

**AGENDA MANAGEMENT SHEET**

**Name of Committee** Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee

**Date of Committee** 27th April 2006

**Report Title** Best Value Review of Traffic Management - Report On Progress

**Summary** This interim 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 asks the Committee to endorse the actions completed to date and to agree to formally conclude the Review when the one outstanding item is completed.

**For further information please contact** Jonathan Simkins  
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** 2006 Local Transport Plan

**CONSULTATION ALREADY UNDERTAKEN:-** *Details to be specified*

Other Committees  Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee  
22nd March 2005 and 8th November 2005,  
Cabinet 26th May 2005.

Local Member(s)  .....  
(With brief comments, if appropriate)

Other Elected Members  Councillor K Browne } for information  
Councillor Mrs E Goode }  
Councillor Mrs J Lea }

All Members were consulted regarding the proposed Policy on Provision of Pedestrian Crossings.

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

Councillor M Heatley – for information.

Chief Executive

.....

Legal

.....

Finance

.....

Other Chief Officers

.....

District Councils

All five Districts consulted on Pedestrian Crossing Policy.

Health Authority

.....

Police

Consulted on Pedestrian Crossing Policy

Other Bodies/Individuals

Pedestrian Crossing Policy - Extensive consultation of organisations representing pedestrians, disabled people, senior citizens, motorists, cyclists, businesses plus emergency services and local Members of Parliament.

**FINAL DECISION**

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

**SUGGESTED NEXT STEPS :**

*Details to be specified*

Further consideration by this Committee

.....

To Council

.....

To Cabinet

Report on delegation of minor Traffic Regulation Order powers 25th May 2006.

To an O & S Committee

.....

To an Area Committee

.....

Further Consultation

.....

**Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee –  
27th April 2006**

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

**Report of the Strategic Director of  
Environment and Economy**

**Recommendation**

That the Committee:-

1. Endorses the actions taken to complete Actions A and C to H of the Service Improvement Plan; and
2. Confirms that the Best Value Review can be considered concluded when Action B (delegated powers to officers to determine minor traffic orders) is complete.

**1. Introduction**

- 1.1 This interim 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 asks the Committee to endorse the actions completed to date.

**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.
- 2.4 A further report was presented to this Committee on 8th November 2005 advising on the progress of the actions in the Service Improvement Plan. It recommended the next steps to be taken to further progress the Plan. Further steps proposed included 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 minor Traffic Regulation Orders. The Committee endorsed the actions proposed in the "Next Steps" in the report except that the above proposals for delegation to officers should confer the right to "call-in" a Traffic Regulation Order for determination by the Area Committee on the local County Councillor instead of the Chair of the Committee.

### **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. Actions A and C to H are complete. Action B is the one remaining item. It involves the delegation to officers of the power to determine contested minor Traffic Orders. A report is due to be presented to Cabinet on 25th May 2006 regarding the delegation proposals. Subject to the support of this committee, it is anticipated that establishing the delegated powers will formally conclude the Best Value Review.

3.2 Further appendices to this report include information on specific items as follows:-

**Appendix B** Consultation on Policy for The Provision of Pedestrian Crossings and Pedestrian Phases at Traffic Signals – List of Consultees.

**Appendix C** Approved Policy for The Provision of Pedestrian Crossings and Pedestrian Phases at Traffic Signals

**Appendix D** Quality Procedure for The Assessment of Outcomes of Traffic Management Schemes (QP306)

**Appendix E** Quality Procedure for The Ownership of Traffic Management Projects (QP307)

**Appendix F** Quality Procedure for Programming and Fast Tracking of Traffic Management Projects. (QP308)

#### **4. Conclusion**

- 4.1 Most of the actions of the Best Value Review are now substantially complete with completion of the one remaining action anticipated in May 2006 when it is planned to obtain approval for the proposed delegated powers to determine minor Traffic Orders. It is recommended that the Committee endorses the Service Improvement Plan Actions completed to date and agrees to conclude the review when the one outstanding item is completed.

