

FAREHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Report to the Executive for Decision 8 February 2016

Portfolio: Public Protection

Subject: Traffic Management

Report of: Director of Operations

Strategy/Policy:

Corporate Objective: A safe and healthy place to live and work

Purpose:

To update the Executive on progress in delivering the 2015/16 Traffic Management programme and request members to consider and approve the programme for 2016/17.

Executive summary:

The Executive agreed the 2015/16 Traffic Management Programme on 2 February 2015. This report updates members on progress in delivering the 2015/16 Traffic Management Programme, seeks approval for the Traffic Regulation Order priorities for 2016/17, and informs the Executive of the general work undertaken by the Traffic Management Team.

Recommendation/Recommended Option:

That the Executive agrees:

- (a) to note the progress on the current 2015/16 programme, considers planned work for 2016/17 identified in Appendices A to D to this report and agrees that:
- (b) that the Proposed Traffic Regulation Order Programme for 2016/17, as shown in Appendix B (Table 4) to the report, be approved; and
- (c) that the work undertaken on the deployment of the Speed Limit Reminder signs, as detailed at Appendix D to the report, be noted.

Reason:

To improve road safety and to reduce congestion.

Cost of proposals:

The proposals in the report can be met from existing budgets.

Appendices:

Appendix A: Programme of Traffic Investigations

Appendix B: Review of Traffic Regulation Orders and Proposed Programme

Appendix C: Externally Funded Traffic Regulation Orders

Appendix D: Speed Limit Reminder Signs Programme

Appendix E: Traffic Regulation Order Flowchart

Background papers:

None

Reference papers:

None

FAREHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Executive Briefing Paper

Date:	08 February 2015
Subject:	Traffic Management Programme
Briefing by:	Director of Operations
Portfolio:	Public Protection

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 Executive in order to provide an update on the progress of the current programme and seeks comment on the proposed programme for 2016/17. The current programme was last reported to and agreed by the Executive on 2 February 2015.
3. The total allocation from HCC for 2015/16 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. This is considered further under the heading "Funding and Resources" below, and is expected to remain the same for 2016/17. An allocation of £68,970 is also made by the County through the agency agreement towards the cost of officers undertaking this work.
4. Under the Traffic Management Agency Partnership Agreement, the process for approving the TRO Programme is required to be agreed by Hampshire County Council after receiving a recommendation from Fareham Borough Council's Executive and comments from the relevant Hampshire Highways Workshop.
5. The Executive is requested to consider the programmes in this report and the recommendations from the Public Protection Policy Development and Review Panel before consideration by the relevant Hampshire Highways Workshop.

TRAFFIC INVESTIGATIONS

6. An update on the progress of Traffic Investigations approved for 2015/16 (Table 1) is shown in Appendix A. The table explains the progress on each scheme, and the ongoing list of Traffic Investigations is shown. Any uncompleted in 2015/16 will be rolled over to form the following year's programme (2016/17).

TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS

7. 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.
8. 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.

RE- CONSOLIDATION OF TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS

9. In April 2007 all waiting restriction TROs were made into a single Consolidation Order as part of the introduction of de-criminalised parking. This was when the responsibility for enforcement was passed from the Police to FBC's Civil Enforcement Officers.
10. Since then, almost a hundred new TROs have been introduced and, after extensive work over many months in close liaison with the Southampton and Fareham Legal Services Partnership, a new Consolidation Order was introduced in April 2014.
11. It is intended to re-consolidate the TRO's again during 2016, it is also the intention to re-consolidate all off street parking orders at the same time, as these have not been re-consolidated since 2007.

FUNDING AND RESOURCES

12. 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 C Table 5.
13. 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.
14. Based on previous resource and funding levels, around ten 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.

PRIORITISATION OF TROs

15. Schemes are prioritised based on the criteria previously agreed by the Executive. The prioritisation criteria are set out at the end of Appendix B. Low priority sites that meet few of the criteria are unlikely to justify being included in future programmes unless circumstances change.
16. 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.
17. 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 2015/16 PROGRAMME

18. The progress of the TROs investigated in 2015/16 is shown in Table 3 Appendix B. Alongside those schemes, as agreed by the Executive on 2 February 2015, there have been additional externally funded Orders. These additional Orders are shown as 'Externally Funded' TROs in Table 5 Appendix C.
19. Members will note from Table 3 Appendix B 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 2016/17 programme.

TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS – 2016/17 PROGRAMME

20. The list of sites recommended by officers for investigation and possible implementation in 2016/17 is included in Table 4, Appendix B. These sites are the highest priority sites taken from the list of requests and are considered to be of greatest benefit to road safety or have been identified as an issue that needs an Order to be enforced.
21. 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 is based upon the priority of the existing requests that are already on the list as well as those that are added to it through requests from Members and the public during the course of the year.

TEMPORARY TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS

22. 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 81 requests for temporary traffic orders had been processed this financial year (2015/16) by the start of January 2016.

SPEED LIMIT REMINDER SIGNS

23. Community Action Teams initially funded the provision of six 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.
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, CATs meetings and local residents. The locations of sites are shown at Appendix D. 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. HCC funds the delivery of the traffic management programme and provides an allocation of £68,970 towards the cost of employees undertaking this work. If there is any reduction in the budget received from HCC there would be an impact upon the Council in subsidising the delivery of this service in its current state, or a reduction in the programme that is delivered.

CONCLUSION

28. This report reviews the progress of the 2015/16 programme of Traffic Regulation Orders and Traffic Investigations and also outlines the proposed traffic management work programmes for 2016/17. The Executive is requested to note the progress made on current programmes and approve the programmes for 2016/17.

Appendices:

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

Background Papers: None

Reference Papers: None

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