



## AGENDA ITEM NO. 8

### GREATER BEDMINSTER COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP

11<sup>th</sup> June 2014

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

**Officer presenting report:** James Dowling

#### RECOMMENDATION

1. To note progress on outstanding local traffic schemes (section 9);
2. To note and discuss possible schemes that the GBCP might prioritise

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

#### Local traffic schemes

1. In 2013-14, a backlog in delivering local traffic schemes was acknowledged and a pause in decision making was agreed by the Partnerships, in order to deliver the backlog of schemes. This is on track for being completed by June/July 2014.
2. Unallocated devolved budgets have been carried forward from 2013/14, meaning that from April 2014, your local traffic scheme budget is £34,284. This funding will be subject to the final accounts of the current schemes, including the adhoc lining and signing works carried out in the area over the last two years.
3. What has become clear during the pause is that there is still not enough capacity within the Highways Delivery Team (specifically not enough personnel) to deliver more than 14 local traffic schemes

per year, in addition to the S106, IBFF and LSTF schemes etc., and highways maintenance works. Prior to 2009/10, when budgets were devolved to the Community and Neighbourhood Partnerships, traffic management officers typically 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 Highways Delivery Team can only guarantee to deliver one scheme per Partnership per year.

4. Therefore, we are proposing the following:

- Limit the number of schemes chosen per year across the city to 14 (equivalent to one per Partnership), which we know we can deliver.
- We would like to ask each Partnership 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.

5. 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 staff 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 cover both 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 carrying out the same work, meaning that less can be achieved overall with this approach.
- Consultants must be managed to ensure 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.
- The City Council is not able to pass certain powers onto

consultants, for example they do not have the authority to make the Traffic Regulation Orders associated with some measures, such as parking restriction changes. Therefore, certain projects, or aspects of projects, cannot be delivered directly by consultants.

6. Below is a list of proposed schemes that have been put forward for discussion and prioritisation by the GBCP:

<b>Scheme / location</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Estimated cost</b>
DYL Compass Point School	TRO needed to address this	£4-5k
Crossing on Dean Lane near Holy Cross School		Puffin - £60K Zebra - £25K Refuge - £10K
Duckmoor Road - speeding / traffic calming measures		Speed cushions - £1K each Chicanes - £12K each
Lower North Street - crossing between Merrywood Road and Hen & Chicken Pub. Plus, also on North Street	Southville Primary School expansion plans may address North Street crossing requests.	Puffin - £60K Zebra - £25K Refuge - £10K
North Street - zebra crossing or similar near Spotted Cow	Southville Primary School expansion plans may address North Street crossing requests.	Puffin - £60K Zebra - £25K Refuge - £10K
North Street - zebra or similar near Gaywood house	Southville Primary School expansion plans may address North Street crossing requests.	Puffin - £60K Zebra - £25K Refuge - £10K
North Street - upgrading zebra crossing at Merrywood Road to a light controlled crossing		Puffin - £60K Zebra - £25K Refuge - £10K
Ashton Drive – zebra crossing or similar		Puffin - £60K Zebra - £25K Refuge - £10K
TROs outside Schools		

Crossing Points for mandatory keep clear markings		
Palmyra Road - crossing / traffic calming		Puffin - £60K Zebra - £25K Refuge - £10K
Chessel St Luckwell Road junction - speed and volume of traffic		Speed table £20K
Luckwell Road Zebra crossing		£25K
Breech Road - crossing		Puffin - £60K Zebra - £25K Refuge - £10K
North street zebra crossing - Bike Shop / lounge & Tobacco Factory near veg shop/ charity shops		£25K
Greville Road – DIY street works		Highly variable
Whitehouse Lane – one-way from Philip Street to Windmill Hill		£8K
Speed table on Blackmoors Lane roundabout		£20k
East Street Discharge Order		£5k
DYL Alpha Road	Alpha Road is within the proposed Bedminster East RPS, and therefore parking restrictions will be addressed as part of this project.	
Avebury Road - parking problems DYL	Parking restriction scheme being promoted in Ashton Vale (including double yellow line junction protection), following Ashton Vale conference. Funding secured through a S106 agreement.	
DYL or similar on	Parking restriction scheme	

South Liberty Lane opposite warehouses	being promoted in Ashton Vale (including double yellow line junction protection), following Ashton Vale conference. Funding secured through a S106 agreement.	
Traffic calming Raleigh Road	Traffic calming proposed for Raleigh Road, linked to Ashton Gate School expansion plans.	

## Equalities Impact Assessment

7. 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 (ie health, education, standard of living)
8. 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.
9. 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.