

AGENDA MANAGEMENT SHEET

Name of Committee	Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee
Date of Committee	8th November 2005
Report Title	Best Value Review of Traffic Management - Report on Progress
Summary	This report advises the Committee on progress regarding the actions in the Service Improvement Plan in connection with the Best Value Review of Traffic Management and proposes next steps to be taken to further progress the Plan. Further steps proposed include introducing a new policy for the Provision of Pedestrian Crossings and Pedestrian Phases at Traffic Signals and the seeking of powers for officers to determine Traffic Regulation Orders for waiting restrictions of purely local interest.
For further information please contact	Jonathan Simkins Group Manager - Traffic Projects Tel. 01926 412938 jonathansimkins@warwickshire.gov.uk
Would the recommended decision be contrary to the Budget and Policy Framework?	Yes/No
Background Papers	2005 Provisional Local Transport Plan

CONSULTATION ALREADY UNDERTAKEN:-

Details to be specified

Other Committees	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee 22nd March 2005, Cabinet 26th May 2005.	
Local Member(s) (With brief comments, if appropriate)	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Other Elected Members	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Councillor C K N Browne <input type="checkbox"/> Councillor Mrs E M Goode <input type="checkbox"/> Councillor Mrs J Lea	} For information

Cabinet Member
(Reports to The Cabinet, to be cleared with appropriate Cabinet Member)

☒ Councillor M L M Heatley – For information

Chief Executive

☐

Legal

☒ I Marriott - Agreed

Finance

☐

Other Chief Officers

☐

District Councils

☐

Health Authority

☐

Police

☐

Other Bodies/Individuals

☐

FINAL DECISION

YES/NO (If 'No' complete Suggested Next Steps)

SUGGESTED NEXT STEPS :

Details to be specified

Further consideration by this Committee

☒ Further progress report proposed for April 2006.

To Council

☐

To Cabinet

☒ Report recommending endorsement of proposed policy for the Provision of Pedestrian Crossings and Pedestrian Phases at Traffic Regulation Signals (March 2006).

Report proposing that it be recommended to full Council that an appropriate amendment be made to the Council's Constitution to enable officer determination of Traffic Regulation Orders for waiting restrictions of purely local interest (January 2006).

To an O & S Committee

☐

To an Area Committee

☐

Further Consultation

☒ On proposed policy for the Provision of Pedestrian Crossings and Pedestrian Phases at Traffic Signals.

**Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee –
8th November 2005**

**Best Value Review of Traffic Management - Report on
Progress**

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

Recommendation

That the Committee endorses the actions proposed in “Next Steps” in **Appendix A** of this report.

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This report advises the Committee on progress regarding the actions in the Service Improvement Plan in connection with the Best Value Review of Traffic Management and proposes next steps to be taken to further progress the Plan.

2. Background

- 2.1 This Committee, at its meeting on 22nd March 2005, considered a 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. 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.
- 2.2 At its meeting on the 26th May 2005 Cabinet approved the Final Report of the Best Value Review of Traffic Management and the Outline Service Improvement Plan.
- 2.3 The proposals selected for further investigation by the Outline Service Improvement Plan were:-
- (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.
- (vii) The adoption of formal procedures for the assessment of project outcomes and project ownership.

3. Progress and Next Steps

- 3.1 Progress on each of the actions (A-H) in the Service Improvement Plan is reported in **Appendix A** of this report. Next steps are proposed against each of these items.
- 3.2 Further appendices to this report include information on specific items as follows.

Appendix B Proposals for an annual planning process for the programming of traffic management projects.

Appendix C Proposals for a Revised Policy for the Provision of Pedestrian Crossings and Pedestrian Phases at Traffic Signals.

Appendix D Draft Protocol defining the roles and responsibilities of Members and officers in connection with programming, "fast tracking", assessing and implementing traffic management projects.

