



**AGENDA ITEM NO. \***

**ASHLEY, EASTON AND LAWRENCE HILL  
NEIGHBOURHOOD PARTNERSHIP**

**5<sup>th</sup> March 2014**

**Title:** Devolved Transport Budgets for 2014/15

**Officer presenting report:** To Be Confirmed

- RECOMMENDATION**
1. To agree the 2014/15 work programmes for carriageway surface dressing and footway maintenance (Sections 1 and 3).
  2. To comment on the proposals for future delivery of local traffic schemes (Sections 5 to 9).
  3. To note progress on outstanding Local Traffic schemes and agree priority list and budget for Local Transport Schemes (Section 10).
  4. To agree the Minor signing and Lining Budget for 2014/15 (Section 11)
  5. To agree release of Section 106 for Old Market (Section 12)

**Carriageway surface dressing – (sufficient funding is available to deliver the priorities listed below)**

1. We would like to ask the NP to agree the carriageway surface dressing priorities as detailed in the table below. The priorities are based on routine inspections and technical assessments carried out by our Highway Officers.

Ref	Location	Ward	Estimated cost
1	Easton Road	Lawrence Hill	£12,000
2	Roman Road	Easton	£2,585

3	Cowper St	Easton	£1,128
4	Queen Ann Road	Lawrence Hill	£5,700

### Footway maintenance schemes

- The budgets available are similar to those for 2013/14. The footway maintenance budget has been split equally amongst the Community and Neighbourhood Partnerships, based on the number of wards in each. Therefore, Partnerships comprised of two wards have £42,000 and partnerships with three wards have £63,000.
- We would like to ask the NP to agree the footway resurfacing priorities as detailed in the table below. The priorities are based on routine inspections and technical assessments carried out by our Highway Officers. Highlighted below are the senior maintenance officer's recommendations.

Ref	Location	Ward	Estimated cost	Score
1	Brunswick St, Argyle Rd,	Ashley	£11,017	50
2	Williamson Rd	Ashley	£18,718	90
3	Philip St	L/Hill	£13,339	70
4	Dalrymple Road, Drummond Road, Ashley Rd, Barnabas St.	Ashley	£22,827	70
5	Temple Way	L/Hill	On Hold	100
6	Midland Road	L/Hill	£11,518	100
7	Tenby St, Brentry Ave	L/Hill	£6,200	40
8	Cambridge St ( Replace Old Slabs To Tarmac)	Easton	£3,765	50
9	Victoria St	L/Hill	On Hold	
10	Devon Grove, Vicarage Road, Devon Rd, Whitehall Rd	Easton	£14,621	60

- For more information about the technical assessment criteria for carriageways and footways scoring, please look on the NP website see Appendix 1 for detailed scoring for the above schemes

### Local traffic schemes

- In 2013-14 a backlog in delivering local traffic schemes in neighbourhoods was acknowledged and a pause in decision making was agreed by NPs to deliver the backlog. This is on track for being complete by June/July 2014.

6. Unallocated devolved budgets have been carried forward from 2012/13, meaning that from April 2014 your NP local traffic scheme budget is £46,428. The funding is subject to any final accounts from the current schemes.
7. What has become clear during the pause is that there is still not enough capacity within the Highways team (specifically not enough personnel) to deliver more than 14 local traffic schemes per year in addition to S106 schemes and highways maintenance works. Prior to 2009/10 when budgets were devolved to Neighbourhood Partnerships, traffic management officers delivered 14-15 local traffic schemes per year, and since the devolution of the budgets the number of staff in the team has decreased while the workload has increased. The last three to four years have shown that realistically the traffic management team can only guarantee to deliver one scheme per Partnership per year.
8. Therefore, we are proposing the following:
  - Limit the number of schemes chosen per year across the city to 14 (equivalent to one per NP), which we know we can deliver.
  - We would like to ask each NP to consider choosing their schemes for a 3 year programme, and we will endeavour to work flexibly to deliver these schemes as quickly as possible within this timescale.
9. We are often asked whether contracting the work/using consultants would allow us to deliver more schemes. The answer to this is that we do regularly contract work out, and we also use internal and external consultants, for which we are charged. Whilst this can be an effective way of delivering projects when resources are limited, this is often not always viable or the best course of action for the funding available for the following reasons:
  - Consultants have to both cover their costs and make a profit from each scheme. Therefore, whilst the estimated cost of each project includes an estimate of staff time, external consultants generally cost more than direct Council employees for the same work, meaning that less can be achieved overall with this approach.
  - The City Council also still have to manage the consultants so that they deliver what is required. Therefore, whilst the time they spend on each project is reduced, Highway officers will still be heavily involved in each project.
  - Finally, the Council are not able to pass certain powers onto consultants, for example they do not have the authority to make the traffic regulation orders associated with parking restriction changes. Therefore, certain projects or aspects of projects cannot be delivered directly by consultants.

