The control of traffic speeds in villages

Ten organisations stated that there was a general need to review/reduce speeds in villages/rural areas.

Nineteen parish councils said that Speeds need reducing at a specific locality.

Two organisations said that implemented speed reduction measures have not been satisfactory.

One Member and five organisations said that better enforcement is needed.

Three Members said that a more positive/quicker response is needed to requests.

Two Members said that funding 'demands' on Parish Councils in connection with projects are too high.

Three Members said that physical measures are needed e.g. wider footways.

The control of illegal on-street parking

Eight Members and eleven organisations commented on the lack of enforcement.

Three organisations mentioned issues at specific locations.

Two organisations commented on parking on footways.

One organisation requested the provision of more on-street parking spaces.

One Member and one organisation (the ambulance service) specifically commented on the problems illegal parking causes to traffic flow.

The control of lorries and other large vehicles

Three organisations requested more control in town centres.

Eight organisations mentioned problems at specific locations.

One organisation requested more control on 'country lanes'.

Six organisations commented that there should be more general control.

One Member and four organisations commented that restrictions were ineffective/not enforced.

Five Members said that progress in addressing the issue was too slow.

The control of junctions by traffic signals

Two Members said that more installations should be provided.

Four organisations requested traffic signals at specific locations.

One Member said that there was 'some reluctance to respond to local wishes'.

Comments were received from Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council expressing a preference for roundabouts rather than signals (one Member also expressed that same view).

One organisation commented that signals were preferred to roundabouts (Cycleways).

One organisation felt that signals 'were not always of help' (The Ambulance Service).

One organisation criticised the design of a proposed installation.

Two organisations commented on the lack of enforcement.

The provision of pedestrian crossings

One organisation commented that an overall improvement for pedestrians was needed – including the provision of more crossings (Stratford).

Three members and four organisations commented that more were needed.

Three organisations suggested that there needed to be more care over the choice of crossing.

A project to control traffic speeds in a main urban area

One organisation commented that the objective of a particular project was incorrect (The Stratford Society – the Gateway Project for Old Town).

One comment was received about a difficulty in 'balancing political and technical issues' (Police).

A project to control traffic speeds in a village

Five organisations commented that projects had not been satisfactory when implemented (Newton and Biggin Parish Council (PC), Brandon and Bretford PC, Fenny Compton PC, Baginton PC, Kingsbury PC, The Police).

Three Members and three organisations commented on the time taken to identify/implement a project (Leek Wootton PC, Priors Marston PC, Pailton PC).

Three organisations requested treatment at a specific location (Copston Magna PC, Leamington Hastings PC, Lapworth PC).

Two organisations commented that WCC was not taking action when action was required (Lighthorne PC, Austrey PC).

One Member said that there had been a good service from officers but a poor service from contractors.

A project to control on-street parking

Two organisations commented on the need for action in a specific location (Old Milverton and Blackdown Joint Parish Council(JPC), Priors Marston PC).

One organisation mentioned concerns about the proposals for a specific project (Living Streets – LUMP).

One Member was 'fairly dissatisfied' because a project had not been delivered.

A project to control lorries and other large vehicles

One Member (A452) and three organisations (Old Milverton and Blackdown JPC, Baginton PC and Bishops Tachbrook PC) raised concerns about large vehicles in a specific location.

One organisation commented on the time taken to determine designated routes for heavy vehicles and questioned whether they would prove effective (Warwickshire Rural Community Council).

One organisation commented on the time taken to investigate an issue (Copston Magna PC).

One organisation mentioned concerns about the proposals for a specific project (Living Streets – LUMP).

One Member and one organisation (The Warwickshire Association of Local Councils) commented on the lack of enforcement of restrictions.

One Member said that too many HGV operating centres are being licensed resulting in nuisance and road maintenance problems.

The provision of traffic signals to control a junction

One organisation commented that their views had been ignored (Bishops Tachbrook PC).

Two Members raised concerns about specific locations.

The provision of a pedestrian crossing

One organisation expressed concern over the design of a crossing (Kineton PC).

One organisation requested a crossing at a specific location and felt that WCC was 'insufficiently sensitive to such matters'(Living Streets).

One Member said that more crossings were needed in Rugby and Cubbington.

TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT BEST VALUE REVIEW

MIDLANDS TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT and TRAFFIC SIGNALS TASK GROUPS

SUMMARY OF SURVEY RESULTS

INTRODUCTION

Responses were received from Cheshire, Derbyshire, Herefordshire, Hull, Lancashire, Leicestershire, Lincolnshire, Nottinghamshire, Staffordshire and Warwickshire.

1. BALANCING PROACTIVE AND REACTIVE WORK

How is the balance between 'proactive' and 'reactive' work in your authority decided?

- 5 authorities give priority to proactive work, carrying out as much reactive work as possible with the remaining resources and
- 4 give priority to reactive work, carrying out as much proactive work as possible with the remaining resources.

Most thought that the correct approach was currently being following in their authority (the exception being one of those that gave priority to reactive work – which would like to be more proactive).