4. Conclusion

- 4.1 In order to further progress the outcome of the Review, it is recommended that further actions are carried out corresponding to the next steps in **Appendix A**. These actions include consultation on a proposed new policy for the Provision of Pedestrian Crossings and Pedestrian Phases at Traffic Signals, with a view to seeking Cabinet approval of the policy, and a report to Cabinet proposing that it be recommended to Full Council that an appropriate amendment be made to the Council's Constitution to enable officer determination of Traffic Regulation Orders for waiting restrictions of purely local interest.

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

27th October 2005

Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee – 8th November 2005

Best Value Review of Traffic Management - Report on Progress

Service Improvement Actions Including Progress and Next Steps

Best Value Service Improvement Action : Traffic Management	
A	<p>Draft proposals for consideration by the Committee for an annual planning process for the programming of traffic management projects, ensuring that consideration is given:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. To the integration of this process with the annual process currently adopted for other integrated transport projects; b. The development of priority ranking systems to guide decision making; and c. To the possibility of excluding some minor and/or 'urgent' traffic management projects from that process.
Progress to Date	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Proposals have been drafted for integrating revenue-funded traffic management projects in the annual programme of Area Committee seminars for the Transport Capital Programme. In line with point (c.) above, minor schemes and signing/road marking works are to be excluded from that process (see Appendix B). 2. A new policy for assessing and ranking pedestrian crossings has been drafted (see Appendix C). 	
Next Steps	By
1. Include revenue-funded traffic management schemes in Area Committee seminars in 2006.	Early 2006
2. Carry out consultation regarding proposed policy for The Provision of Pedestrian Crossings and Pedestrian Phases at Traffic Signals.	January 2006
3. Report to Cabinet and obtain approval of proposed policy for The Provision of Pedestrian Crossings and Pedestrian Phases at Traffic Signals.	March 2006
Independent Review Mechanism	Report Date
Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee	April 2006

Benefits of Improvements	
<p>An annual process should :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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; • help develop mutual understanding with the public by providing a transparent, readily understandable process and defined timescale for considering requests. 	

Best Value Service Improvement Action : Traffic Management	
B	<p>Draft proposals for consideration by the Committee for 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> <ol 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.
Progress to Date	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Proposals for delegating to officers the powers to determine contested Traffic Regulation Orders of purely local interest have been drafted (see Action E and Appendix D). These proposals include the role of Members. New arrangements are operating for the on-site implementation of minor projects. A schedule of rates, which enables orders to be placed directly with the sign manufacturers for supply and erection work, is now in operation. This has significantly accelerated on-site delivery. 	
Next Steps	
Report to Cabinet recommending referral to full Council for amendment to Council's constitution.	By January 2006.
Independent Review Mechanism	
Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee	Report Date April 2006
Benefits of Improvements	
Streamlining the implementation of minor projects would not just improve delivery but also improve public relations.	

Best Value Service Improvement Action : Traffic Management	
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>

Progress to Date	
<p>It is recommended that systematic assessment of those traffic management projects, which are amenable to simple measures of performance, is carried out. Because there is a need to obtain data <u>before</u> project implementation, as well as after, so that the impact of the scheme can be quantified, data should be routinely obtained for measuring performance of all projects in the following categories</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pedestrian crossings. • Safer Routes to school schemes. • Village speed review schemes. <p>This would be more effective than selecting projects for assessment on an ad hoc basis.</p> <p>A procedure has been drafted. See Appendix D.</p>	
Next Steps	By
To be included in the operating procedures of PTES Department and implemented.	January 2006.
Independent Review Mechanism	Report Date
Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee	April 2006
Benefits of Improvements	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would help to address concerns about uncertainty about the policy being followed in project outcome assessment. • The operation of a procedure would demonstrate the level of success achieved in meeting objectives. 	

