

FAREHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Report to Public Protection Policy Development and Review Panel

Date: **12 November 2013**

Report of: **Director of Regulatory and Democratic Services**

Subject: **TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT PROGRAMME**

SUMMARY

The Executive agreed the 2013/14 Traffic Management Programme on 11 February 2013. This report updates members on progress on the 2013/14 Traffic Management Programme, seeks a recommendation on the Traffic Regulation Order priorities for consideration in 2014/15, seeks comments on the remainder of the 2014/15 Traffic Management Programme and informs members of the general work undertaken by the Traffic Management Team.

RECOMMENDATION

The Panel is asked to note progress on current programmes, consider planned work for 2014/15 identified in Appendices A to E and recommend the following proposals to the Executive:

- (a) that the Proposed Traffic Regulation Order Programme, as shown in Appendix B (Table 4) to the report, be approved;
- (b) that the work undertaken on the deployment of the Speed Limit Reminder signs, as detailed at Appendix D to the report, 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 programme for 2014/15, before being recommended to the Executive. The current programme was last reported to and agreed by the Executive on 11 February 2013.
3. The total allocation from HCC for 2013/14 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 will remain the same for 2014/15. An allocation of £68,286 is also made by the County through the agency agreement to meet 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. At the meeting of the Executive on 11 February 2013, approval was given to the programmes of Traffic Regulation Orders, and Traffic Investigations for 2013/14. This report reviews the progress of the 2013/14 programme and also outlines the proposed programme for 2014/15.
6. The meetings of the Community Action Teams (CATs) have highlighted that traffic management is a key issue in the community and this feeds into the work programme of the Traffic Management Team.
7. The Executive will consider the programmes in this report and recommendations from this Panel at its meeting on 10 February 2014 before consideration by the relevant Hampshire Highways Workshop.

TRAFFIC INVESTIGATIONS

8. An update on the progress of Traffic Investigations approved for 2013/14 (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 2013/14 will be rolled over to form the following year's programme (2014/15).

TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS

9. 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.

10. Where it is deemed necessary (at the discretion of the Traffic and Design Manager in consultation with the Head of Community Safety 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

11. 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.
12. Since then, almost a hundred new TROs have been introduced, but each has involved a further amendment to the 2007 Consolidation Order, which has become unwieldy. To simplify this, extensive work has been undertaken during 2012 and 2013 in close liaison with the Southampton and Fareham Legal Services Partnership to produce a new Consolidation Order. This has involved tracing all of the orders that have been introduced since April 2007, including all relevant maps and evidence of the orders having been introduced.
13. This culminated in a report to the Executive on 7 October 2013, where it was agreed that the new Consolidation Order would be made. It is anticipated that this will be introduced within the next few weeks.

FUNDING AND RESOURCES

14. In addition to the funding allocation from HCC as mentioned in paragraph 3, further TROs are required 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.
15. 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.
16. Based on previous resource and funding levels, around ten sites can be considered for implementation in each year, and these are generally referred to as comprising the "internal" programme". The amount which can be processed depends to a fair extent 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

17. 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.

18. 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.
19. 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 2013/14 PROGRAMME

20. The progress of the TROs investigated in 2013/14 is shown in Table 4 Appendix B. Alongside those schemes, as agreed by the Executive on 11 February 2013, there have been additional externally funded Orders. These additional Orders are shown as 'Externally Funded' TROs in Table 5 Appendix C.
21. 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 2014/15 programme.

TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS – 2014/2015 PROGRAMME

22. The list of sites recommended by officers for investigation and possible implementation in 2014/15 is included in Table 4, Appendix B. These sites are the highest priority sites taken from the Pool List 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 under FPE. Any scheme from the 2013/14 programme that is not completed in this current financial year will be carried over into the 2014/15 programme.
23. The Portfolio Holder for Public Protection has been given delegated authority, in conjunction with the Director of Regulatory and Democratic Services, and in consultation with Ward members, to manage the Pool List. Work has been undertaken to reduce the number of requests / schemes on this list. 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

24. 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 34 requests for temporary traffic orders have so far been progressed this year (2013/14), which is higher than the figure at this time last year, of 25

TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT FOR EVENTS

25. Since the Police are no longer available to assist with traffic management at events, FBC officers are now regularly consulted during the planning of events to participate in the production of a traffic management plan.
26. Where a smaller event (e.g. less than 500 visitors) has been held previously and without incident, the Council would not need to take a significant involvement unless specifically requested. However, for larger or new events, then the Traffic and Design Manager will attend a Safety Advisory Group (SAG) meeting where he will advise on any possible traffic problems and offer solutions.

SPEED LIMIT REMINDER SIGNS

27. CATs funding is used for the provision of six Speed Limit Reminder (SLR) signs, which 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.
28. There is also a Community Speedwatch programme operated from Park Gate police station, 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.
29. 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.
30. The work involved in this programme has been considerably extended by the Yew Tree Drive bus link, which opened to all traffic in the summer of 2013. In association with this, HCC has commissioned FBC to deploy an additional six SLRs for this area. This makes a total of 12 sets of equipment which need to be deployed and maintained; this is being successfully managed at present.
31. 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

32. HCC funds the delivery of the traffic management programme and provides an allocation of £68,286 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

33. This report reviews the progress of the 2013/14 programme of Traffic Regulation Orders and Traffic Investigations and also outlines the proposed traffic management work programmes for 2014/15. The Panel is asked to note progress on current programmes, and comment on the planned work for 2014/15 identified in Appendices A to E before it is recommended to the Executive for approval.

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:

[Report to Executive - 2013/14 Traffic Management Programme](#)

Reference Papers:

None.

Enquiries:

For further information on this report please contact Chris Oldham (Ext 4560).