Update on local traffic schemes, s106 schemes, local sustainable transport schemes and other relevant schemes in the area identified in the report of March 2013.

Scheme / location	Current status (in progress/not yet started)	Estimated completion date	Other
Minor Signing and Lining – Partnership wide	Ongoing	31 March 2014	Devolved NP funding
Waiting restriction review – Chelsea Road Area	Completed	July 2013	Devolved NP funding
DIY Streets – Victoria Parade	Phase 1 completed August 2013	August 2013	Devolved NP funding
One Way & Parking restriction review – Brook Hill Area	Traffic Regulation Order process ongoing	Summer 2014 (subject to objections)	Devolved NP funding
Sussex Place / Sevier Street – pedestrian refuge island	Completed November 2013	November 2013	S106 funding
Sevier Street – Road Closure	Design consultation complete, TRO instruction being compiled.	October 2014	IBFF funding
Mina Road – Parking restrictions, speed reduction measures, footway improvements	Design consultation complete, TRO instruction being compiled.	October 2014	IBFF funding
Magdalene Place – Pedestrian and cycle improvements	Internal design and consultation ongoing	December 2014	IBFF funding
Westminster Road – measures to reduce vehicle conflict and	Ongoing public consultation Option B without closures favoured.	Not known	S106 funding
Redfield North - Parking restriction review.	Design study complete and public consultation carried out. No further funding to progress	Subject to further funding	Devolved NP funding
Redfield South - Parking restriction review.	TRO process	June 2013	Devolved NP funding
Traffic calming feasibility study – Hinton Road	Awaiting speed and volume data before study can commence	Not known	Devolved NP funding
Traffic calming feasibility study – High Street	Awaiting speed and volume data before study can	Not known	Devolved NP funding

	commence		
Parking restriction review – St Phillips Area	TRO process nearing completion, decision on objections report to be made by Director	March 2014	S106 funding
Parking restriction review – Beam Street / Barton Hill Area	TRO complete, contractor procurement ongoing	March 2014	S106 funding
Picton Lane – Road closure	Complete	July 2013	S106 funding
Bath Buildings – Parking restrictions	Complete	July 2013	S106 funding
Wade Street – Pedestrian crossing	Design and internal consultation ongoing	August 2014	S106 funding
Ashley Hill – Pedestrian crossing	TRO process ongoing	September 2014	Active Neighbourhoods funding
Railway Path – Cycle speed reduction measures	Design and internal consultation ongoing	Not known	IBFF funding
Feeder Road – Cycle improvement scheme	Design and internal consultation ongoing	March 2015	Enterprise Zone funding

10. The Neighbourhood Committee are asked to consider the recommendations from the Traffic and Transport Sub Group which are supported by Highway Officers in Appendix 2. The Neighbourhood Committee are therefore requested to agree the following funding as detailed in the table below. It is not anticipated that officer will start work on this until June.

Priority	Scheme/Location	Estimated Cost
1	Redfield North Parking Restriction Scheme to include Herber St, Lyppiatt Rd and planters at Victoria Parade. Easton	£15000
2	Devon Rd Crossing Design and Feasibility Study Easton	£4000

11. Annually the Neighbourhood Committee are asked to agree the Minor Signing and Lining Budget. This is to enable the Senior Traffic Officer to address small adhoc requests from local residents. As a 3 ward partnership the Neighbourhood Committee are requested to agree the funding £2250.

