

# Growth and Regeneration Scrutiny Commission

29<sup>th</sup> November 2018



**Report of:** Transport Service/Local and Sustainable Transport

**Title:** Delivery of Local Transport Schemes

**Ward:** Citywide

**Officer Presenting Report:** Ed Plowden – Head of Local and Sustainable transport  
/  
Mark Sperduty – Group Manager

**Contact Telephone Number:** 0117 90 36568

## **Recommendation**

1. Scrutiny to note the process for delivering transport schemes.
2. Scrutiny to make comment on the proposed changes to the method of collecting suggestions from the public.(Section 2)
3. Scrutiny to comment on how to keep ward members up to date on progress. (Section 3.4)

## **The significant issues in the report are:**

1. Proposals to amend the way local ward members make decisions – particularly about CIL - via Area Committees, which are in currently in progress and due to be considered by Scrutiny in the New Year.
2. The way in which any highways scheme is delivered.



## 1. Summary

1.1 This report covers how concerns over local traffic issues are collated and processes that are in place to deliver resulting projects, including the risks and timescales involved. This work is delivered by the Road Safety and Local Area Engineering team and the report also covers the wider work of this team and key contacts across Transport. Parallel to this, the progress that has been made on the local schemes identified by the Neighbourhood Partnerships since 2015/16 is being communicated to all Councillors and is an Appendix of this report.

## 2. Context

### 2.1 Current Scheme progress

- 2.1.1 At the start of 2015/16 the Neighbourhood Partnerships were asked to not to allocate any further schemes due to the size of the backlog of agreed projects. An additional 6-8 people were brought in on agency contracts for up to 18 months to accelerate delivery. Neighbourhood Partnerships were then requested only to prioritise one scheme per year so that the demands matched the available resources.
- 2.1.2 Progress on the schemes that were live at the start of 2015/16 and those that were prioritised subsequently, is contained in Appendix A along with the estimated completion dates of all remaining schemes. This has been circulated to all members and is not the focus of this report.
- 2.1.3 In summary:
- Schemes live at the start of 2015/16 = 94
  - Schemes still live = 7
  
  - Schemes identified after 2015/16 = 29
  - Schemes still live = 19

### 2.2 Receiving and collating Issues of concerns to local communities

- 2.2.1 The Traffic Choices website was introduced to help the Neighbourhood Partnerships (NPs) consider to which local issues to allocate funding. The website collated local concerns raised and tracked progress of schemes that were funded. This is separate from fix my street, which is a similar tool to map defects and/or repairs needed to existing infrastructure rather than to suggest alterations to existing arrangements.
- 2.2.2 At that time anyone who contacted the City Council with this type of concern received a bespoke response explaining either why this wasn't possible or if it was that it would be considered by the local NP.
- 2.2.3 Staff levels were reduced as part of the Corporate Savings and a new automated webform system resulted in a standardised response saying the enquiry had been received and would be considered in due course. The lack of detail in the generic response has led to many of the issues coming back a second time via Members or MPs.
- 2.2.4 The reduced staff level also makes it impossible to offer the previous level of service to each of the new Area Committees (ACs).
- 2.2.5 All the above requests were manually entered onto Traffic Choices in order for the issue to be logged for future reference. There are 1857 such issues logged by this system.
- 2.2.6 When the Neighbourhood Partnerships ceased, the Traffic Choices website was taken down and so has not been available to log issues. Around 1200 web enquires have been received since then. These have been filed and are awaiting review and assessment.
- 2.2.7 A new web based process to raise queries is now being developed. The aim of this is to enable the person raising the issue to map the precise location as well as the nature of their concern.

This would automate part of the process freeing up officer time on assessing the request. It should also be capable of providing a generic but more informative response as to its potential viability in future.

### **2.3 Mapping of Local Issues**

- 2.3.1 The issues recorded by the Traffic Choices website are available to view on the Council's internal pinpoint mapping that all Councillors have access to - <http://maps.bcc.lan/pinpointplus/>
- 2.3.2 Those issues rose since Traffic Choices was closed down, are not yet mapped, but we are seeking to add these to pinpoint in a similar way.
- 2.3.3 The new process for entering webform enquiries intends to map and enter the issues directly into a spreadsheet for us to be able to assess.
- 2.3.4 We are working on how to make this information visible to Councillors and the public. The resultant information should also be available on pinpoint so all three sets of information should be visible together. The new process is intended to be live early in the new year and to be of use in the generating of ideas in the new AC decision making cycle.

### **2.4 How this information is used to influence highway changes**

- 2.4.1 The concerns recorded in this manner are used in multiple ways:
  - To address urgent issues directly through central budgets in the capital programme;
  - To help provide the transport input when reviewing planning applications – i.e. there is already an issue which could be resolved by a planned development;
  - To input into the design of major schemes being delivered by the City Council, e.g. CPNN; and
  - To feed into the Area Committee process.