Best Value Service Improvement Action : Traffic Management	
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> <ol 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.
Progress to Date	
A procedure has been drafted. See Appendix D .	
Next Steps	By
To be included in the operating procedures of PTES Department and implemented.	January 2006.
Independent Review Mechanism	Report Date
Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee	April 2006

Benefits of Improvements	
Would address the perceived lack of continued ownership during the delivery of projects in cases where delivery depends upon the performance of a number of different bodies.	
Best Value Service Improvement Action : Traffic Management	
E	<p>Draft a protocol for consideration by the Committee defining the roles and responsibilities of Members and officers in connection with:-</p> <ol 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.
Progress to Date	
A procedure for the above has been drafted. See Appendix D .	
Next Steps	By
1. A procedure is to be included in PTES Department operating procedures in connection with programming, "fast tracking", assessing and implementing traffic management projects.	January 2006
2. Report to Cabinet proposing that it be recommended to Full Council that an appropriate amendment be made to the Council's Constitution to enable officer determination of Traffic Regulation Orders for waiting restrictions of purely local interest.	January 2006
Independent Review Mechanism	Report Date
Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee	April 2006
Benefits of Improvements	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An annual planning process – Would provide a more integrated approach to the management of the highway network and provide a better understanding by the public of process and timescales 'Fast track' procedures for the implementation of 'minor' projects - Would provide a better service to customers and improve public relations. The operation of a procedure covering the assessment of traffic management projects would demonstrate the level of success achieved in meeting objectives. A formal project ownership procedure - would address the perceived lack of continued ownership during the delivery of projects in cases where delivery depends upon the performance of a number of officers in different parts of the organisation. 	

Best Value Service Improvement Action : Traffic Management

- | | |
|---|---|
| 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> <ol style="list-style-type: none">a. the development of Intelligent Transport Systems;b. a more consistent approach to the implementation of measures to control speeds on the main road network of urban areas;c. 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). |
|---|---|

Progress to Date

1. A strategy for the development of Intelligent Transport Systems has been included in the 2005 Provisional Local Transport Plan.
2. Consideration has been given to the development of a strategic initiative for reviewing speed limits on the main road network of urban areas, with a particular emphasis on achieving workable 30 mph limits on roads that currently have 40 mph limits. As lower speed limits need to be self-enforcing and as many of the routes have characteristics which encourage speeds much higher than 30 mph, then speed reducing measures would be needed. Resources are currently being focused on the Village Speed Review. It is recommended that the focus should move to the urban areas when that initiative reaches its conclusion towards the end of the new Local Transport Plan.

In the preparation of the 2005 Provisional Local Transport Plan, consideration was given to the possibility of a strategic initiative for the provision of traffic signals. However traffic signals play a significant part of the following strategies included in the 2005 Provisional LTP :-

- Walking Strategy
- Cycling Strategy
- Network Management - Intelligent Transport Systems Strategy
- Bus Strategy
- Network Management - Network Management Duty Strategy

Traffic signals are a key aspect of traffic management, but it was felt that it would be more focussed on achieving transport objectives by deploying and managing them in connection with the above strategies.

3. The policy for the provision of pedestrian crossings and pedestrian phases on traffic signals however has been reviewed. See **Action A** and **Appendix C**.

Best Value Service Improvement Action : Traffic Management	
Action F (Continued)	
Next Steps	By
1. Carry out consultation on proposed policy for The Provision of Pedestrian Crossings and Pedestrian Phases at Traffic Signals.	January 2006
2. Report to Cabinet and obtain approval of proposed policy for The Provision of Pedestrian Crossings and Pedestrian Phases at Traffic Signals.	March 2006
3. Include initiative for measures to control speeds on the main road network of urban areas in the LTP to be submitted to government in March 2006 with a view to implementing the initiative on completion of the rural Speed Review.	March 2006
Independent Review Mechanism	Report Date
Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee	April 2006
Benefits of Improvements	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The adoption of a strategy to integrate intelligent transport systems throughout the County will ensure that resources are shared, not duplicated. A review of speed limits in urban areas would address concerns about the control of vehicle speeds in urban areas. A strategic approach to the provision of pedestrian phases on traffic signals and pedestrian crossings would ensure that such installations are installed in accordance with the overall LTP strategy. 	