JOHN DEEGAN  
Strategic Director of Environment and Economy  
Shire Hall  
Warwick

19th April 2006

**Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee –  
27th April 2006**

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

**Service Improvement Actions**

**Summary of Progress**

<b>Action</b>	<b>Brief Description</b>	<b>Status</b>
A	Annual planning process, priority ranking systems.	Completed.
B	Fast track procedures for minor projects including delegation to officers of the power to determine contested minor Traffic Orders.	To be considered at Cabinet on 25th May 2006.
C	Assessment of outcomes of traffic management projects.	Completed.
D	Project ownership	Completed
E	Protocol for annual planning process, fast tracking of minor projects and project assessment.	Completed with exception of action included in B above.
F	Traffic management initiatives in the Local Transport Plan.	Completed.
G	Investigate single contact arrangements and a multidisciplinary team to examine cross-cutting requests.	Completed.
H	Review allocation of traffic management activities between the Barrack Street and Area Offices.	Completed.

The pages following in this Appendix contain details of individual Actions A – H with progress in relation to actions agreed at Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 8th November 2005.

## Action A – COMPLETED

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"> <li>a. To the integration of this process with the annual process currently adopted for other integrated transport projects;</li> <li>b. The development of priority ranking systems to guide decision making; and</li> <li>c. To the possibility of excluding some minor and/or 'urgent' traffic management projects from that process.</li> </ol>
Actions agreed at Environment O&S Committee on 8th November 2005	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Include revenue-funded traffic management schemes in Area Committee seminars in 2006.</li> <li>2. Carry out consultation regarding proposed policy for The Provision of Pedestrian Crossings and Pedestrian Phases at Traffic Signals.</li> <li>3. Report to Cabinet and obtain approval of proposed policy for The Provision of Pedestrian Crossings and Pedestrian Phases at Traffic Signals.</li> </ol>	<p>Early 2006.</p> <p>January 2006.</p> <p>March 2006</p>
Progress since Environment O&S Committee on 8th November 2005	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Revenue-funded traffic management schemes were included as appropriate in Area Committee seminars in January/February 2006.</li> <li>2. An extensive consultation regarding the draft policy for The Provision of Pedestrian Crossings and Pedestrian Phases at Traffic Signals was carried out (See <b>Appendix B</b>) Adjustments to the policy were made following the consultation. The proposed policy with associated technical procedure was reported to Cabinet on 6th April 2006 and approved. The new policy (see <b>Appendix C</b>) is now operational. The policy has been written in a simple style that will enable it to be presented in an information leaflet and on the Warwickshire Web.</li> </ol>	
Next Steps	By
None required.	N/A.
Independent Review Mechanism	Report Date
Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee.	No further reporting required.
Benefits of Improvements	
<p>An annual process should :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• Help develop mutual understanding with the public by providing a transparent, readily understandable process and defined timescale for considering requests.</li> </ul>	

## Action B – NOT COMPLETED

<b>Best Value Service Improvement Action : Traffic Management</b>	
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"> <li>a. To the delegation to officers of the powers to determine contested Traffic Regulation Orders of purely local interest;</li> <li>b. 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</li> <li>c. The introduction of new, discrete arrangements for the on-site implementation of such projects.</li> </ol>
<b>Actions agreed at Environment O&amp;S Committee on 8th November 2005</b>	
<p>Report to Cabinet proposing the delegation to officers of the powers to determine contested Traffic Regulation Orders of purely local interest, recommending referral to Full Council for an amendment to the Council's constitution. <i>(NB – Environment O&amp;S Committee endorsed proposal for delegation of powers except that the proposal should confer the right to "call-in" a Traffic Regulation Order for determination by the Area Committee on the local County Councillor instead of the Chair of the Committee.)</i></p>	<p>January 2006.</p>
<b>Progress since Environment O&amp;S Committee on 8th November 2005</b>	
<p>Proposed delegation powers drafted and report in preparation for Cabinet for 25th May 2006.</p> <p>The proposed powers to determine minor Traffic Orders to be delegated by Cabinet to the Strategic Director will not remove or tamper with the existing powers of Area Committees to determine Traffic Orders. There will be a limitation on the authority of the Strategic Director, which means that the objection of the local County Councillor will kill the power of the Director to determine an Order so that the decision can only be made by Area Committee.</p> <p>It has now been confirmed that Cabinet has authority to make the proposed delegation and that referral to Council will not be necessary.</p>	
<b>Next Steps</b>	<b>By</b>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Report to Cabinet recommending delegation of powers to the Strategic Director of Environment and Economy.</li> </ol>	<p>25th May 2006.</p>
<b>Independent Review Mechanism</b>	<b>Report Date</b>
<p>Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee.</p>	<p>No further reporting proposed.</p>
<b>Benefits of Improvements</b>	
<p>Streamlining the implementation of minor projects should not just improve delivery but also improve public relations.</p>	