### **2.5 Area Committees**

- 2.5.1 The way in which Area Committees work is being refined following the initial first year. A summary of the proposed process is at Appendix B. The overall process is still being finalised and will be discussed by Scrutiny in the New Year
- 2.5.2 Last year the review of Residents Parking Schemes was a major priority for the Transport Department, meaning that the capacity to deliver TROs was reduced. As a result officers produced for ACs a list of schemes from PinPoint that would not require TROs, but this list was not found to be of use to the majority of ACs.
- 2.5.3 As a result, the more automated way of mapping local concerns is proposed so that ACs can have this as another option to inform their prioritisation processes.
- 2.5.4 Another key change is that we are now asking people to identify what the problem is – which helps officers gain a better understanding than the Traffic Choices website, which prompted people to jump to a solution.

### **3.1 What are the different stages of a project?**

- 3.1.1 The following lists some of the key stages of a project that take time and add risk.
- 3.1.2 Feasibility and Preliminary Design
  - Data Collection such as land ownership and presence of statutory undertakers equipment (usually utility companies) and delays may be due to a reliance on third parties in responding with the appropriate information
  - Traffic surveys need to be timed to avoid school holidays etc.

- Preparing a proposal that addresses the initial concern, including research if no standard solution is obvious
- Stage 1 Road Safety Audit if required; to initiate and respond can take –4-8 weeks
- Undertake an EQIA

### 3.1.3 Informal Consultation

- Defining the type and scale of consultation that needs to take place, usually 4-6 weeks
- Preparation of consultation material.
- Determining when the consultation can take place, for instance not during school holidays, local and national elections, over Christmas.
- Reviewing and considering all the responses received to the consultation, including formally considering and responding to any petitions (the timescale would depend on the volume received);
- Redesigning or even redefining the scheme to take into account the consultation.

### 3.1.4 Detailed Design

- This is the main design work to finalise the overall design and determine materials, drainage, lighting, signing and lining changes, resurfacing requirements, position of street furniture and trees etc.
- This would depend on the size of the project but there should not be any unknowns by this stage if the above stages have all been undertaken.
- Stage 2 Road Safety Audit (another 4-6 weeks if needed)
- Redesign to address and Road Safety Audit issues.

### 3.1.5 Statutory Consultation on Traffic Orders

- Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) are required for parking restriction changes, one way orders, no entries, speed limit orders, whilst Statutory Notices are required for zebra crossings and raised tables, speed humps.
- There is a defined legal process to undertake which sets certain timescales.
- The current aim is to get all orders to advert within 4 months, although this depends on a number of elements.
  - A review of all existing local orders to identify which existing orders need to be amended or revoked and how.
  - The complexity of the proposed changes and hence of the order itself
- An advert has to be prepared and issued in the local press and erected on site to make people aware of the proposed changes in advance of the statutory consultation.
- Statutory consultation takes place that has to last at least 21 days once an advert has been placed in the local press and local notices erected on site
- If no objections are received then the scheme can proceed as advertised to sealing.
- If objections are received, a formal review of each one has to take place and a decision taken on whether each objection is valid, can be addressed in a revised design or not.
- An objections report is drafted to recommend how to proceed (as proposed, with amendments or not at all)
- A further supplementary consultation may be needed if minor changes to the advertised scheme are required. This could take an additional 3-4 weeks.

- This is then sent to the appropriate Ward Councillors for comment, before being considered by the Director of Transport for a decision.
- If approved, a Final Notice is prepared and issued in the press and the order sealed. Following sealing the decision can be challenged for up to 6 weeks.
- The proposed scheme can not move onto the next stage before this has been completed as this could be construed as predetermining the outcome of the statutory process.

#### 3.1.6 Tendering

- Construction drawings need to be prepared covering all changes including ground clearance.
- The estimated cost of the scheme determines which section of the Highways contract these works are ordered under. If under £150k then this goes to the contractor appointed under the framework contract for them to consider.
- They need to be given a reasonable time to consider accepting the work, before an official order can be raised. This could be up to 4 weeks.
- If they do not accept the work then other contractors can be approached which could add a further 4-8 weeks to the process.
- If this is in excess of £150k then a full tendering process needs to be commenced. This can take 8-12 weeks.

#### 3.1.7 Construction

- An agreement needs to be reached with the appointed contractor over their overall programme and when they can be on site, what schemes they have which are a priority for the Council.
- There is a minimum 6 week mobilisation period to allow them to plan the work appropriately on health and safety grounds.
- Start dates can also be constrained by site constraints or clashes with other projects, especially those that might create excessive congestion if undertaken at the same time.

### 3.2 Other key factors affecting the timescale for delivery of projects

3.2.1 There are a number of other issues that also affect the delivery timetable of schemes, including:

- The overall programme of activity and priorities of teams involved in the scheme;
- Contractor availability;
- If specific Legal advice is required;
- If planning permission is required.
- Corporate procurement rules;
- Approvals by external bodies e.g. Environment Agency, Network Rail, English Heritage
- If forecast costs look like exceeding the budget there would need to be additional funding sought; and
- Third party works in the areas that delay potential start times.

