

Individual Decision

The attached report(s) will be taken as
Individual Portfolio Member Decision(s) on:

Thursday, 21st March, 2013

Ref:	Title	Portfolio Member(s)	Page No.
ID2608	Traffic Management & Road Safety Programme 2013/14	Councillor Keith Chopping	1 - 8
ID2557	Zebra Crossing on Bridge Street, Hungerford - Petition	Councillor Keith Chopping	9 - 16



This page is intentionally left blank

Individual Executive Member Decision

Title of Report:	Traffic Management and Road Safety Programme 2013/14
Report to be considered by:	Individual Executive Member Decision
Date on which Decision is to be taken:	21 March 2013
Forward Plan Ref:	ID 2608

Purpose of Report: To seek approval of the Traffic Management and Road Safety Programme 2013/14.

Recommended Action: That the Executive Member for Planning, Transport Policy, Property, Highways & Transport (Operational) approves the Programme.

Reason for decision to be taken: To ensure that the programme is approved at the same time as the Councils Capital Programme and is in place for the financial year 2013/14.

Other options considered: N/A

Key background documentation:

Portfolio Member Details	
Name & Telephone No.:	Councillor Keith Chopping - (0118) 983 2057
E-mail Address:	kchopping@westberks.gov.uk

Contact Officer Details	
Name:	Andrew Garratt
Job Title:	Principal Traffic & Road Safety Engineer
Tel. No.:	01635 519491
E-mail Address:	agarratt@westberks.gov.uk

Implications

Policy: The recommendations within this report accord with existing Council policy.

Financial: None arising from this report because the Traffic Management and Road Safety Programme is funded from the Councils Revenue and Capital Programmes, which provisionally total £302,420 and £260,000 respectively.

Personnel: None arising from this report.

Legal/Procurement: None arising from this report.
Environmental: None arising from this report.
Property: None arising from this report.
Risk Management: None arising from this report.
Equalities Impact Assessment: EIA Stage 1 attached as Appendix A.

Consultation Responses

Members:

Leader of Council: Councillor Gordon Lundie – will be consulted prior to Individual Decision meeting and any comments will be verbally reported before the Decision is made.

Overview & Scrutiny Management Commission Chairman: Councillor Brian Bedwell - will be consulted prior to Individual Decision meeting and any comments will be verbally reported before the Decision is made.

Ward Members: All Councillors will be sent a copy of the report prior to the Individual Decision meeting and any comments will be verbally reported before the Decision is made.

Opposition Spokesperson: Councillor Keith Woodhams will be consulted prior to Individual Decision meeting and any comments will be verbally reported before the Decision is made.

Local Stakeholders: N/A

Officers Consulted: Mark Edwards, Mark Cole

Trade Union: N/A

Is this item subject to call-in.	Yes: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No: <input type="checkbox"/>
If not subject to call-in please put a cross in the appropriate box:		
The item is due to be referred to Council for final approval	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Delays in implementation could have serious financial implications for the Council	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Delays in implementation could compromise the Council's position	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Considered or reviewed by O&SMC or associated Task Groups within preceding six months	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Item is Urgent Key Decision	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Supporting Information

1. Background

1.1 The purpose of this report is to seek approval of the Traffic Management and Road Safety Programme 2013/14. The programme needs to be approved at this time so that it runs alongside the Councils Capital Programme and is in place for the financial year 2013/14.

1.2 Approximately 50% of the work undertaken by the Traffic Management and Road Safety Team is planned and consists of schemes that are approved by the Council during March as part of the Capital Programme. These schemes are identified under the following work areas:

- School Safety Programme.
- Local Safety Schemes.
- Network Signing Schemes.
- Parking Schemes.
- Speed Limit Review.
- Section 106 Schemes.
- Safety Campaigns.
- Road Safety Events.

1.3 Due to the nature of the work undertaken by the Traffic Management and Road Safety Team many schemes cannot be identified in advance as they are requested throughout the year by Members, in correspondence with stakeholders, at Neighbourhood Action Groups or from maintenance inspections. These schemes fall within the following work areas:

- Assessment Reports – Traffic Assessments, Home to School Assessments and School Crossing Patrol Assessments.
- Road Marking Maintenance.
- Road Signing Maintenance.
- Temporary Traffic Regulation Orders – i.e. Road Closures.
- Petition Reports.
- Rechargeable Schemes – i.e. Tourist Signs, Access Protection Markings.
- Vehicle Operators Licences – Assessment and attending Public Inquiries.
- Letters & E-mails requiring a response.
- Telephone enquiries.