## Action C - COMPLETED

<b>Best Value Service Improvement Action : Traffic Management</b>	
C	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.
<b>Actions agreed at Environment O&amp;S Committee on 8th November 2005</b>	
Procedure for assessment of the outcomes of pedestrian crossing, Safer Routes and Village Speed Review schemes to be included in the operating procedures of the then Planning, Transport and Economic Strategy (PTES) Department and implemented.	January 2006.
<b>Progress since Environment O&amp;S Committee on 8th November 2005</b>	
Procedure (see <b>Appendix D</b> ) included in the Quality Procedures of the Environment and Economy Directorate and implemented.	
<b>Next Steps</b>	<b>By</b>
None required.	N/A.
<b>Independent Review Mechanism</b>	<b>Report Date</b>
Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee.	No further reporting required.
<b>Benefits of Improvements</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should help to address concerns about uncertainty about the policy being followed in project outcome assessment.</li> <li>• The operation of a procedure should demonstrate the level of success achieved in meeting objectives.</li> </ul>	

## Action D - COMPLETED

<b>Best Value Service Improvement Action : Traffic Management</b>	
D	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:- <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. To those aspects of project ownership that need to be maintained by the original project planner; and</li> <li>b. 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.</li> </ol>
<b>Actions agreed at Environment O&amp;S Committee on 8th November 2005</b>	
Procedure for project ownership to be included in the operating procedures of PTES Department and implemented.	January 2006.
<b>Progress since Environment O&amp;S Committee on 8th November 2005</b>	
Procedure (see <b>Appendix E</b> ) included in the Quality Procedures of the Environment and Economy Directorate and implemented.	
<b>Next Steps</b>	<b>By</b>
None required.	N/A.
<b>Independent Review Mechanism</b>	<b>Report Date</b>
Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee.	No further reporting required.
<b>Benefits of Improvements</b>	
Should 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.	

## Action E – COMPLETED

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"> <li>a. An annual planning process for the programming of traffic management projects;</li> <li>b. The development of ‘fast track’ procedures for the implementation of ‘minor’ projects;</li> <li>c. A formal procedure covering the assessment of traffic management projects; and</li> <li>d. A formal procedure to ensure there is a clear understanding during all stages of project implementation of project ownership.</li> </ol>
Actions agreed at Environment O&S Committee on 8th November 2005	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A procedure is to be included in PTES Department operating procedures in connection with programming, “fast tracking”, assessing and implementing traffic management projects.</li>   <li>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.</li> </ol>	<p>January 2006.</p> <p>Now included in Action B.</p>
Progress since Environment O&S Committee on 8th November 2005	
<p>Procedure for Programming and Fast Tracking of Traffic Management Projects (see <b>Appendix F</b>) included in the Quality Procedures of the Environment and Economy Directorate and implemented.</p> <p>Delegation to officers now included in Action B.</p>	
Benefits of Improvements	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• ‘Fast track’ procedures for the implementation of ‘minor’ projects - Would provide a better service to customers and improve public relations.</li> <li>• The operation of a procedure covering the assessment of traffic management projects would demonstrate the level of success achieved in meeting objectives.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	

## Action F - COMPLETED

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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. the development of Intelligent Transport Systems;</li> <li>b. a more consistent approach to the implementation of measures to control speeds on the main road network of urban areas;</li> <li>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).</li> </ul>
Actions agreed at Environment O&S Committee on 8th November 2005	
1.	Carry out consultation on proposed policy for The Provision of Pedestrian Crossings and Pedestrian Phases at Traffic Signals. <span style="float: right;">January 2006.</span>
2.	Report to Cabinet and obtain approval of proposed policy for The Provision of Pedestrian Crossings and Pedestrian Phases at Traffic Signals. <span style="float: right;">March 2006.</span>
3.	Include initiative for measures to control speeds on the main road network of urban areas in the Local Transport Plan (LTP) to be submitted to government in March 2006 with a view to implementing the initiative on completion of the rural Speed Review. <span style="float: right;">March 2006.</span>
Progress since Environment O&S Committee on 8th November 2005	
<p>1. An extensive consultation regarding the draft policy for The Provision of Pedestrian Crossings and Pedestrian Phases at Traffic Signals was carried out (See <b>Appendix B</b>) Adjustments to the policy were made following the consultation.</p> <p>2. The proposed policy with associated technical procedure was reported to Cabinet on 6th April 2006 and approved. The new policy (see <b>Appendix C</b>) is now operational. The policy has been written in a simple style that will enable it to be presented in an information leaflet and on the Warwickshire Web.</p> <p>3. A future initiative for measures to control speeds on the main road network of urban areas was included in the Local Transport Plan approved by Council on 14th March 2006.</p>	
Next Steps	By
None required.	N/A.
Independent Review Mechanism	Report Date
Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee.	No further reporting required.