### 3.3 Internal management processes

3.3.1 **Transport Delivery Board:** This is an officer board with managers from across the Council who are involved in the management and delivery of changes to the highway and public realm which coordinates the overall programme, oversees the resourcing and timing of individual

projects, aims to minimise the risks identified above and improve the delivery of transport schemes overall.

- 3.3.2 **Quality Assurance Process and Board:** This is an officer board to ensure all schemes are delivered to the highest quality, and it specifies the internal teams that should be involved in the design of each scheme, the external bodies/groups that should be consulted and any other additional audits that should be undertaken. It signs off schemes at different stages (in principle, general design and detailed design) A full list of the internal teams/disciplines that could be consulted on any scheme depending on its nature is included in Appendix C.

### **3.4 Reporting schemes to Councillors and local communities**

- 3.4.1 Officers in the Road Safety and Local Area Engineering teams have always been willing to meet Councillors to discuss any local issue or progress on any scheme.
- 3.4.2 Councillors are also contacted directly at certain stages in a scheme:
- Prior to informal consultation
  - Results of informal consultation
  - Prior to statutory consultation
  - Draft Objection report stage
  - When site work is about to commence
  - There are extended periods in here outside of these points when there is no formal contact but some does take place on an adhoc basis
- 3.4.3 Until recently, this was supplemented by the NP process, including the Transport sub groups and Tracker element of the Traffic Choices website.
- 3.4.4 The list in Appendix A shows the current status of all local schemes. This could be provided quarterly in the same format, if Councillors felt that more regular updates would be useful.
- 3.4.5 Additionally the Councillors whose ward covers a particular scheme will be informed as and when one of the above milestones has incurred a delay.
- 3.4.6 The Strategic City Transport Team are also developing a 5 year capital programme and are working on mapping this information so that it can be made available to Councillors and officers to help further improve coordination of work and allocation of budgets and resources.

### **3.5 Resources and work of the Road Safety and Local Area Engineering team**

- 3.5.1 Currently there are 4.6 FTE under the Area Manager, with a further 4 FTE vacancies. An additional 4 FTE's are currently being brought back into the team following the delivery of the RPS reviews.
- 3.5.2 The vacancies are due to be advertised, whilst we are seeking additional posts to address an increase in the number of parking restrictions and traffic schemes that need to be installed linked to approved planning applications.
- 3.5.3 To supplement the core team, work is also commissioned from the City Council's Engineering Consultancy and highway framework consultants when possible.
- 3.5.4 Alongside the delivery of local traffic schemes through the NP or Area Committee process the team also works on a number of other areas. This includes:
- Parking, pedestrian crossings, traffic calming, pedestrian and cycle route improvements that are funded directly through the Capital Programme;
  - S106 Schemes (including some significant parking schemes);
  - Casualty Reduction and Road Safety schemes;
  - Safety Camera Programme and general speed enforcement;
  - Road Safety Audits for other transport projects;
  - Road Safety Research (e.g. TRL Community Corners/Pocket Parks/DIY streets);

- Assessing Fatal collisions;
- Controlled Parking Zones and Residents Parking Schemes;
- Highway works for other departments such as the Schools Expansion Programme;
- Liaison with Business Improvement District and other bodies;
- Tourist and Destination signing (working alongside Destination Bristol);
- Pedestrian and cycle route signing;
- Assessment of all requests by residents for Disabled Parking Bays;
- Correspondence on local issues with residents, Councillors, MPs and FOIs; and
- Road Safety, Cycling, Walking, Traffic Management/Engineering and Local knowledge input and advice to planning applications, other schemes and other teams and departments.

### **3.6 Sign posting Councillors to who does what in other teams in Transport**

- 2.5.1 All correspondence from Councillors should, as per the instructions across the Council, be directed to the Councillor and MP Growth and Regeneration Place email account ([growth.regeneration.cllrmp@bristol.gov.uk](mailto:growth.regeneration.cllrmp@bristol.gov.uk)). From here it can be distributed to the relevant team, or person in that team.
- 2.5.2 This is the same as per all enquires to the items listed in paragraph 2.11. However, the Area Manager and individuals leading on specific projects are usually able to meet Councillors if there are particular scheme issues that need to be discussed.

### **3. Policy**

Not Applicable

### **4. Consultation**

#### **a)Internal**

We are currently working with the GIS and ICT teams to develop the new automated online mapping tool that will populate PinPoint. This is due for completion in January

#### **b)External**

Not Applicable

### **5. Public Sector Equality Duties**

This report notes the current position and does not put forward any proposals, and so no equality impact assessment has been undertaken. An EQIA is undertaken for each and every scheme at an early stage in the process as per 3.1.2 above.

### **Appendices:**

Appendix A – Progress on schemes

Appendix B – Draft Area Committee Process

Appendix C – QA Consultation List [STILL TRYING TO OBTAIN]

### **LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) ACT 1985**

#### **Background Papers:**

None