- 1.4 A programme of schemes for 2013/14 based on the level of work completed in previous years is provided in Appendix B.
- 1.5 At the end of March 2013 it is expected that approximately 96% of the 353 schemes and projects listed in the 2012/13 works programme will be completed. This includes an additional 33 schemes and projects that were not originally identified as part of the works programme.
- 1.6 Delivery of the works programme for 2013/14 is based on a fully resourced Traffic Management and Road Safety Team. The precise number of schemes to be delivered within the programme is dependant on the detail of what is actually required when the individual schemes are developed. This programme is therefore a desirable outcome subject to sufficient funding being available from various funding sources. Any variations will be agreed with the Executive Member for Planning, Transport Policy, Property, Highways & Transport (Operational).

2. Conclusions

- 2.1 Given the high volume of work and the available resources to deliver it the prioritisation of work is important. The Traffic Management and Road Safety programme for 2013/14, which includes an estimated number of schemes for unplanned work in response to the various stakeholder's requests, is shown in Appendix B. This is based on the level of work completed in previous years.
- 2.2 If the programme is approved it will commit a fully resourced Traffic Management and Road Safety team for the year. Any variations to the programme resulting from changed priorities will require the approval of the Executive Member for Planning, Transport Policy, Property, Highways & Transport (Operational) and may result in reprogramming of some schemes.

3. Recommendations

- 3.1 That the Traffic Management and Road Safety Programme 2013/14 as shown in Appendix B is approved.

Appendices

Appendix A – EIA Stage 1

Appendix B - Traffic Management and Road Safety Programme 2013/14

Equality Impact Assessment – Stage One

Name of item being assessed:	Traffic Management & Road Safety works programme – 2013/14
Version and release date of item (if applicable):	15 February 2013
Owner of item being assessed:	Andrew Garratt – Principal Traffic & Road Safety Engineer
Name of assessor:	Andrew Garratt
Date of assessment:	15 February 2013

1. What are the main aims of the item?
<p>The main aim of this item is for the approval of the Traffic Management and Road Safety works programme for 2013/14.</p> <p>The programme consists of many different types of schemes/projects and any requiring an Individual Decision report will have an EIA attached at that stage.</p> <p>For the schemes/projects that do not require an Individual Decision, the appropriate groups will be considered as part of the design and implementation process.</p>

2. Note which groups may be affected by the item, consider how they may be affected and what sources of information have been used to determine this. (Please demonstrate consideration of all strands – Age, Disability, Gender, Race, Religion or Belief and Sexual Orientation.)															
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Group Affected</th> <th>What might be the effect?</th> <th>Information to support this.</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> </tr> <tr> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> </tr> <tr> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> </tr> <tr> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Group Affected	What might be the effect?	Information to support this.												
Group Affected	What might be the effect?	Information to support this.													
Further comments relating to the item:															
All appropriate groups will be considered as part of each individual scheme/project.															

3. Result (please tick by double-clicking on relevant box and click on 'checked')
<input type="checkbox"/> High Relevance - This needs to undergo a Stage 2 Equality Impact Assessment
<input type="checkbox"/> Medium Relevance - This needs to undergo a Stage 2 Equality Impact Assessment
<input type="checkbox"/> Low Relevance - This needs to undergo a Stage 2 Equality Impact Assessment
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Relevance - This does not need to undergo a Stage 2 Equality Impact Assessment

For items requiring a Stage 2 equality impact assessment, begin the planning of this now, referring to the equality impact assessment guidance and Stage 2 template.