Best Value Service Improvement Action : Traffic Management	
G	Investigate the feasibility of a single public contact 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.
Progress to Date	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> It is recommended that those traffic management activities being considered for possible reallocation from Barrack Street to Area Offices (see list in Action H) should also be considered for inclusion in the range of services covered by the County Highways call centre. The functions of existing liaison meetings are to be extended to include multidisciplinary consideration of requests for improvement to the highway network. 	

Next Steps	By
1. Consider the inclusion of the traffic management activities in 1. above in the range of services covered by the County Highways call centre, when the current reviews in County Highways are complete (see Action H).	January 2006
2. Include multidisciplinary consideration of requests for improvement to the highway network in agendas for liaison meetings between the Transport Planning Unit and County Highways, commencing at next meeting.	January 2006
Independent Review Mechanism	Report Date
Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee	April 2006
Benefits of Improvements	
Savings in the use of resources could be achieved. A single public contact point would address problems for the public in knowing who to contact. A multi-disciplinary team could examine issues where the solution is not evident to specialist groups acting alone.	

Best Value Service Improvement Action : Traffic Management	
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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> To making the best overall use of resources and Possible benefits from a local presence, ownership, knowledge and experience.
Progress to Date	
<p>The review has focused on the possibility of transferring the following traffic management activities to the Area Maintenance Teams within County Highways:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Minor permanent Traffic Regulation Orders. Provision of informal disabled persons parking bays. Approval of temporary signing. (<i>already actioned</i>) Control of multi-phase temporary signals. The provision of access markings. Bridge height restriction signs.(ad hoc requests). Minor signs and road markings. Brown tourist signs. (<i>already actioned</i>) <p>There are currently two projects under way in County Highways that are considering the organisation of client Area staff and their operational procedures, including the working arrangements with the maintenance contractor, Carillion. The outcome of these projects may identify areas of work where efficiencies can be achieved, thus providing a possibility for taking on the above functions.</p>	

Next Steps	By
Consider the matter again when the reviews of client Area operational procedures and working arrangements with the maintenance contractor are complete.	January 2006
Independent Review Mechanism	Report Date
Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee	April 2006
Benefits of Improvements	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would achieve a better overall use of resources. • Would benefit in terms of local presence, ownership, knowledge and experience. 	

**Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee –
8th November 2005**

**Best Value Review of Traffic Management – Report on
Progress**

**Proposals for an Annual Planning process for the Programming of
Traffic Management Projects.**

B1. Background

- B1.1 Activity A of the Service Improvement Plan requires the drafting of proposals for consideration by the Committee of an annual planning process for the programming of traffic management projects with consideration to be given to the integration of this process with the annual process currently adopted for other integrated transport projects. Consideration was also to be given to the possibility of excluding some minor and/or urgent traffic management projects from the process.

B2. Current Process for Integrated Transport Capital Schemes

- B2.1 Seminars are held for Area Committees in January/February each year for Members to consider proposals for Local Transport Plan (LTP) capital schemes. Formal endorsement of the draft capital programme to be submitted to Cabinet usually then follows at the March meetings of the Area Committees. There is no formal procedure for this, but the process became well-established during the implementation of the 2000 Local Transport plan.

B3. Scope for Integration of Other Traffic Management Schemes into this Process.

- B3.1 Most traffic management proposals of substance are already considered by Members in this annual process. However, there is scope for integrating the larger revenue-funded schemes in this annual process, and also parking proposals funded by virtual bank borrowing in connection with the project to decriminalise parking enforcement.

B4. Schemes to be Excluded from this Process

- B4.1 It is desirable to exclude minor and/or 'urgent' traffic management projects from this process. It is proposed that revenue-funded traffic management schemes costing £5,000 or less should be excluded. This will permit minor works to be fast-tracked.

B5. Formal Approval of Procedure Not Required

- B5.1 The current practice of presenting the draft programme to informal meetings of Area Committee Members is not based on any formal decision of the County Council, but has become well-established custom and practice. It is a simple matter therefore to expand the scope of the Seminars to include other traffic management schemes.

B6. Next Steps

- B6.1 It is recommended that revenue funded traffic management schemes costing over £5,000 and parking schemes in connection with the decriminalisation of parking enforcement should be included in the next round of Area Committee seminars in early 2006.