## Section 106 Funding

**12.** We are seeking the Neighbourhood Partnership's endorsement to release S106 funds (totalling £67,469.17) as set out in the table below to deliver pedestrian and cycling improvements on Old Market Roundabout and Old Market Street. These funds would be additional to the £300k committed from the Local Sustainable Transport Fund. The proposal, endorsed by the OMCA, is to create an improved walking and cycling route across the roundabout by filling in the subway and widening the existing signalised crossings. There will also be works to de-clutter and rationalise signing on Old Market Street and where possible introduce planting to enhance the environment and create a gateway feature. These works will greatly compliment the works planned in March for improvements to Tower Hill, realising a high quality pedestrian and cycle route from Old Market Street to Castle Park.

S106	Description	Expiry Date	Funding
04/01279 / Former FPS Site, Waterloo Road, Old Market / ZCD...866	Environmental improvement works to Waterloo Street and its vicinity	8 Dec 14	£55,134.29
03/02621 / 24 to 30 West Street, Old Market / ZCD...856	The cost of carrying out environmental improvement works to Waterloo Street and its environs	3 Oct 19	£12,334.88

### Equalities impact assessment

**13.** The Equalities Impact Relevance Check has been reviewed and determined that due to the fact that this decision has no impact on those with protected characteristics in the following ways a full equalities impact assessment is not required:

- access to or participation in a service;
- levels of representation in BCC workforce; or
- reducing quality of life (i.e. health, education, standard of living)

Generally, older people, those with a physical disability, or a mobility impairment are more likely to be disadvantaged than others with protected

characteristics when there are footway maintenance issues.

Investment in Bristol's roads, footways, gullies and street lighting improves the accessibility and safety of the road and footway network and therefore has a positive impact on all equalities groups, and in particular older.

## Appendix 1

Ashley, Easton, Lawrence Hill.	Ward	PRICE	POINTS RATE	1	2	3	4	total
Brunswick St, Argyle Rd,	Ashley	11,017		40	0	10	0	50
Williamson Rd	Ashley	18,718		30	30	30	0	90
Philip St	L/Hill	13,339		40	10	20	0	70
Dalrymple Road, Drummond Road, Ashley Rd, Barnabas St.	Ashley	22,827		50	0	10	10	70
Temple Way	L/Hill	On Hold		30	10	60	0	100
Midland Road	L/Hill	11,518		30	10	60	0	100
Tenby St, Brentry Ave	L/Hill	6,200		30	0	10	0	40
CAMBRIDGE ST ( Replace Old Slabs To Hsc)	Easton	3,765		40	0	10	0	50
Victoria St	L/Hill	on Hold						
Devon Grove, Vicarage Road, Devon Rd, Whitehall Rd	Easton	14,621		40	0	20	0	60



## **Condition Survey Assessment Process for Footways**

### **Prioritisation Process**

Under Section 41 of the Highways Act 1980, Bristol City Council has a statutory duty as Highway Authority to maintain adopted highways at public expense. This can lead to claims against the Council for damages resulting from a failure to maintain the highway.

Under Section 58 of this Act the Council can defend against a claim for failure to maintain if it can prove that it has taken such care as was reasonable to identify and correct defects.

The City Council's current strategy for identifying and prioritising footway resurfacing works, is therefore based on a system of inspections and assessment of condition and use.

Detailed Inspections of the highway network (roads and footways are surveyed together) are done twice a year by the City Council's team of Highway Inspectors. These include the general condition of the highway, with particular attention to defects that are deemed to be 'hazardous'. These inspections also record dangerous defects with street furniture, defects on street name plates and signs, and any highway drainage and associated sewerage works. 'Warning' levels on the general condition of the highway are reported to the Highway Technician to be incorporated into Condition surveys.

Safety Inspections are done on a two-monthly intervals on busy footways, local shopping areas and traffic sensitive principal A roads. The shopping area of the City is inspected at monthly intervals. These inspections focus on hazardous defects only. Safety works may involve immediate repair, temporary repair, closing the dangerous area to the public, provision of warning signs or any other way of removing the danger within 24 hours of the danger being reported. Any concerns raised by a local resident will also generate a Safety Inspection.

