



AGENDA ITEM NO. 6

**ST GEORGE
NEIGHBOURHOOD PARTNERSHIP
Tuesday 25th March 2014**

Title: Highways Devolved Transport Budgets for 2014/15

Officer presenting report: Shaun Taylor (East Area Highways Manager)

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 10).
3. To note progress on outstanding Local Traffic schemes and agree priority for Local Transport Schemes (Section 11).
4. To agree the Minor signing and Lining Budget for 2014/15(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	Greendown	St George East	£1,100

Footway maintenance schemes

2. 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.
3. 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	Bellevue Road, Avening Road	West	20,700	70
2	Whiteway Road	West	28,211	60
3	Glen Park Gardens, Glen Park	West	10,000	40
4	Cherry Orchard Lane	West	15,000	70
5	Rodney Road/Avenue, Brockhurst Road	West/East	23,500	70
6	Northcote Road, Salisbury Street	West	9,500	50
7	Roseberry Park	West	19,200	60
8	Nags Head Hill	East	11,500	70
9	Barcroft Close, Albany Street	East	7,700	40
10	May Street	East	10,500	40

4. For more information about the technical assessment criteria for carriageways and footways scoring, please look on the NP website (www.bristol.gov.uk/page/council-and-democracy/neighbourhood-partnerships) Or ask your area coordinator. See Appendix 1 for detailed scoring for the above schemes

Local traffic schemes

5. 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

£49,725.03. 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.

10. Please see Appendix 2 for Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ's) concerning the proposals.

11. 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.

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	On going	31 March 2014	Devolved NP funding
Waiting restriction review – Kingsway Area	Completed	January 2014	Devolved NP funding
Experimental Traffic Calming Scheme – Beaufort Road	TRO process and contractor procurement	Start May 2014	S106
Speed reduction and pedestrian improvement measures – Crews Hole Road near Butlers Close	Traffic Regulation Order process on going	June 2014	S106
Conham Road – Pedestrian and cycle improvements	On going design work to provide options for consideration	Not known	Enterprise Zone funded
Waiting restriction review – Hudds Vale Road / Plummers Hill Area	TRO objections being considered	May 2014	Devolved NP funding
Stibbs Hill Area- Waiting restriction review and modification of road closures	Traffic Regulation Order process on going	June 2014	S106
Troopers Hill	Preliminary Design work to start in April 2014	Not known	IBFF funding

12. The Neighbourhood Committee are asked to consider the recommendation below from the Traffic and Transport Sub Group which is supported by Highway Officers. The Neighbourhood Committee are therefore requested to agree the following funding as detailed for Priority 1 and chose a feasibility study from either Priority 2 or 3 from the table below. It is not anticipated that officers will start work until June 2014.

Priority	Scheme/Location	Issue	Description of Works	Estimated Cost
1	Plummers Hill	Speeding vehicles	Introduce traffic management/calming measures	£40,000
2	Lyppiatt Rd	Parking	Feasibility	£4000
3	Bryants Hill	Crossing	Feasibility	£4000

13. 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 2 ward partnership the Neighbourhood Committee are requested to agree the funding £1500.

Equalities impact assessment

14. 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.

Highways Delivery Schemes

NPs are receiving a report in March to say that the number of local traffic schemes that can be delivered per year will be limited to one per NP.

FAQs

Q What counts as a scheme for the “one scheme a year”?

A A scheme is something which requires significant traffic officer time – so something which requires repeated consultation, a traffic regulation order, significant design work, major construction, etc.

Q How did you decide on one scheme a year?

A This is all based on the amount of time different works take officers to do, and planning how much officer time is available within the highways team. When planning out how long the different work-streams take, we know that we can deliver s106 works, the LSTF works, maintenance works, general day-to-day fixing matters (the proposed “minor works”, see below) and 14 local traffic schemes a year (these are the schemes chosen by the NP).

Q Does this include s106 schemes – i.e. can we only have one scheme a year including s106 work?

A No this does not include s106 schemes – you can have s106 schemes/CIL schemes plus one local traffic scheme. If you want to use your money to match fund/top-up the s106 schemes then this is encouraged.

Q What about local sustainable transport fund schemes?

A The “one scheme a year” also doesn’t include externally funded schemes, of which there are many (e.g. LSTF, IIBF, Active Travel Grant, etc.) – we will continue to deliver these schemes until the funding is finished.

Q What about feasibility studies?

A As the work associated with a feasibility study takes about half the total time needed to deliver a scheme, feasibility studies including consultation will count as half a scheme. If the scheme goes ahead, the resulting work has already been consulted on, so the scheme would only be another half a scheme for the final design, supervision and construction work.

Q What about small things that we want to do?

A Our proposal is that we have a new work-stream called “minor works” which don’t class as schemes but which would be works that Highways Officers undertake on behalf of Neighbourhoods, this would replace the current “minor signs and lines” category. These works are loosely defined as anything that doesn’t involve consultation, legal processes, significant design work or major construction. Examples would be dropped kerbs to enable access, bollards (small numbers of bollards), small build outs of paths, other minor works. Our proposal would be to increase the amount of money currently set aside for minor lines and signs into a new pot called “minor works”, and that before doing any works above and beyond the level of our previously delegated “signs and lines” work, there must be at least email agreement by the councillors, and/or agreement at the traffic subgroup. The money would only be spent if the NP has agreed what it is spent on, and it will be properly monitored and fed back to the NP.

Q What about if we want another area of highways to do some work – does this count as a scheme (e.g. street lighting)?

A This does not count as the “one scheme a year”.

Appendix 1

Footway Assessment Scoring

ST GEORGE EAST, ST GEORGE WEST	WARD	PRICE	POINTS RATE	1	2	3	4	TOTAL
BELLEVUE ROAD, AVENING ROAD	WEST	20,700		50	10	10	0	70
WHITEWAY ROAD	WEST	28,211		40	0	20	0	60
GLEN PARK GRDS, GLEN PARK	WEST	10,000		30	0	10	0	40
CHERRY ORCHARD LANE	WEST	15,000		40	10	10	10	70
RODNEY ROAD /AVE, BROCKHURST RD.	WEST/EAST	23,500		40	0	20	10	70
NORTHCOTE ROAD, SALISURY ST.	WEST	9,500		40	0	10	0	50
ROSBERRY PARK	WEST	19,200		50	0	10	0	60
NAGS HEAD HILL	EAST	11,500		30	10	30	0	70
BARCROFT CLOSE , ALBANY ST	EAST	7,700		30	0	10	0	40
MAY ST	EAST	10,500		30	0	10	0	40