

FAREHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Report to Public Protection Policy Development and Review Panel

Date 17 January 2017

Report of: Head of Parking and Enforcement

Subject: TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT REPORT – 2017/18

SUMMARY

The Council's Executive agreed the 2016/17 Traffic Management Programme on 1st February 2016. This report updates Members on progress on the 2016/17 Traffic Management Programme, and informs Members of the general work undertaken by the Traffic Management Team.

RECOMMENDATION

Members are asked to:-

- (a) note the progress on the current Traffic Management Programme in Appendices A to D and;
- (b) recommend to the Executive that this work, including progress on Traffic Regulation Orders and the work undertaken on the deployment of the Speed Limit Reminder signs, be noted.

INTRODUCTION

1. Traffic Management is undertaken on behalf of Hampshire County Council (HCC) through an Agency Agreement. An annual allocation of funding is provided for administration of the Agency Agreement and to fund the introduction of Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) and associated signs and lines.
2. This report is presented to the Panel in order to provide an update on the progress of the current programme and seeks comment on the proposed way forward for the introduction of any new TRO's for 2017/18, before being recommended to the Executive. The current programme was last reported to and agreed by the Executive on 1st February 2016.
3. The total allocation from HCC for 2016/17 for implementing TROs, including a small amount for the introduction of new signing and lining to address minor traffic management issues and the marking of disabled driver bays, was £15,500, a further £4000 is provided for advertising TRO's. The Council has received notification that funding for the Traffic Management team will be reducing significantly for 2017/18 and 2018/19, this is further addressed under funding and resources.

TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS

4. The TRO Programme is a programme of investigations that are likely to result in the introduction of a legally enforceable TRO. Requests are received from many sources asking for the provision of restrictions, every one of which requires statutory consultation procedures including press advertisements and site notices. Without these processes, it would not be possible to provide the enforcement required after the order is introduced.
5. Where it is deemed necessary (at the discretion of the Traffic and Design Manager in consultation with the Head of Parking and Enforcement), a letter drop is carried out to all directly affected frontages where a TRO is proposed. This is done where a proposal is likely to be contentious, and where the scheme is likely to be modified if there are significant objections. This type of consultation is therefore less likely to take place where, for example, the proposal is a small scheme to provide something like or nothing more than junction protection for safety reasons.

FUNDING AND RESOURCES

6. In addition to the funding allocation from HCC as mentioned in paragraph 3, further TROs are at times required to be introduced as part of new developments or other highway schemes such as for casualty reduction. These TROs are funded separately, either by the developer or directly from the individual scheme budget and are scheduled in Appendix B Table 5.
7. The works and advertising costs for the introduction of a typical TRO involving double yellow lines are in the region of £1,500, as these do not require signing. Costs for single yellow line orders, limited waiting orders or speed limits will be more due to the regulatory signing requirements, particularly if there is a need for the signing to be illuminated.

8. Based on previous resource and funding levels, around 15 sites can be considered for implementation in each year; these are generally referred to as comprising the "internal programme". The amount which can be processed depends on the "external" programme, which is made up of those requests that come in from and are funded by HCC and developers.
9. Fareham Borough Council currently receives £88,700 a year from the County Council, towards employment costs, line marking, legal fees and advertising costs. Taking into account all other costs associated with delivering this service, (not including internal recharges), the Borough Council currently subsidises the cost of delivering this County Council service by an additional £6,000 per annum.
10. As part of a wide ranging efficiency plan, Hampshire County Council has proposed significant changes to the amount of funding it will provide to Fareham Borough Council to deliver this County Council service in the future. This will reduce the County Council funding element by up to 60%, which could result in Fareham Borough Council's subsidy increasing to approximately £59,200 per annum by 2018/19.
11. Given the scale of the potential reduction in County Council funding and the implications on Fareham Borough Council's budget, the Executive at its meeting on 5 December 2016 resolved to terminate the agency agreement with Hampshire County Council. The implementation of the Executive decision was temporarily suspended following the formal notification of the item being called-in. In accordance with the Council's Constitutional arrangements, the decision was reviewed by the Scrutiny Board on 22 December and following a detailed debate, the decision made by the Executive was accepted and can now be implemented. The timing of the termination has yet to be agreed and will be determined following discussions between the appropriate officers from FBC and Hampshire County Council. In the event that the agreement continues for a limited period in 2017-18, a suitable programme will be devised for Executive approval in the normal way.

PRIORITISATION OF TROs

12. Schemes are prioritised based on the criteria previously agreed by the Executive. The prioritisation criteria are set out at the end of Appendix A. Low priority sites that meet few of the criteria are unlikely to justify action in future unless circumstances change.
13. Externally funded TROs do not require prioritisation as they are deemed necessary as part of a particular scheme or development. These TROs are progressed as and when required throughout the year.
14. Where there is a requirement for any changes to be made following a review of an implemented TRO, a report will be provided to the Executive portfolio holder.