If larger issues are identified by the Highways Inspector then these will be raised with the Highway Technicians for a Condition Survey.

Condition Surveys are carried out annually by the Highway Technicians (or as advised by the results of Detailed or Safety Inspections) for major preventative and structural maintenance operations, such as footway reconstruction and surface dressing. The list of locations requiring footway resurfacing result from these surveys.

This approach was developed on the basis of extensive research into good practice across the Country and from the professional expertise and experience of the Highway Maintenance officers.

In undertaking a Condition Survey the trained Highway Technicians will use their professional judgement to assess each section of footway in terms of the condition of the walking surface, the local environment it serves, the level of pedestrian activity and the level of public interaction and accident claims. The scoring system is contained at the end of this note.

The Highway Technician will total up the score for each location, compare each site and rank these according to their overall score.

## Cost

The cost of each section of resurfacing is largely determined by the area of resurfacing required, the material to be used (for instance tarmac is cheaper than paving slabs) and what other repairs need to be corrected at the same time (e.g. broken kerbs). Other factors will also affect the cost of the works, such as how long the work will take to complete, whether there are any local constraints (such as access to shops) which make the work more complicated, or if specific temporary traffic controls need to be installed to enable the contractor to work safely.

## Condition Survey Assessments

### Section 1

Classification	Condition of Walking Surface	Points
Not Satisfactory	25% crazed/cracked/uneven - no trips>20mm	20
Fairly Poor	50% crazed/cracked/uneven - 5 trips>20mm/100m	40
Poor	75% crazed/cracked/uneven - 5-10 trips>20mm/100m	60
Very Poor	100% crazed/cracked/uneven - 10+ trips>20mm/100m	80

### Section 2

Environmental Considerations	Impact	Points
Historical/Tourist Areas	Jobs/Amenity	10
Industrial Premises/Estates	Jobs	10
Office/Commercial Premises	Jobs	10
Public Buildings/Hotels	Image	20
Schools/Hospitals/Health Centres	Image	30
Shopping/Heart of Community	Jobs/Amenity	30

### Section 3

Pedestrian Usage	Examples	Points
Light	Minor/Residential/Local Access Road	10
Medium	Busy Estate/Secondary Distributor Roads	30
Heavy	Minor Shopping/Main Distributor Roads	60
Very Heavy	Main Shopping Areas	90

### Section 4

Public Inter-action	Accident	Points
Public Request 1-5	Accident Claims 1 in 2 year period	10
Public Request 6-10	Accident Claims 2 in 2 year period	20
Public Request 11-20	Accident Claims 3 in 2 year period	30
Public Request 20+	Accident Claims 4+ in 2 year period	40

**Traffic and Transport Sub Group – Shortlisted 28<sup>th</sup> January 2014 Recommendations to the Neighbourhood Partnership re local highway schemes.**

Chair: Lori Streich. The sub group is made up of residents from across the three wards. They are supported by the Area Coordinator for the NP and the Area Manager for Highways and a Highways Engineer.

**Context**

At the meeting the group were advised that Bristol City Council have the capacity to deliver one scheme on 2014/15. The budget (excluding any under spends from existing scheme) for 2014-15 is £46,781 (made up of £21,067 c/f from 12/13 and £25,714 for 2014/15 assuming the budget is the same as previous years). All of the issues/schemes on this sheet have been agreed as having met the T&T Groups priorities. **All the schemes are important** – they have been put forward by residents who principally are concerned about the safety on their street.

The task on the 28<sup>th</sup> Jan was to present recommendations to the NP and specifically ward councillors.

**The process**

The group considered all the issues/proposed schemes, shortlisted 5 schemes and ranked them in priority order having considered the following questions:

1. Does the NP have the budget?
2. Is the sub group convinced it is the right solution?
3. Is the sub group convinced that the proposed solution is value for money – i.e. it will have a really positive impact on the local area and is affordable.
4. Is the scheme going to help non car users move around the area (this includes tackle unsafe and inaccessible environments)?
5. Is there an alternative solution? For example, it is likely to be addressed by a strategic intervention further down the line?
6. What will be the impact if we do nothing?