Appendix C of Agenda No

**Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee –
8th November 2005**

**Best Value Review of Traffic Management - Report on
Progress**

**Proposals for a Revised Policy for the Provision of Pedestrian Crossings and
Pedestrian Phases at Traffic Signals**

C1. Introduction

- C1.1 This Appendix presents proposals for revisions to the County Council's Policy for the Provision of Pedestrian Crossings. It also includes the provision of pedestrian phases at traffic signals.
- C1.2 Local Transport Note 1/95 and good practice in other highway authorities have been taken into account in developing these proposals.
- C1.3 The likely outcome of adopting these changes would be a greater priority being given to the provision of crossing facilities at locations frequented by children, elderly people and disabled people, and where traffic flows include a significant proportion of heavy goods vehicles. It is also possible that some crossings, which would not have been considered justified under the existing policy, may now be justified.

C2. Current Policy for Pedestrian Crossings

- C2.2 The provision of pedestrian crossings is an area of service provision where the demand far exceeds the resources available. For this reason it is, necessary to be able to compare the levels of justification at various sites so that decisions can then be made in a consistent way and the best value can be obtained from available resources.
- C2.3 Current County Council Policy on the Provision of Pedestrian Crossings was approved by the County Council's former Transportation Committee in January 1992. It was substantially based on the then current guidance from the former Department of Transport (DTp) which recommended criteria based on measuring the degree of conflict between pedestrians crossing a road and traffic on the road by using the number of pedestrians crossing in an hour (P) and the two-way flow of traffic in an hour (v) in the formula $P \times V \times V$ (or PV^2). By this means the relative merits of different types of crossings at various sites could be measured and proposals ranked in order of priority.
- C2.4 This approach is considered to be sound in principle, but has some limitations as it does not take into account factors such as the age and ability of pedestrians, speed and composition of traffic, width of road and the accident record.

C3. Proposed changes to policy

- C3.1 It is still intended to retain the PV² criteria as a basis for considering the need for new crossing, but now the following factors will also be taken into account – the needs of different types of pedestrians (e.g. children, or elderly), vehicle type (e.g. heavy goods vehicles), waiting time to cross the road, width of road, speed limit of the road, and the pedestrian injury accident record. The new factor will be known as the “**adjusted PV² value**”.
- C3.2 A revised policy also needs to recognise legitimate approaches to the provision of crossings which need to coexist with the method of justifying schemes and ranking them on the basis of existing pedestrian demand and vehicle flows. These other approaches are
- a. **Safer Routes to School** – where the aim is to encourage modal shift i.e. more children walking to school with less reliance on the car.
 - b. **Local Safety Schemes** – where the rate of return from likely casualty savings is sufficient to justify the expenditure on a crossing.
 - c. **Developer-funded schemes** – where crossing facilities are required to mitigate anticipated traffic impact of developments and/or anticipated increases in pedestrian flows.
 - d. **Facilities installed on Quality Pedestrian Corridors** – where crossing facilities may be considered as part of a package of measures on a strategic walking corridor.

C4. Proposed revised criteria for justifying pedestrian crossings

- C4.1 To justify a **refuge**, the adjusted PV² value should be greater than 0.4×10^8 , but the minimal width of road needs to be 7.8m.
- C4.2 To justify a **zebra crossing**, the adjusted PV² value should be greater than 0.6×10^8 , but a zebra crossing should not be installed on roads with an 85-percentile speed of 35 m.p.h. or above and the two-way traffic flow should be less than 500 vehicles/hour.
- C4.3 To justify a **signalled-controlled** crossing (Puffin or Toucan), the adjusted PV² value should be greater than 0.9×10^8 . Current national guidelines indicate that it is not advisable to install a signalled controlled crossing where the 85th percentile speed is greater than 50 mph.