REVIEW OF THE 2016/17 PROGRAMME

15. The progress of the TROs investigated in 2016/17 is shown in Table 1 Appendix A. Alongside those schemes, as agreed by the Executive on 1st February 2016, there have been additional externally funded Orders. These additional Orders are shown as 'Externally Funded' TROs in Table 2 Appendix B.

16. Members will note from Table 1 Appendix A that all of the TROs programmed to be investigated have been either implemented or are progressing towards implementation. Where there has been a delay, the reason is also detailed within the Appendix. Any scheme that is not completed in this current financial year will be carried over into the 2017/18 programme.

TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS – 2017/18 PROGRAMME

17. As previously indicated under Funding and Resources, it was recommended by the Executive has resolved to hand back the Traffic Management function to HCC. As we do not yet know the final time scales for this function to cease for Fareham Borough Council, there will be no Traffic Management Programme put forward for 2017/18 at this stage.
18. However in more recent years the Executive Portfolio Holder for Public Protection has been given delegated authority, in conjunction with the Director of Operations, and in consultation with Ward Members, to manage the list of requests for TROs. This has allowed particularly pressing items to be progressed at shorter notice, and also for long standing items to be removed where investigations have shown the need to have diminished. This method of progressing TROs has proved to be very successful.
19. It is therefore recommended that management of the TRO request list could work best by progressing all items at the discretion of the Executive Member in conjunction with the Director of Operations, until such time as the function is handed back to HCC.

TEMPORARY TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS

20. Temporary road closures and diversions for road works, including works carried out by public utility companies, are processed by the Borough Council. The temporary closures are processed on request and include closures requiring an Order, those dealt with by site notices and also emergency closures. The cost of these Orders is recharged to the applicant. A total of 52 requests for temporary traffic orders have so far been progressed this calendar year (2016). This is fewer than the figure at this time last year (71), but this is because those requested by Hampshire County Council now tend to arrive in batches rather than individually, and each batch has only been counted as a single application.
21. Hampshire County Council has informed all local authorities in Hampshire that it will be taking on this function from 1st April 2017.

SPEED LIMIT REMINDER SIGNS

22. Fareham Council has 12 Speed Limit Reminder (SLR) signs. These flash the speed limit (either 30 or 40), and are activated when a vehicle exceeds the set speed limit. These have now been in use since September 2010, and their deployment continues to be welcomed by Members and the general public. FBC initially had 6 SLR's however a further six SLRs have been provided by Hampshire County Council, following completion of the temporary programme of their use in

the Yew Tree Drive area.

23. The SLR's will still be deployed by FBC staff when the Traffic Management function passes back to HCC. Discussions are taking place to look at which service is best placed to continue the deployment of these SLR's.
24. There is also a Community Speedwatch programme operated by the Police in most parts of the Borough, which involves members of the public using radar speed guns to measure vehicle speeds. Excessive speeds can be followed up by a police letter warning that their details have been noted.
25. The SLR programme is developed with information from the Police, HCC, local Members and local residents. The locations of sites are shown at Appendix C. In respect of many locations comments have been made that traffic speeds have reduced, and their further use has been requested.
26. The SLR programme can be supplemented by the use of Speed Data Recorders (SDRs), which enable traffic volume and speed data to be recorded (SLRs don't record data, they only flash the speed limit). If a major speeding problem is identified, further consultation with the Police and HCC would be undertaken to attempt to resolve the problem. However, for the majority of surveys undertaken, vehicle speeds have been at a level that does not require intervention through police speed enforcement or traffic calming.

RISK ASSESSMENT

27. There are currently no risks associated with this report.

CONCLUSION

28. This report reviews the progress of the 2016/17 programme of Traffic Regulation Orders and notes the deployments of Speed Limit Reminder signs, as shown in Appendices A to D.
29. The Panel is asked to note this before it is recommended to the Executive for approval.
30. The Panel is requested to recommend to the Executive that until the Traffic Management function passes back to HCC, the Executive Member for Public Protection and Director of Operations continues to make decisions on which TRO's to implement, in the absence of a full Traffic Management Programme for 2017/18.

Appendices:

- [Appendix A:](#) Review of Traffic Regulation Orders and Proposed Programme
- [Appendix B:](#) Externally Funded Traffic Regulation Orders
- [Appendix C:](#) Speed Limit Reminder Signs Programme
- [Appendix D:](#) Traffic Regulation Order Flowchart

Background Papers:

None

Reference Papers:

None

Enquiries:

For further information on this report please contact Kevin Wright (Ext 4359)