### **Benefits of Improvements**

- 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.

## Action G - COMPLETED

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.
Actions agreed at Environment O&S Committee on 8th November 2005	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Consider the inclusion of those traffic management activities being considered for possible reallocation from Barrack Street to Area Offices (see list in <b>Action H</b>) in the range of services covered by the County Highways call centre.</li> <li>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.</li> </ol>	<p>January 2006.</p> <p>January 2006.</p>
Progress since Environment O&S Committee on 8th November 2005	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The functions of the County Highways call centre are now being transferred to the corporate call centre. Three-way discussion has taken between Traffic Projects Group, the Performance and Development Directorate's Business Consultancy and the corporate Customer Service Centre. It has been concluded that it is both desirable and feasible to incorporate the above traffic management activities into the call centre subject to (a) funding being available, (b) the completion of the transfer of the County Highways call centre and (c) the necessary process mapping being undertaken.</li> <li>2. It has been agreed to convene a sub-group of the Transport Planning/County Highways Liaison Group for multidisciplinary consideration of improvements to the highways network as and when required, particularly where the solution is not evident to specialist groups acting alone.</li> </ol>	
Next Steps	By
None required.	N/A.
Independent Review Mechanism	Report Date
Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee.	No further reporting required.
Benefits of Improvements	
<p>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.</p> <p>A multi-disciplinary team could examine issues where the solution is not evident to specialist groups acting alone.</p>	

## Action H - COMPLETED

Best Value Service Improvement Action : Traffic Management	
H	<p>Complete a review for the then Director of the Planning, Transport and Economic Strategy 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"> <li>a. To making the best overall use of resources, and</li> <li>b. Possible benefits from a local presence, ownership, knowledge and experience.</li> </ol>
Actions agreed at Environment O&S Committee on 8th November 2005	
<p>Consider transferring the following traffic management activities to the Area Maintenance Teams within County Highways when the reviews of client Area operational procedures and working arrangements with the maintenance contractor are complete:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Minor permanent Traffic Regulation Orders.</li> <li>2. Provision of informal disabled persons parking bays.</li> <li>3. Approval of temporary signing. (<i>already actioned</i>).</li> <li>4. Control of multi-phase temporary signals.</li> <li>5. The provision of access markings.</li> <li>6. Bridge height restriction signs.(ad hoc requests).</li> <li>7. Minor signs and road markings.</li> <li>8. Brown tourist signs.</li> </ol>	<p>January 2006.</p>
Progress since Environment O&S Committee on 8th November 2005	
<p>Agreement has been reached to transfer these functions from Traffic Projects to the five Area Teams. The review of these traffic management activities is therefore complete. Functions are being transferred gradually by arrangement between the operational managers concerned. In the transition, training and technical support for these functions is being provided by Traffic Projects Group as required for the Area Teams.</p>	
Next Steps	By
None required.	N/A.
Independent Review Mechanism	Report Date
Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee.	No further reporting required.
Benefits of Improvements	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should achieve a better overall use of resources.</li> <li>• Should benefit in terms of local presence, ownership, knowledge and experience.</li> </ul>	

**Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee  
27th April 2006**

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

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

**List of Organisations and Individuals Consulted**

- All Members of Warwickshire County Council
- Midlands Traffic Signal Service Improvement Group
- 5 Members of Parliament (Mike O'Brien, Bill Oler, Jeremy Wright, John Maples & James Plaskitt)
- Stratford-upon-Avon Town Centre Manager - Mr Andrew Cooper
- Rugby Town Centre Company - Mr Robin Richter
- Warwick District Council – Mr Ian Coker
- Nuneaton and Bedworth Town Centre Manager - Mr Alan Ottey
- Warwick Town Centre Business Development Manager - Mr Adrian Field
- North Warwickshire Borough Council - Borough Secretary
- North Warwickshire Borough Council - Borough Technical Officer
- Nuneaton & Bedworth Borough Council - Planning & Development Manager
- Rugby Borough Council Department of Technical Services
- Stratford-on-Avon District Council - Chief Technical Officer
- Warwick District Council - The Head of Engineering
- Warwickshire Constabulary - The Chief Constable
- Warwickshire Fire and Rescue Service - The County Fire Officer
- Nuneaton Ambulance Station - Mr R Moore
- West Midlands Ambulance Service - The Chief Ambulance Officer
- Automobile Association Developments Limited
- RAC Live
- National Framers Union - Mr P Tame
- The Road Haulage Association Limited Midland & Western Region
- Freight Transport Association - The Regional Secretary
- Cyclist's Touring Club, Nuneaton - Mr I Bonner
- WCC Countryside Recreation - Mr Paul Williams
- Coventry and Warwickshire Disabled Drivers' Association - Mrs N Lewis
- Council of Disabled People
- Disabled Drivers Association - Mrs N Lewis
- Guide Dogs for the Blind Association Midland Region Training Centre



- Living Streets Leamington - Janet Alty
- Senior Peoples Forum - Mr K Hope
- Warwickshire & West Midlands Association of Local Councils - Mrs A Hodge
- Warwickshire Association for the Blind George Marshall Centre at Canalside
- Ramblers Association Area Secretary - Mr S Wallsgrove
- DIAL - Ms Mary Beaumont
- Stratford-upon-Avon & District Chamber of Trade – Ms Gloria Parker
- Coventry & Warwickshire Chamber of Commerce - Mrs Clare Newell
- Leamington Spa Chamber of Trade – Mr John Curtis
- Nuneaton Business Alliance – Secretary - Karen Little

**Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee –  
27th April 2006**

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

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

(As Approved by Cabinet – 6th April 2006)

**(1) The Policy**

**1. Introduction**

- 1.1 This policy explains how requests for new pedestrian crossings will be considered by the County Council's Environment and Economy Directorate.
- 1.2 The demand for new crossings far exceeds the County Council's ability to provide funding. For this reason we will compare the need at requested sites, so that decisions can be made in a consistent way and best value obtained from the available resources.

**2. Safety**

- 2.1 We will consider safety first, so we will only assess the need for crossings at locations where the appropriate design standards for safety can be met.

**3. How we will Assess the Need for a Pedestrian Crossing**

- 3.1 We will assess the level of need for a requested crossing by:-
- (i) Measuring the degree of conflict between pedestrians crossing the road and the two-way traffic flow; and
- (ii) We will also take into account the following factors:-
- the age and ability of pedestrians;
  - the different types of vehicles in the flow of traffic;
  - the length of time pedestrians have to wait to cross;
  - the width of the road;
  - the speed of traffic, and
  - the pedestrian injury accident record at the site.

## **4. The survey**

4.1 If the safety requirements for a crossing can be satisfied then we will measure the conflict between the traffic and pedestrians by carrying out a 12-hour survey which will count:-

- the number of pedestrians crossing in an hour (P)
- the flow of vehicles in both directions in an hour (V)

4.2 Our assessment will be based on the average of the four busiest hours in the day (between 7 am and 7 pm). When the survey are carried out, the pedestrians will be classified by their age and ability; and the vehicles will be classified by vehicle type so that we can take into account the differences between cars, heavy goods vehicles, buses, motorcycles and pedal cycles.

## **5. The Appropriate Type of Crossing**

5.1 We will use the information gathered in the survey and the various factors listing in 3.2 to determine whether a crossing should be provided and which type of crossing (if any) is appropriate at the site.

5.2 There are three main types of crossing - a refuge, a Zebra crossing or a signal-controlled crossing (usually a Puffin). The type of crossing to be provided will also be subject to engineering considerations (e.g. there must be sufficient width to fit in a refuge).

5.3 To justify a signal-controlled crossing, such as a Puffin, it will be necessary to demonstrate a much higher level of need than a refuge. We will consider a Zebra crossing at the intermediate level of need.

## **6. Upgrading a Zebra Crossing to a Puffin Crossing**

6.1 Generally the pedestrian accident rate at Zebra crossings is lower than at Puffin crossings. However a Zebra crossing may be considered for conversion to a Puffin crossing, when a worse than average pedestrian injury record is likely to be improved.