4. Identify next steps as appropriate:	
Stage Two required	
Owner of Stage Two assessment:	
Timescale for Stage Two assessment:	
Stage Two not required:	√

Name: Andrew Garratt

Date: 15 February 2013

Traffic Management & Road Safety Programme 2013/14

No	Project Name	Scheme	Comments
School Safety			
1		Stockcross Village	Safer crossing locations.
2		Speenhamland Primary School	Safety improvements to be investigated.
3		Thatcham Park C of E Primary School	Safety improvements to be investigated.
4		Curridge Primary School	Safety improvements to be investigated.
5		Long Lane Primary School	Safety improvements to be investigated.
6		St Bartholomew's School	Safety improvements to be investigated.
Local Safety Schemes			
7	(average 10 schemes per year)	Beech Hill to Mortimer railway Station	High Risk Site - Accident Investigation
8		Ilisley Road, Compton	warning sign and marker posts
9		A339 Bear Lane roundabout, Newbury	High risk site - Investigation to be undertaken.
10		A4 Newbury between Robin Hood roundabout and Hambridge Road.	High risk site - Investigation to be undertaken.
11		A4 Junction with Royal Avenue, Calcot	High risk site - Investigation to be undertaken.
12		A340 Calleva Park roundabout	High risk site - Investigation to be undertaken.
13		Additional safety scheme identified throughout the year	
Speed Limit Review			
14		Speed limit review process	May Review 2013
15		Speed limit review process	October Review 2013
16		Implementation from May Speed Limit Review	Average 7 Speed limit schemes per review to be agreed.
17		Newbury Town Centre.	Introduction of a 20mph speed limit zone.
18		Aldworth Road, Compton	Extension of 30mph speed limit
19		Checking all Speed limit Orders	All locations
Parking Schemes			
20		Parking scheme amendment No 13	Implementation of restrictions from 2012/13.
21		Parking scheme amendment No 14	Locations to be identified
22		On Street Parking and Shared Use - Newbury and Thatcham	Feasibility Study for implementation during 2013/14.
23		Disabled Parking Bays	Location to be identified.
Signing Schemes (average 15 schemes per year)			
24			
25		Lower Basildon & Skew Bridge	Review of 7.5 tonne weight restriction
26		Advance weight limit warning signs for B4000	
27		Sulhamstead Hill, Sulhamstead	Weight limit signing improvements.
28		Lambdens Hill	Investigation of weight limit
29			5 - 15 to be identified.
Traffic Signals (average 15 schemes per year)			
30		Schemes identified throughout the year.	
Traffic Signal Contract			
31		maintenance of signals and equipment	Various sites.
Signing & Lining Maintenance			
32		Average 60 road sign maintenance schemes per year	This is a reactive programme as schemes are identified throughout the year following inspections or as a result of sign being knocked down.
33		Average 60 road marking maintenance schemes per year	
Section 106 funded schemes			
34		Pangbourne	Safety improvements to Pangbourne Hill
35		Pangbourne	Raise Zebra crossings in village
36		Pangbourne	Safety improvements to Reading Road
Other Schemes			
37		Schemes identified throughout the year if required.	
Speed Management			
38		West Berkshire Safer Roads	supply of specialised road safety services and speed camera maintenance
39		West Berkshire Safer Roads	Maintenance of speed cameras
40		Road Safety Constable	contribution for dedicated officer.
41		Speed Camera maintenance	
42		Key Traffic Services	
43		Speed Indicator Device (SID)	Average 4 SID checks per working week
44		Speed Indicator Device (SID)	Training for Parish Councils / PCSO
45		Speed Data Recorder (SDR)	SDR surveys (approx 200 per year)
46		Speed Intervention Programme	Community Speed Watch - Average 1 check per week
47		Speed Intervention Programme	Mobile VAS
48		Speed Intervention Programme	Poster Campaign to support Speedwatch
49		Speed awareness checks (average 10 per year)	1 - 10 Location to be identified
50		Seatbelt/mobile phone awareness checks (average 10 per year)	1 - 10 Location to be identified
51		Drink/Drugs awareness checks average 3 per year	1 - 3 Location to be identified
52		Other Roadside checks (average 2 per year)	Locations to be identified.
Road Safety Events and Campaigns			