**Recommendation for 2014/15**

1. Progress Redfield North implementation (including Heber St., completion of Victoria Parade DIY Streets and review of parking restrictions and Lyppiatt Rd)
2. Progress the design study for Devon Road with a view to this being the priority scheme for 2015/16.
3. Councillors support the allocation of a budget for delegated minor works but that this should include access improvements such as drop kerbs as well as ‘lines and signs’.

Location	Problem	Residents Proposed Solution	Traffic and Transport Sub Group Comments	Proposed solution/next steps	Highways recommendations/costs	Recommendations from the T&T Sub Group 28 <sup>th</sup> Jan
Redfield North (Mary St etc)		.		Feasibility funded by the NP 2012/13 £3,000 committed.	£6,000 to implement parking restrictions proposed in feasibility study plus £5,000 to include Heber St £1k for Lyppiatt Rd £2k to complete Victoria Parade <b>Total £14k</b>	<b>Priority 1</b> - £14k (to be confirmed) Implement feasibility study and include completion of Victoria Parade (planters) and Heber Street parking restrictions/ review & implementation. Highways will review the scheme to improve access (such as drop kerbs) where required. <b>It is understood by the group this may increase the cost.</b>
Devon Road at the junction	Cars driving fast, poor visibility	Safe crossing point	Appreciate the problem. For the NP to help the solution needs to within the	Add to short list	Crossing will cost between £10 and 35k depending on the type.	<b>Priority 2</b> -£4,000 Design Study

Location	Problem	Residents Proposed Solution	Traffic and Transport Sub Group Comments	Proposed solution/next steps	Highways recommendations/costs	Recommendations from the T&T Sub Group 28 <sup>th</sup> Jan
with Alpine Road Easton Ward	(caused by railway-bridge hump) by children and parents crossing the road to Whitehall School. Fairly wide, busy road taking vehicles in and out of Easton.		<p>available budget the NP needs to be confident about the benefit. Many families are using the cycle path for example.</p> <p>Need to find out more information as follows:</p> <p>A scheme is being progressed on the cycle path at the request of local people to provide traffic calming and making it safer. Can people make more use of the cycle path? Is this an option particularly for school pick up times?</p> <p>The speed limit on the road is 20 miles an hour. Is community speed watch an option? Could this be a school based approach?</p> <p>Need to find out more about the numbers of people a scheme would benefit. E.G. How many children/families are taking this route? Are other people taking a different/safer route? Suggest someone does a 'head count' on Devon Road.</p> <p>This site has been indentified within Whitehall School's travel plan and is well used by families travelling to and from school so would make sense to involve the school.</p>	<p>Advice from highway engineer - The problem would require a crossing <u>and</u> traffic calming measure.</p> <p>BCC Active Travel Officer to work with residents/parents to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Find out to what extent the improvements to the cycle path will help the problem.</li> <li>b) Consider setting up a community speed watch perhaps with the school.</li> </ul> <p><b>Highways to provide costs of scheme to T&amp;T sub group for Jan 14.</b></p> <p>FEEDBACK FROM CATO (Celia) Talked about potential solutions, group favour either a pedestrian crossing or restriction to through traffic. Concerned issue is not just speed but inappropriate volume of traffic for residential area. Group would also welcome traffic calming or kerb build outs to slow traffic and increase visibility for pedestrians trying to cross the road. Explained options and feasibility would need to be investigated by highways officer.</p>	<p>Due to the layout of the road it will require traffic calming along the road and approaching the crossing which will increase the cost.</p> <p>Highways Officers recommend a design study is the first step at a cost of £4,000.</p>	
Easton Road in particular junctions with Bouverie St and Croydon St.	Parking on junctions causing problems of visibility. Heavy traffic including	Parking restricted to one side of the road.	<p>Agreed needs a solution.</p> <p>The NP budget would probably not stretch to a zebra crossing. So propose parking restrictions and then review the</p>	<p>Review and implement parking restrictions to allow visibility.</p> <p><b>Highways to provide costs</b></p>	<p>Appx. £10k for parking review - £3k to design the scheme and £10k to implement. Crossing would cost between £10 and 50k depending on type.</p>	<p><b>Priority 3</b> - £4k Design Study to determine the scheme (including a parking review and crossing) and cost of the works.</p>