C5. Upgrading existing zebra crossings

- C5.1 Investigations carried out in the County show that the average rate of pedestrian injury accidents at zebra crossings is 0.2 accidents per year, and the average rate at Pelican / Puffin crossings is 0.6 accidents per year. It is proposed that that a zebra crossing should be converted to Puffin crossing only when a worse than average pedestrian injury record is likely to be improved.

C6. Provision of a pedestrian phase at existing traffic signal controlled junctions

- C6.1 At traffic signal controlled junctions, pedestrians can cross most easily when traffic is stopped on the road they wish to cross. The greatest danger is from traffic turning into that road. However, it is appreciated that vulnerable road users find this judgment difficult to make.
- C6.2 It is therefore proposed that the need for a pedestrian phase at an existing traffic signal junction will be investigated in a similar manner to the criteria for justifying a pedestrian crossing.
- C6.3 It should be noted that providing a pedestrian phase reduces the time available for traffic and at busy junctions this can result in long queues of vehicles. For this reason each junction needs to be considered individually.

C7. Prioritising Schemes

- C7.1 As with current practice schemes which are justified will be added to the Minor Improvements list for future funding from the Capital Programme. The list will contain those schemes which are justified in order of priority, plus a reserve list of those schemes which just fall short of the criteria. Priority may be given to those schemes that have been awaiting funding for more than three years.

C8. Technical Details – Determining the Adjusted PV^2 Value

- C8.1 Currently, the County Council's policy recommends that the degree of conflict between pedestrians crossing the road and the traffic flow should be measured. The number of pedestrians crossing the road (P) and the two-way traffic flow (V) in an hour are used in the formula PV^2 . The values used for P and V are the average of the four busiest hours in the day (between 7 am and 7 pm).
- C8.2 The remaining paragraphs in this Appendix provide technical details describing how the adjusted PV^2 value should be determined in accordance with the revised approach.

C9. Weighting factors for Pedestrians and vehicles

- C9.1 When pedestrian and vehicle count surveys are carried out, the pedestrians are classified by their age and an indication of whether they are physically disabled. The vehicle flow should be classified by vehicle type.
- C9.2 The number of pedestrians is weighted by composition, P_{mod} , as follows:

type of pedestrian	multiplying factor
Child <16	1.25
Adult	1
Elderly	2
Disabled	3

C9.3 It is proposed to calculate the number of vehicles as PCUs (passenger car units), V_{mod} . This weights the number of vehicles to take into account the differences between cars, HGVs, buses, motorcycles and pedal cycles. The weightings are as follows:

type of vehicle	multiplying factor
Cars	1
Light goods vehicles	2
Bus	2
Heavy goods vehicles	2.5
Motorcycles	1*
Pedal cycles	1*

* Since these impact on pedestrians in the same way as cars, the PCUs are up-rated to reflect this.

C9.4 The above should be used to calculate the initial value of PV_{mod}^2 . The paragraphs below describe the following factors then to be applied to the value of PV_{mod}^2 :

- Waiting time factor (T) (para. C10.1)
- Road width weighting factor (W) (para. C11.1)
- Speed limit weighting factor (S) (para. C12.1)
- Pedestrian injury accident record factor (A) (para. C13.1)

C10. Waiting Time

C10.1 The waiting time factor (T), is based on an average pedestrian waiting time, which is observation on-site during the peak hours and the multiplying factor is as follows:

waiting time	multiplying factor
Less than or equal to 20 seconds	1.00
21 seconds to 30 seconds	1.20
31 seconds to 40 seconds	1.25
More than 40 seconds	1.30

C11. Width of Road (W)

C11.1 The road width weighting factor (W), is based on a standard 7.3m road and the multiplying factor by dividing the road width by 7.3m i.e. $(\frac{\text{road width}}{7.3})$.