53	Safe Drive Stay Alive	Three day event to be held during November 2013.
54	Drive start	Event in October 2013.
55	Ride start	Event in June 2013.
56	Older drivers	Event in September 2013.
57	Road Safety Theatre Productions - KS1 & KS2	Louis Taylor event February 2014.
58	Powered Two Wheelers	Event to be identified.
59	Mobility Scooters event	Event in May 2013.
60	Junior Citizen	Event with schools in June 2013.
61	Walk to school week	Giant walking bus day - June 2013.
62	Road Safety Week in November 2013.	Presentations to schools.
63	Road Safety Month	Event in October to be identified.
64	Drink & Drug Driving Campaign	Campaign during October and November 2013
65	Winter Driving Campaign	
66	Car Seat event	Event to be identified.
67	Walk to school event	Event to be identified.
68	Cycle Event	The Big Pedal - March 2014.
69	Cycle Event	Urban Limits
70	Cycle Event	Treasure Hunt - 3 event to be identified.
71	Cycle Event	Big West Berkshire Bike Ride
72	Tyre Safe Event	Event to be identified.
	Cycle training:-	
73		
74	New instructor training sessions, risk assessment of sites and cycle training admin.	
75	Cycle Training	Bikeability training and monitoring.
76	Cycle Training	Bikeability supporting material
77	Cycle Training	Cycle Mechanics Course for Key Stage 3
78	Cycle Training	Holiday Courses during school summer holidays
79	Cycle Training	Get on your bike project adult training
	Road Safety Education	
80	Various schemes	i.e. Walking Bus, Footsteps, older drivers etc....
81	Work Related Road Risk	Presentations and meetings as necessary.
82	School in take information	Presentation and information to schools for start of new school year
83	Education presentations	presentation to local community groups
84	Education training for School children	initiatives for Key Stage 3
85	School Training Booklet	Update booklet for Road Safety Education to Schools.
86	School Crossing Patrol Training Booklet	
	Reports / Assessments	
	Permanent / Temporary Traffic Regulation Orders	
87	Section 14(2) & Section 21 - Emergency orders	Average 65 per year.
88	Section 14 (1) Programmed Temporary Orders (i.e. road closures)	Average 65 per year.
89	Section 16A Programmed Temporary Orders (i.e. Special events)	2 Orders covering approx 40 regular Charitable events and Remembrance Day Parades
90	Section 21 of the Town Police Clauses Act 1847	Mainly required for Street Parties
91	Petitions (approx 10 Petitions per year)	1 - 10 To be identified
	Home to School Transport Assessments / School Travel Plans (approx 10 assessments per year)	
92		1 to 10 to be identified
	School Crossing Patrol - New Site Assessments (approx 5 new assessments per year)	
93		1 to 5 to be identified
	School Crossing Patrol - Risk Assessments of existing Sites (approx 12 assessments per year)	
94		1-12 to be identified
	Traffic Management Assessments (approx 10 per year)	
95		TMA 162 - Little Heath Road and Bitterne Road, Review of traffic calming measures.
		TMA 163 - Love Lane - review of traffic calming.
		TMA 164 - Frouds Lane, Aldermaston - Request for traffic calming.
96		Other assessments to be identified.
	Vehicle Operators Licence	
97	Checking applications	Average 26 per year
98	Preparing and attending inquiries	Average 2 per year
99	Accident Investigation and monitoring	Monthly updates and post fatal accident meetings
100	Letters & Emails	Average 135 responses / month - Including letters, e-mails & Streetcare enquires
101	Telephone enquiries	Approximately 1,000 calls per month

Individual Executive Member Decision

Title of Report:	Petition – Zebra crossing, Bridge Street Hungerford
Report to be considered by:	Individual Executive Member Decision
Date on which Decision is to be taken:	21 March 2013
Forward Plan Ref:	ID 2557

Purpose of Report: To respond to a petition that has been submitted to the Council requesting a zebra crossing on Bridge Street in Hungerford.

Recommended Action: That the Executive Member for Planning, Transport Policy, Property, Highways & Transport (Operational) resolves to approve the recommendations as set out in section 4 of this report.

Reason for decision to be taken: To provide a response to the petitioners.