Location	Problem	Residents Proposed Solution	Traffic and Transport Sub Group Comments	Proposed solution/next steps	Highways recommendations/costs	Recommendations from the T&T Sub Group 28 <sup>th</sup> Jan
Lawrence Hill ward	large vehicles using petrol station, First Bus Depot and families attending SPAN/Silai for Skills building. Busy, chaotic St. with few parking restrictions. Problem is not evident on a Sunday or late evenings. Suggesting this is commuter parking.	Move the bus stop back to the inlet so it doesn't block the road.  A zebra crossing near the petrol station and play park on Bannerman Rd.	situation.	to T&T Jan '14.	The area borders the Easton Resident Parking Scheme so may be considered for RPS.	
Lyppiatt Road (outside TESCO) Easton Ward	People parking on the pavement, blocking pedestrian access despite double yellow lines and regular enforcement.	Close the road to motor vehicles except for access  Widen the pavement and install bollards along pavement	Can see that something physical needs to be done because regular enforcement is not working. The group was advised that closing the road is not really an option because of the potential impact on other roads in the area and access for the Tesco lorries (it would require a whole area review).	Put something - a solid object- for example, planters with maintenance contract, a Gromit, cycle stand? Which will be attractive but deter parking. If the parking is prevented the pavements do not need widening.  Residents to explore options with some advice from Highways about size and location. Residents to confirm preferences. <b>Highways to confirm costs T&amp;T Group Jan '14</b>	Careful consideration would need to be given because of Tesco lorries loading and unloading. Cost appx. £5-10k.  St George NP would like to work jointly with AELH NP to address the issues (this road is the ward boundary).	<b>Priority 4</b> Highways have agreed to look at loading and parking restrictions in the area linked to the Redfield North Scheme.  If AELH NP deliver this aspect of the work the St George Partnership may be able to deliver a scheme to prevent parking on the pavement.
Victoria Parade Easton ward	Poor parking, speeding traffic, vehicles going the wrong way down the street. Funding will have	NP has funded 'DIY' approach. Need additional funding for planters and	T&T Group congratulate the residents of Victoria Parade and would like the learning and approach to be shared and for this kind of approached use across the area.	Propose £2,000 of NP funding is made available to complete the scheme project and an evaluation and some kind of tool-kit or guide for others.	.	<b>Included in priority 1</b> Include £2,000 to complete Victoria Parade in Redfield North scheme (priority 1)

Location	Problem	Residents Proposed Solution	Traffic and Transport Sub Group Comments	Proposed solution/next steps	Highways recommendations/costs	Recommendations from the T&T Sub Group 28 <sup>th</sup> Jan
	to be kept for maintenance and so there is not money for everything the residents wanted to do.	evaluation.		Review process at the T&T Review planned for April 14.		
Heber Street, Easton ward	Availability of parking for residents. Competition with car sales businesses at Church Rd end. Car sales park on double yellows and onto the pavement.	Remove one side of double yellow lines to create more space for parking. Parking enforcement.	A significant amount of work has been carried out over recent months to enforce the double yellow lines and address parking on pavements. This has improved the situation. It should be noted that the parking spaces made available by removing the double yellow lines can be used by anyone including the local businesses.	<b>Add to Redfield North Feasibility Study being carried out for the NP.</b>  <b>Highways to confirm</b>  Remove double yellow lines from one side of the road and explore reducing them on the other side.	Could be included in Redfield North at a cost of £5k (£2k for additional design work and £3,000 for implementation).	<b>Included in Priority 1.</b>
Berwick Road	Speeding cars all day and night time too.	Chicane using planters or possibly bike rack. Also exploring closing the road at the St Marks Road end.	Technical advice – a chicane is unlikely to get the support of the whole street because of the number of parking spaces it will remove.  T&T Group think this road and is an ideal candidate for a ‘DIY’ streets approach - residents get together and agree ‘soft’ community-led measures to reduce speed and remind drivers they are in a residential street. If these measures remove parking there must be support from the majority of the street.  NP is considering a policy of only funding planters with a maintenance agreement. May want to consider other forms. Need to evaluate the Victoria Parade DIY street and share the learning.	Resident received a Wellbeing Grant to install planters.  Review DIY streets approach and consider resource/toolkit for residents going forward.  T&T Sub Group to note the resident-led action.		Planters have been funded though the Well Being Fund. Not a priority.
Sussex Place	Parking on pavements. Planters have improved the		<b>History</b> - The large green planters were installed to address the problem and worked. They were moved by contractors and were not put back in the right place	Add to short list.  Find out if the proposed RPS will address the	Part of RPS.	Will become part of the residents parking scheme which will lead to more enforcement. Monitor problem following the