6.2 We may also consider upgrading a Zebra crossing to a Puffin crossing as part of a wider traffic management scheme linked to the County Council's Urban Traffic Control System in appropriate circumstances.

## **7. Provision of Pedestrian Phases at Traffic Signals**

7.1 We will investigate the need for a pedestrian phase at an existing traffic signal junction in a similar way to a stand-alone pedestrian crossing. However, 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 will be considered individually.

## 8. The Priority List

- 8.1 We will include a justified crossing in a list, ranked by the level of need, for future funding. The list will be used annually to inform the selection of schemes to be included in the County Council's capital programme.

## 9. Other Circumstances Where Crossings will be Provided or Upgraded

- 9.1 This policy describes the way in which we will consider requests for new crossings based on surveys of existing pedestrian and vehicle flows. There are four alternative approaches to providing crossings in the County Council's Local Transport Plan in addition to this policy. We will continue to use these approaches.

- **Safer Routes to School** – where the aim is to encourage more children to walk to school with less use of the car.
- **Casualty Reduction Schemes** – where the rate of return from likely casualty savings is sufficient to justify the expenditure on a crossing.
- **Developer-funded schemes** – where crossing facilities are required to mitigate anticipated traffic impact of developments and/or anticipated increases in pedestrian flows.
- **Facilities installed on Quality Pedestrian Corridors** – where crossing facilities may be considered as part of a package of measures on a strategic walking corridor.

## 10. The Technical Procedure

- 10.1 A procedure covering the technical details of the operation of this policy is maintained by the Council's Head of Transport and Highways.
- 10.2 The content of this procedure may be reviewed and updated by the Head of Transport and Highways, but it is to be expected that the same technical process will be used to assess all schemes during an annual funding cycle.

# Policy for the Provision of Pedestrian Crossings and Pedestrian Phases at Traffic Signals

## (2) Technical Procedure

### 1. Introduction

- 1.1 This procedure covers the technical details of operation of the Council's Policy for the Provision of Pedestrian Crossings and Pedestrian Phases at Traffic Signals (hereinafter referred to as "the Policy"). This document must be read in conjunction with the Policy.

### 2. Survey

- 2.1 The survey for obtaining values of P and V as described in the Policy shall take place along the stretch of road approximately 50 metres either side of the requested location. If the weather deteriorates during the survey, arrangements will be made to carry out a survey on another day.
- 2.2 When pedestrian surveys are carried out, the pedestrians will be classified by their age and an indication of whether they are physically disabled.

### 3. Determining the Level of Need for a Pedestrian Crossing

- 3.1 The level of need will be determined by calculating the degree of conflict between pedestrians crossing the road and the two-way traffic flow as described in the paragraphs below.
- 3.2 The degree of conflict used will be **the adjusted  $PV^2$  value** calculated as follows.

$P_{mod}$  = the number of pedestrians crossing in an hour (P) weighted by age and ability in accordance with the table below

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

The multiplying factor for cyclist is 1 and for equestrian is 3.

$V_{mod}$  = the flow of traffic in PCUs (passenger car units) in an hour calculated from the survey data using the weightings in the table below:-

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

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

- 3.3 For each hour between 7 am and 7 pm the weighted  $P_{mod} V_{mod}^2$  value is calculated by multiplying the weighted number of pedestrians by the weighted number of vehicles squared, i.e.  $P_{mod} \times V_{mod} \times V_{mod}$ .
- 3.4 The  $P_{mod} V_{mod}^2$  figures are ranked in order and the top four figures are divided by four to obtain the **average  $P_{mod} V_{mod}^2$**  value (representing the four busiest hours of the day).
- 3.5 The **adjusted  $PV^2$**  value is obtained by multiplying the **average  $P_{mod} V_{mod}^2$**  value by the pedestrian waiting time factor (T), width of road factor (W), speed limit factor (S) and accident record factor (A). Hence the **adjusted  $PV^2$  value** is calculated as follows:

**adjusted  $PV^2$**  = average  $P_{mod} V_{mod}^2$  value x T x W x S x A using the factors T, W, S & A from the paragraphs below.

#### 4. Waiting Time Factor (T)

- 4.1 The Average Waiting Time will be derived by the engineer attempting to cross the road at five random times during the known peak traffic period.
- 4.2 The waiting time factor (T) will then be taken from the table below.