Other options considered: N/A

Key background documentation: The Petition,
Traffic and pedestrian surveys

Portfolio Member Details	
Name & Telephone No.:	Councillor Keith Chopping - (0118) 983 2057
E-mail Address:	kchopping@westberks.gov.uk

Contact Officer Details	
Name:	Andrew Garratt
Job Title:	Principal Traffic & Road Safety Engineer
Tel. No.:	01635 519491
E-mail Address:	agarratt@westberks.gov.uk

Implications

Policy:	None arising from this report.
Financial:	None arising from this report as the introduction of a zebra crossing is not recommended.
Personnel:	None arising from this report.
Legal/Procurement:	None arising from this report.
Environmental:	None arising from this report.
Property:	None arising from this report.
Risk Management:	None arising from this report.
Equalities Impact Assessment:	EIA Stage 1 attached as Appendix A.

Consultation Responses

Members:

Leader of Council:	Councillor Gordon Lundie - To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
Overview & Scrutiny Management Commission Chairman:	Councillor Brian Bedwell has no comments.
Ward Members:	Councillor David Holtby commented that walking has become increasingly popular since the introduction of the Jubilee Footbridge and the addition of a safe crossing on Bridge Street would be a welcome enhancement. However he appreciates there are difficulties in this location due to the War Memorial and impact on local residents so would support further investigations for a more suitable crossing in the vicinity of the Methodist Church in the form of a narrowing rather than a full crossing, if this was viable. Councillor Paul Hewer supported the views of Councillor Holtby.
Opposition Spokesperson:	Councillor Keith Woodhams supports the officer's recommendations.
Local Stakeholders:	N/A
Officers Consulted:	Mark Edwards, Mark Cole
Trade Union:	N/A

Is this item subject to call-in.	Yes: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No: <input type="checkbox"/>
If not subject to call-in please put a cross in the appropriate box:		
The item is due to be referred to Council for final approval		<input type="checkbox"/>

Delays in implementation could have serious financial implications for the Council
Delays in implementation could compromise the Council's position
Considered or reviewed by O&SMC or associated Task Groups within preceding six months
Item is Urgent Key Decision

Supporting Information

1. Background

- 1.1 Two petitions have been submitted to the Council on the same subject. First an e-petition containing 33 signatures was submitted followed by a 107 signature petition, which was presented by Councillor David Holtby at the full Council meeting on 5th March 2013. Both petitions state:

'We, the undersigned, petition the Council to provide a zebra crossing on Bridge Street in Hungerford

The completion of the new footbridge in Hungerford is a boon to road safety in the town. However, there is no provision for any residents living to the north and east of the bridge to access it. This includes all the residents of Eddington and a large proportion of the residents of Hungerford. If the creation of this crossing were to be made a part of the resurfacing work scheduled for September, savings could be made in cost and disruption.'

- 1.2 The requested location of the crossing is on Bridge Street in the vicinity of the war memorial. At this location the carriageway is approximately 5.5 metres wide with footway widths of approximately 1.4 metres.
- 1.3 Within the latest ten year period, to the end of October 2012, there have been no recorded injury accidents in the vicinity of the proposed crossing.
- 1.4 To determine the number of pedestrian movements across Bridge Street a pedestrian and vehicle survey was undertaken on Saturday 21st April 2012 and Thursday 26 April 2012 between 07:00 and 19:00. The length of the crossing survey was between its junctions with the A4 Bath Road and Canal Walk as it can be assumed that any person crossing within this section of road is likely to use a crossing facility by the war memorial.
- 1.5 The justification for a crossing facility is based on a formula known as PV^2 where P is the average number of pedestrian movements during the busiest 4 hours and V is the average volume of vehicles during the same period.

2. Results of Survey

- 2.1 The highest number of pedestrian movements was recorded on Saturday 21st April 2012. From this survey the section with the highest number of recorded pedestrian movements was in the vicinity of the Church with a total of 78 pedestrian movements being recorded in the busiest 4 hours, giving an average of 19.5 movements per hour. However a crossing facility in this location would remove much of the on street parking which is something the Town Council does not want.
- 2.2 The total number of pedestrian movements recorded in the vicinity of the war memorial was 30 during the busiest 4 hours, giving an average of 7.5 movements per hour.