Location	Problem	Residents Proposed Solution	Traffic and Transport Sub Group Comments	Proposed solution/next steps	Highways recommendations/costs	Recommendations from the T&T Sub Group 28 <sup>th</sup> Jan
	problem in some area but there appears to be no enforcement.		and are now not so effective.  There appears to be no enforcement  Discussion about enforcement v physical measures. Will the RPS assist enforcement?  Police have been enforcing	enforcement issue.  Arrange to put the green planters in the right place.  <b>What's the solution?</b>		implementation of the RPS.
Portland Square	Square is a very large round about which does not make the most of the amenity or history for non car use	Pedestrianise the area outside Circomedia/St Pauls Church. Make the road two way.	<b>History</b> - This is proposed in the St Pauls Neighbourhood Plan 2006. Proposal would make much better use of the outside space but also connect the Church and Circomedia with the square facilitating opportunities for utilising and populating the outside area.	Add to short list  <b>Highways to cost</b>	Scheme cost would be very high due to the expensive historic materials needed in the area.	Very expensive, way above NP budget appx. £250k. Not prioritised.
Hannah More School Crossing – New Kingsley Road	Parents are encouraged to park in the Gardiner Haskins car park When picking up and dropping off. They then have to cross over New Kingsley Road which is a Long straight road. There is no crossing/ traffic calming apart from zig- zags outside the school to prevent parking.	Ideally pedestrian crossing, improved signage with better lighting outside Hannah More Primary School, to keep our children safe. But would like anything to improve the current situation.	There are plans funded by S106 to improve this area including a raised table.	<b>Highways advice please – What are the options? Can to S106 deliver improvements to the crossing?</b>	Speed tables and informal crossings are being constructed by the developer.	Work being done by developer – not prioritised. Review once the developer has carried out the work.
James St School/Crossing	Lack of safe crossing provision on James St. Current zebra crossing on James	Puffin crossing	T&T Group were advised the budget for a puffin crossing is greater than the budget available and the residents should look to the school expansion to fund appropriate crossing facilities.	<b>Update</b> The school expansion plan does not include provision for an up graded crossing.	The pedestrian crossing will be renewed and a raised table installed as part of the school expansion.	Work being carried out – not prioritised.

Location	Problem	Residents Proposed Solution	Traffic and Transport Sub Group Comments	Proposed solution/next steps	Highways recommendations/costs	Recommendations from the T&T Sub Group 28 <sup>th</sup> Jan
	<p>Street is not fit for purpose – badly maintained, frequently ignored by vehicle traffic; there are no designated crossing facilities for the school &amp; nursery on James Street; and 20mph speed limit is regularly ignored by vehicle traffic through the area.</p> <p>The island crossings along the stretch have inadequate refuge and feel dangerous for pedestrians at peak traffic hours.</p>		<p>Highways made a commitment to renew the existing crossing facilities. Residents were asked to monitor the situation once this had been done.</p> <p>Contacted the resident to explain the position of the T&amp;T Group/highways advice.</p>	<p><b>Highways to confirm if renewing has been carried out</b></p> <p>Consider next steps?</p>		
Outcome of Feasibility Studies from 2013/14	High Street, Easton					Awaiting results from the feasibility
	Hinton Road, Easton					Awaiting results from the feasibility