Average Waiting Time	Waiting Time Factor (W)
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

#### 5. Width of Road Factor (W)

- 5.1 This factor considers the standard road width to be 7.3 metres. The Road Width Factor is obtained by dividing the road width by 7.3m i.e.  $(\frac{\text{road width}}{7.3})$ .

#### 6. Speed Limit Factor (S)

- 6.1 The Speed Limit Factor (S) is based on the speed limit and will be taken from the table below:-

Speed limit of the road	Speed Limit Factor (S)
20 mph speed limit	0.8
30 mph speed limit	1.0
40 mph speed limit	1.2
50 mph speed limit	1.3

## 7. Accident Record Factor (A)

7.1 The pedestrian injury accident record at a site is taken into account in the following formula:-

$$A = 1 + \frac{N}{10}$$

where N is the number of pedestrian injury accidents in the previous three years.

## 8. Criteria for Justifying Pedestrian Crossings

8.1 To justify a **refuge**, the adjusted  $PV^2$  value should be greater than  $0.4 \times 10^8$ , but the width of road needs to be at least 7.8m.

8.2 To justify a **zebra crossing**, the adjusted  $PV^2$  value should be greater than  $0.6 \times 10^8$ , but a zebra crossing should not be installed on roads with an 85-percentile speed of 35 mph. or above and the two-way traffic flow should be less than 500 vehicles/hour.

8.3 To justify a **signalled-controlled** crossing (Pelican, Puffin, Toucan or Pegasus), the adjusted  $PV^2$  value should be greater than  $0.9 \times 10^8$ . 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.

## 9. Guidance on Upgrading a Zebra Crossing to a Puffin Crossing

9.1 Investigations carried out in the County (Summer 2005) 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. The Policy states that a zebra crossing may be considered for conversion to a Puffin crossing, when a worse than average pedestrian injury record is likely to be improved.

Graeme Fitton  
 Planning, Transport and Economic Strategy  
 Warwickshire County Council

22nd February 2006

**Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee –  
27th April 2006**

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

**WARWICKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL**  
**Environment and Economy Directorate**  
**Quality Procedure**

**No 306**  
**Issue 1**

**THE ASSESSMENT OF OUTCOMES OF TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT SCHEMES**

**1. BACKGROUND**

- 1.1 A number of traffic management projects are amenable to simple measures of performance to assess their effectiveness.

**2. SCOPE**

- 2.1 This document sets out the procedure for measuring the performance of projects in the following categories:-
- Pedestrian crossings
  - Safer Routes to School schemes
  - Village Speed Limit Review schemes

**3 RELATED DOCUMENTS**

- 3.1 None.

**4 PROCEDURE**

- 4.1 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 categories listed in 2.1 above.

**PEDESTRIAN CROSSINGS**

- 4.1 Surveys of pedestrian flows are undertaken at potential locations for pedestrian crossings in accordance with the Council's policy for the



## Provision of Pedestrian Crossings and Pedestrian Phases at Traffic Signals.

- 4.2 Assessment of new pedestrian crossings should be carried out through further surveys after the installations have been operational for 12 months. This will provide an indication of how useful a crossing is and also reveal any suppressed demand if there has been a significant increase in pedestrian flows at the location.
- 4.3 Any pedestrian crossing implemented as a Casualty Reduction Scheme will be monitored over a three-year period. This is to ensure that pedestrian injury accidents have been reduced and that the scheme has had the desired effect.

### SAFER ROUTES TO SCHOOL

- 4.4 A School Travel Survey is carried out annually to determine the mode of transport that pupils use to travel to and from school. The results of the survey when compared with previous years give trends in car usage both countywide and for individual schools. This enables the effectiveness of Safer Routes to School schemes to be gauged. Each school is sent details of their own results, together with figures for the local district and county for comparison and the results of the School Travel Survey are also posted on the Warwickshire Web.

### VILLAGE SPEED REVIEW

- 4.5 Prior to a Village Speed Limit Review scheme being implemented traffic speed surveys are taken at appropriate locations along the length of affected roads. Following full completion of a scheme traffic speeds will be monitored to evaluate its effectiveness. The reduction in 85th percentile vehicle speed and the degree of compliance with the new speed limit will be determined. The results of the monitoring will be sent to the appropriate Parish Council and local Member and also posted on the Warwickshire Web.