C12. Speed Limit (S)

C12.1 The speed limit weighting factor (S), is based on the speed limit and the multiplying factor is as follows:

speed limit of the road	multiplying factor
20 mph speed limit	0.8
30 mph speed limit	1.0
40 mph speed limit	1.2
50 mph speed limit	1.3

C13. Accident Record

C13.1 The pedestrian injury accident record at a site over the previous three years is taken into account in the following formula:

$$A = 1 + \frac{N}{10}, \text{ where } N \text{ is the number of accidents.}$$

C14. How the adjusted PV^2 Value is to be Calculated

C14.1 For each hour between 7 am and 7 pm the weighted **PV^2 mod** value is calculated by multiplying the weighted number of pedestrians by the weighted number of vehicles squared, i.e. $P_{\text{mod}} \times V_{\text{mod}} \times V_{\text{mod}}$.

C14.2 The **PV^2 mod** figures are ranked in order and the top four figures are dividing by four to obtain the **average PV^2 mod** value (representing the four busiest hours of the day).

C14.3 The adjusted PV^2 value is obtained by multiplying the average PV^2 value by the pedestrian waiting time, width of road, speed limit and accident record. Hence the adjusted PV^2 value is calculated as follows:

$$\underline{\text{Adjusted } PV^2 = \text{average } PV^2 \text{ mod value} \times T \times W \times S \times A}$$

**Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee –
8th November 2005**

**Best Value Review of Traffic Management - Report on
Progress**

**Draft Procedure for Programming, “fast tracking”, Assessing and Implementing
Traffic Management Projects.**

D1. Introduction

D1.1 The following draft procedure is in connection with **Action E** of the Service Improvement Plan. It defines the roles and responsibilities of Members and officers in connection with programming, “fast tracking”, assessing and implementing traffic management projects. It is in four parts, which contain outcomes from **Actions A to D** of the Service Improvement Plan, as follows.

1. An annual planning process for the programming of traffic management projects (**Action A**);
2. ‘Fast track’ procedure for the implementation of ‘minor’ projects (**Action B**);
3. The assessment of traffic management projects (**Action C**); and
4. Project ownership during all stages of project implementation (**Action D**).

D1.2 Parts 1, 3 and 4 can be implemented without any change to formal policies or procedures of the County Council. However Part 2 requires an amendment to the Constitution of the County Council as it proposes a change to the delegated powers for determining Traffic Regulation Orders.

D2. Part 1 - An annual planning process for the programming of traffic management projects

D2.1 Seminars are held for Area Committee Members in January/February each year for Members to consider proposals for LTP capital schemes. Formal endorsement of the draft capital programme to be submitted to Cabinet usually then follows at the March meetings of the Area Committees.

D2.2 Most traffic management proposals of substance are already considered by Members in this annual process. However there is scope for integrating the larger revenue-funded schemes in this annual process, together with parking proposals funded by virtual bank borrowing in connection with the project to decriminalise parking enforcement.

D2.3 It is desirable to exclude minor and/or ‘urgent’ traffic management projects from this process. It is proposed that revenue-funded traffic management schemes

costing £5,000 or less should be excluded. This will permit minor works to be fast-tracked.

- D2.4 Revenue-funded traffic management schemes and parking schemes in connection with decriminalisation of parking enforcement should be included in the next round of Area Committee seminars in early 2006 and in seminars held in subsequent years.

D3. **Part 2 - 'Fast track' procedure for the implementation of 'minor' projects**

- D3.1 The County Council's Constitution (Part 2 Section 10) gives the Director of Planning, Transport and Economic Strategy delegated power to recommend to the County Solicitor to make Traffic Regulation Orders in the event of no objections being received.

- D3.2 No such delegated power exists when objections are received and in these circumstances the matter must be reported to the appropriate Area Committee for a decision. This procedure is considered to be entirely appropriate for substantial traffic management schemes or proposals which are of more than purely local significance. However there can be a perception of poor service when very minor proposals (e.g. double yellow lines on corner radii at junctions) are delayed by this process.

- D3.3 Action B of the Service Improvement Plan requires proposals for "the delegation to officers of the powers to determine contested Traffic Regulation Orders of purely local interest".

- D3.4 It is proposed to define "proposals of purely local interest" as proposals for waiting restrictions on short lengths of carriageway or for junction protection, where the impact of the restriction is confined to adjacent properties, and for extensions to existing speed limits. It is not proposed for this to apply to new speed limits or weight/width restriction orders.