- 2.3 The total number of pedestrian movements recorded within the whole length of the survey during the busiest 4 hours was 236, giving an average of 59 movements per hour.
- 2.4 A traffic survey undertaken at the same time as the pedestrian survey showed that during the survey period on Saturday 21st April 2012 a two way total of 9,150 vehicles was recorded. During the survey period on Thursday 26 April 2012 a two way total of 11,968 vehicles were recorded.
- 2.5 The busiest 4 hours give a PV^2 value of 0.149×10^8 , which is well below the minimum value normally recommended for a crossing facility of 1×10^8 . Using the survey statistics alone a pedestrian crossing could not be justified.

3. Conclusion

- 3.1 The footway at the war memorial site, which has a number of underground services, has insufficient width to install the poles for the belisha beacons. Given the road width at this location and that it is an 'A' classified road there is no opportunity to widen the footways to accommodate the belisha beacon poles.
- 3.2 The placement of the crossing is difficult to locate due to the properties on Bridge Street having large windows, building overhangs, awnings and hanging baskets.
- 3.3 The results of the survey show that a formal crossing facility is not justified due to the number of pedestrian movements and that there are no further special circumstances to justify a formal crossing facility at any location in Bridge Street.
- 3.4 Experience has shown that the introduction of a crossing facility that does not meet the criteria is detrimental to road safety. Where formal crossing facilities cannot be justified other measures can be investigated. However, due to the constraints of the public highway in Bridge Street other measures such as narrowings, build outs or a pedestrian refuge are not feasible in the vicinity of the war memorial.
- 3.5 Other measures could be introduced on Bridge Street in the vicinity of the Church, although this would remove much of the on street parking, which would be a concern to the Town Council and local business.

4. Recommendations

- 4.1 The request and reasons for a crossing facility on Bridge Street is appreciated by officers and every effort has been made to find a suitable location. However, as a facility cannot be located near the war memorial and the pedestrian crossing criteria is not met for any location in Bridge Street, the introduction of a crossing facility cannot regrettably be recommended.
- 4.2 It is recommended that no other measures are investigated given the concern previously expressed by the Town Council about the loss of any on street parking on Bridge Street.
- 4.3 That the petition organiser be informed of the decision.

Appendices

Appendix A – EIA Stage 1

Equality Impact Assessment – Stage One

Name of item being assessed:	Petition – Zebra crossing, Bridge Street Hungerford
Version and release date of item (if applicable):	11 February 2013
Owner of item being assessed:	Andrew Garratt – Principal Traffic & Road Safety Engineer
Name of assessor:	Andrew Garratt
Date of assessment:	11 February 2013

1. What are the main aims of the item?
The main aim of this item is to respond to a petition that has been submitted to the Council.

2. Note which groups may be affected by the item, consider how they may be affected and what sources of information have been used to determine this. (Please demonstrate consideration of all strands – Age, Disability, Gender, Race, Religion or Belief and Sexual Orientation.)
--

Group Affected	What might be the effect?	Information to support this.
Local Residents	See note below.	
Elderly Pedestrians	See note below.	
Persons with less mobility	See note below.	
Child pedestrians	See note below.	

Further comments relating to the item:
Whilst a crossing facility would assist pedestrians to cross the road, due to the constraints of the site near the war memorial a crossing cannot be installed. Given that the criteria for a crossing is not met at any location on Bridge Street the recommendation in the report will mean that the crossing situation will remain unchanged.

3. Result (please tick by double-clicking on relevant box and click on 'checked')
<input type="checkbox"/> High Relevance - This needs to undergo a Stage 2 Equality Impact Assessment
<input type="checkbox"/> Medium Relevance - This needs to undergo a Stage 2 Equality Impact Assessment
<input type="checkbox"/> Low Relevance - This needs to undergo a Stage 2 Equality Impact Assessment
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Relevance - This does not need to undergo a Stage 2 Equality Impact

	Assessment
--	------------

For items requiring a Stage 2 equality impact assessment, begin the planning of this now, referring to the equality impact assessment guidance and Stage 2 template.

4. Identify next steps as appropriate:	
Stage Two required	
Owner of Stage Two assessment:	
Timescale for Stage Two assessment:	
Stage Two not required:	√

Name: Andrew Garratt

Date: 11 February 2013

This page is intentionally left blank