#### **Approved**

#### **Authorised**

J Simkins  
Group Manager – Traffic Projects  
5 April 2006

R Newham  
Head of Profession - Transport Planning  
5 April 2006

**Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee –  
27th April 2006**

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

**Warwickshire County Council  
Environment and Economy Directorate**

**Quality Procedure**

**No 307  
Issue 1**

**The Ownership Of Traffic Management Projects**

**1. BACKGROUND**

1.1 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.

**2. SCOPE**

2.1 This document sets out the procedure for clarifying responsibilities of the parties involved at each stage of a project.

**3 RELATED DOCUMENTS**

3.1 None.

**4 PROCEDURE**

**General Principles**

4.1 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.

4.2 Those to whom a project is passed also have responsibilities, e.g. delivering the project to an agreed time and budget.

- 4.3 Responsibilities should be clarified by the adoption of formal, standardised handover documents when a project is transferred that define outstanding issues and ongoing responsibilities.

#### **Actions Required**

- 4.5 At the start of a project the project planner will hold a preliminary meeting to agree a timetable and individual responsibilities.
- 4.6 At an early stage, a handover document in the form of a Briefing Note will be prepared, agreed and signed by the relevant parties (see Appendix 1). This will define the responsibilities of each party and state the budget allocated and proposed timescale for completion of the project.
- 4.7 Regular meetings will be held to track progress, but immediate contact will be made if the project threatens to exceed the allocated budget or timescale.
- 4.8 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.
- 4.9 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.

#### **Approved**

J Simkins  
Group Manager – Traffic Projects  
5 April 2006

#### **Authorised**

R Newham  
Head of Profession - Transport Planning  
5 April 2006

## QP No. 307 Appendix 1

### TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT PROJECT – BRIEFING NOTE

#### OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the project

#### SCHEME

Outline of the proposed scheme

#### BUDGET

The estimated cost of the scheme and the funding source (e.g. LTP capital project)

#### LOCAL MEMBER(S)

County Councillor(s) in whose electoral division the works are proposed.

#### RESPONSIBILITIES

<b>Stage of Project</b>	<b>Traffic Projects</b>	<b>Design Services</b>	<b>Network Management</b>	<b>Street Lighting</b>	<b>Target Date</b>
Outline design of scheme					
Public consultation					
Detailed design					
Traffic Regulation Order					
Street Lighting					
Tender					
Construction of scheme					

#### OUTSTANDING ISSUES

#### PROJECT TEAM

<b>Name</b>	<b>Role</b>	<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>

**Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee –  
27th April 2006**

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

**Warwickshire County Council  
Environment and Economy Directorate**

**Quality Procedure**

**No 308  
Issue 1**

**PROGRAMMING AND FAST TRACKING OF TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT PROJECTS**

**1. BACKGROUND**

- 1.1 Seminars are held for Area Committee Members in January/February each year for Members to consider proposals for Local Transport Plan (LTP) capital schemes.
- 1.2 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.
- 1.3 Some projects are minor and/or urgent and do not readily fit within an annual planning process and should be fast-tracked.

**2. SCOPE**

- 2.1 This documents sets out the procedure for annual programming and fast tracking (as appropriate) of traffic management projects. It applies only to those projects which are not included in the annual LTP programming.

**3. PROCEDURE**

- 3.1 Traffic management projects will normally be planned as part of an annual programme including those which are not funded from the annual LTP.
- 3.2 Those requesting measures should be made aware that projects are to be managed within this framework.
- 3.3 Projects included within this annual framework will be included in the consultation of Members through the seminars provided for Members of Area Committee held in January/February for schemes being considered for the following financial year.

- 3.4 It is desirable to exclude minor and/or 'urgent' traffic management projects from this process. Traffic management schemes costing £5,000 or less should be excluded from the annual planning process. This will permit minor measures to be fast-tracked.
- 3.5 'Urgent' traffic management schemes will include those which are necessary to maintain public safety.
- 3.6 Fast tracking of minor schemes may include use of delegated powers to officers to determine minor traffic orders, but only if and when such powers become available.
- 3.7 At all stages the local Member should be made aware of the progress of projects through this annual process.

**Approved**

**Authorised**

J Simkins  
Group Manager – Traffic Projects  
5 April 2006

R Newham  
Head of Profession - Transport Planning  
5 April 2006