2. MONITORING AND REVIEW OF EXISTING FACILITIES

How do you monitor and review existing signal and crossing installations?

- 7 authorities limit their monitoring and review to that which is needed for the implementation of new projects e.g. a major road improvement project
- 3 authorities carried out a comprehensive programme, reviewing all crossing and signal installations at regular intervals.

Most (8) authorities were dissatisfied with the approach that they were following (including one of the authorities that undertook a comprehensive programme). Two mentioned the implications of the Traffic Management Bill as a factor that needed consideration.

3. DEVELOPING INTELLIGENT TRANSPORT SYSTEMS

In terms of 'Intelligent Transport Systems'

- 3 authorities were implementing an overall strategy to integrate the potential related components of that and other systems and
- 7 were In the process of developing such an overall integrated strategy.

Everyone thought that they were following the correct approach.

4. POLICIES

How 'flexible' are the policies that you follow for traffic signals and pedestrian crossings?

Nearly all the authorities were following 'flexible policies' for traffic signals (9) and pedestrian crossings (8). Only one authority was following 'inflexible policies'.

Most of those following flexible policies thought the approach correct. The one exception alluded to (1) problems of 'political' pressure resulting in projects being implemented where the need was questionable and (b) development funded projects proceeding when other projects were seen to be of higher priority by the public.

The one authority following inflexible policies thought that flexible policies should be adopted.

5. ASSESSING THE OUTCOME OF PROJECTS

How do you assess the outcome of projects (e.g. in terms of the usage of new pedestrian crossings, impact of new traffic signals on delays and accidents etc)?

- 8 authorities carry out 'before and after surveys' for certain projects selected on the basis that the results from them are likely to be of particular interest or significance - most thought that this was the correct approach.
- 2 authorities do not generally carry out any 'before and after surveys' – both being discontent with this approach.

6. PUBLIC REQUESTS

How are requests from the public for new signals and crossings initially considered by your authority?

- In 5 authorities, requests are they initially dealt with by whichever part of the Department receives them e.g. the maintenance offices or the traffic signal teams;
- In 2 authorities, they are generally considered by a 'first stop shop' provided by Area Offices with sufficient expertise to decide what response should be made;
- In 2 authorities, they are generally considered by some other form of 'first stop shop'.

Most (8) thought that the correct approach was being taken in their authority.

To what extent do you inform Members about any requests for new signals and crossings that are raised by the public?

The responses to this question were variable.

- 2 specifically informed Members when they had received a request about which they particularly wanted the Member to be aware;
- 2 specifically informed Members when they thought the request might be of 'political' interest;
- 5 adopted a variety of other practices – including one who mentioned petitions and one that only informed Members when projects had received funding and were proceeding.

Everyone thought that the correct approach was being followed in their authority.

If you need to consult Members about a request for new signals or crossings, do you sometimes only consult a 'local Member' rather than a Committee?

- 4 always consulted a Committee (one meeting regularly with the Chair who acted as the Committee's representative);
- 4 always only consulted a 'local Member', no matter how politically controversial;
- 1 always only consulted a 'local' Member on relatively non-controversial local issues.

Everyone thought that the correct approach was being followed in their authority.

7. CONSULTATION/INFORMATION PROVISION FOR PROJECTS

When you are developing a project, do you carry out any additional consultations or provide any information in addition to statutory requirements?

- 7 authorities always carried out additional consultations;
- 2 authorities carried out additional consultations in particular circumstances (either when it might limit objections or when the project is expected to affect a wider range of people/organisations than those covered by the statutory requirements);
- 1 authority never carried out additional consultations

Everyone thought that the correct approach was being followed in their authority except in the authority where additional consultation was never carried out (expressing concerns about this approach).

What happens if you receive an objection to a project?

- 4 always refer the objection to a Committee;

- 3 refer the objection to Committee if the objection is of wide, general significance but refer it to the local Member if it is only of local significance;
- 4 adopted other courses of action.

Everyone thought that the correct approach was being followed in their authority except one authority that currently always referred the objection to Committee which advocated more use of local Members.

Do you generally only proceed with projects which the police support or proceed with projects even if they are not supported by the police?

- 6 authorities only proceed with projects which the police support;
- 3 authorities proceed with projects even if they are not supported by the police.

Everyone thought that the correct approach was being followed in their authority – one making the comment that the police were generally supportive of new signals and crossings (these not being as controversial as traffic regulation orders can be).

8. THE FUTURE

In terms of the pressure for resources in the future

- 10 authorities thought that there will be significant pressure for additional revenue expenditure;
- 8 authorities thought that there will be significant pressure for additional capital investment.
- 7 authorities thought that additional resources will be made available in terms of capital investment (only one authority not expecting additional capital resources);
- 7 authorities thought that no additional resources will be made available in terms of revenue expenditure (two authorities expecting additional revenue resources);
- 9 authorities expected that there will be a lack of staff with the necessary experience and skills.