- D3.5 Where objections are received to Traffic Regulation Orders which have been identified as of purely local interest, it is proposed that the Director of Planning, Transport and Economic Strategy be given delegated power to recommend to make the Orders subject to having considered the objections and the views of the appropriate local Member(s). In these circumstances, it is proposed that the Chair of the appropriate Area Committee should be advised of the intention to make the Orders and that the Chair be given the right to call-in the decision to a meeting of the Area Committee, within ten working days of being advised of the Director's recommendation.

- D3.6 The proposal in paragraph D3.5 above requires an amendment to the County Council's constitution.

- D.3.7 Involving the local Member will be crucial when developing proposals for "fast track" process. The onus will be on the officer concerned to consult the local member when minor Traffic Regulation Orders are being considered and to take into account the views of the local Member on the proposals. The officer will advise the local Member regarding any objections received and consider and

record the Member's view as to whether the Order should be made. The latter information will inform the Director's decision as to whether to recommend the making of the Order.

D4. **Part 3 - The assessment of traffic management projects**

D4.1 Systematic assessment of all traffic management projects, which are amenable to simple measures of performance, is to be carried out. There is a need to obtain data before project implementation, as well as after, so that the impact of the scheme can be quantified. Data should be routinely obtained for measuring performance of all projects in the following categories

- Pedestrian crossings.
- Safer Routes to School schemes.
- Village Speed Review schemes.

D4.2 The following table shows the method to be adopted for assessing the performance of schemes in each category.

Category	Performance measure(s)	Source of data
Pedestrian crossings	Increase in number of pedestrians crossing at the location. Reduction in pedestrian casualties (if applicable) over a three-year period	Pedestrian count surveys (before and after) Police injury accident data
Safer Routes to School schemes	Reduction in numbers of children travelling to or from school by car	Annual School Travel Survey
Village Speed Review schemes	Reduction in 85 th percentile vehicle speed. Degree of compliance with speed limit .	Speed surveys (before and after).

D5. **Part 4 - Project ownership during all stages of project implementation**

D5.1 **Improving Project Ownership.** There can be issues of a perceived lack of continued ownership during the delivery of traffic management projects because delivery depends upon the performance of a number of different parts of the organisation

- those planning the project;
- those carrying out detailed design;
- those physically implementing the project on site.

D5.2 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 should be clarified by the adoption of

formal, standardised handover documents when a project is transferred that define outstanding issues and ongoing responsibilities.

D.5.3 Responsibilities It is proposed that the Project Planner will retain overall control and responsibility for delivery of the project, including

- ensuring that funds are allocated to the project
- taking the project through the necessary legal and committee procedures
- keeping elected members and other interested parties informed of progress

D.5.4 At an early stage, a handover document in the form of a Briefing Note will be prepared and agreed. This will define the responsibilities of each party and state the budget allocated and proposed timescale for completion of the project.

D.5.5 During the implementation stage, it is important that the local Member is briefed of proposals for anything that may adversely affect road users or residents such as temporary traffic management or unanticipated problems. In these circumstances the member of staff with direct responsibility for operations on site should appraise the local Member and the Project Planner of the situation. The member of staff with direct responsibility for operations on site should identify themselves to the local Member so that any concerns or complaints about the works can be communicated and dealt with quickly and effectively.

D5.6 Communication between the project planner, the detailed designer and the site supervisor is important and regular meetings should be held to track progress, but immediate contact should be made if the scheme threatens to exceed budget or timescale or if other serious problems are encountered.

D6. Conclusion

D6.1 As the implementation of the principles contained in Parts 1,3 and 4 above requires no changes to formal policies or procedures of the County Council, it is recommended that they should be incorporated into the Operating Procedures of PTES Department. Part 2, however, requires an amendment to the Constitution of the County Council. It is proposed, therefore to ask the County Solicitor, to draft an amendment to the Constitution embodying the principles outlined in Part 2, for consideration initially by Cabinet.