

Report to the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation)

Date: 20 January 2015

Subject: UTC General Traffic Signal Equipment Refurbishment

Capital Scheme Number : 32172

Are specific electoral Wards affected? If relevant, name(s) of Ward(s): ,	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Are there implications for equality and diversity and cohesion and integration?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Is the decision eligible for Call-In?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Does the report contain confidential or exempt information? If relevant, Access to Information Procedure Rule number: Appendix number:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

Summary of main issues

- 1 This report seeks approval to continue the rolling programme to replace ageing and obsolescent traffic signal equipment with more modern traffic signal equipment which is more efficiently maintainable to an acceptable standard. Such improvements provide a safer and more efficient service for our customers and allow greater Local Transport Plan benefits to ensue.

Recommendations

- 2 The Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) is requested to:
 - i) note the contents of this report;
 - ii) approve the proposal at the total cost of £80,000; and
 - iii) give authority to incur expenditure of £72,000 works costs and £8,000 staff costs, to be funded from the LTP Transport Policy Capital Programme (100% Government grant funding).

Purpose of this report

- 3 To seek approval to continue the rolling programme for the replacement of ageing / obsolescent traffic signal equipment.

1 Background information

- 1.1 Each year Leeds replaces outdated signal equipment. This year £95,000 was approved in September 2014. This was spent on upgrading equipment at 8 sites.
- 1.2 The general view on traffic signal equipment is that it has an expected lifetime of around 15 years. In addition, as technology moves rapidly on, a number of the older models become unmaintainable due to unavailability of spares. Older equipment can be more unreliable, leading to longer down time.
- 1.3 In Leeds around 4% of traffic signal controllers are over 20 years old, and 20% are between 15 and 20 years old. The average age of controllers is 10 years, which increases if no action is taken. An ongoing programme of refurbishment is necessary to modernise the controller stock and replace any on street equipment that has been identified as in poor condition following inspections.
- 1.4 On street equipment such as traffic signal poles can rust over time and become unsafe and unsightly. It is proposed to inspect sites with equipment that falls into this category and identify a solution for replacement.
- 1.5 Depending on specific site details, new equipment has a lower energy footprint, is more flexible in terms of control, and can be more easily adapted for bus priority. Thus upgrading equipment has benefits for all users.
- 1.6 The scheme was identified as a key element of the Asset Management work stream for Implementation Plan 2 and was approved by the (then) West Yorkshire Integrated Transport Authority.

Main issues

2 Design Proposals/Scheme Description

- 2.1 To replace obsolescent traffic signal controllers and equipment in order to provide an efficient and safe traffic signal network for the benefit of our customers.
- 2.2 The work consists of the physical replacement of traffic signal equipment on-street and the design of new control strategies for the microprocessor controller and its monitoring units.

3 Programme

- 3.1 It is proposed to start work as soon as approval is received. Work will continue to completion throughout the financial year 2014/2015.
- 3.2 A provisional list of sites rated by age or condition following an inspection is given below. Should urgent problems arise elsewhere the funding may be used to remedy those issues.

Site

450L Harrogate Rd / Chapeltown Rd

217L A62 / Lowfields Rd
351L Queenswood Rd / Foxcroft Rd
913L High St / Boston Spa
631L Royds Ln / Rothwell
851L A65 / Rawdon Cross Rds
716L M621 / Jun 1
321L Hough Ln / Bramley
153L Briggate / Boar Ln
350L Stanningley Rd / Richardshaw Ln
651L Rose Wharfe / Toucan

The total works cost will be £72,000 with staff costs of £8,000.

4 Corporate Considerations

4.1 Consultation and Engagement

- 4.1.1 Consultation will be undertaken in the Wards affected if there is an obvious change to the operation of the signal installation.

5 Equality and Diversity / Cohesion and Integration

- 5.1 A screening document has been prepared and an independent impact assessment is not required for the approvals requested.
- 5.2 The proposal will make crossing the road easier and safer for people with mobility issues and those who are visually impaired by fitting push button units with both audible and tactile components.
- 5.3 The equipment currently installed is now at the end of its current life span and can become unreliable if not replaced. New equipment will benefit all users as signal aspects will be more visible and reliable.

6 Council Policies and City Priorities

- 6.1 Environmental Policy: The introduction of more efficient (Extra Low Voltage) traffic signal equipment translates to more efficient junctions/pedestrian facilities to the benefit of the environment, and provide energy cost savings to the council.
- 6.2 The proposal contributes to the policies in the West Yorkshire Local Transport Plan 2011-26 as follows:
Proposal 1 - Prioritise asset management [] according to a hierarchy of key transport route networks and users that best supports the Plan
- 6.3 Mobility Policies: This work will assist mobility for disabled pedestrians.

7 Community Safety

- 7.1 The proposals within this report have no implications under Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998.

8.1 The proposals contained in this report do not have any implications in respect of the Council Constitution.

9.1 Scheme Design Estimate: The estimated total cost for this additional work is £80,000, consisting of £72,000 works costs and £8,000 staff costs. It is proposed to procure the equipment through the contract 3435 Supply & Installation of traffic signal equipment.

Previous total Authority to Spend on this scheme	TOTAL £000's	TO MARCH 2013 £000's	FORECAST				
			2013/14 £000's	2014/15 £000's	2015/16 £000's	2016/17 £000's	2017 on £000's
LAND (1)	0.0						
CONSTRUCTION (3)	87.0			87.0			
FURN & EQPT (5)	0.0						
DESIGN FEES (6)	8.0			8.0			
OTHER COSTS (7)	0.0						
TOTALS	95.0	0.0	0.0	95.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Authority to Spend required for this Approval	TOTAL £000's	TO MARCH 2013 £000's	FORECAST				
			2013/14 £000's	2014/15 £000's	2015/16 £000's	2016/17 £000's	2017 on £000's
LAND (1)	0.0						
CONSTRUCTION (3)	72.0			72.0			
FURN & EQPT (5)	0.0						
DESIGN FEES (6)	8.0			8.0			
OTHER COSTS (7)	0.0						
TOTALS	80.0	0.0	0.0	80.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total overall Funding (As per latest Capital Programme)	TOTAL £000's	TO MARCH 2013 £000's	FORECAST				
			2013/14 £000's	2014/15 £000's	2015/16 £000's	2016/17 £000's	2017 on £000's
LCC Supported Borrow ing	0.0						
Revenue Contribution	0.0						
Capital Receipt	0.0						
Insurance Receipt	0.0						
Lottery	0.0						
Gifts / Bequests / Trusts	0.0						
European Grant	0.0						
Health Authority	0.0						
School Fundraising	0.0						
Private Sector	0.0						
Section 106 / 278	0.0						
Government Grant - LTP	175.0			175.0			
SCE (C)	0.0						
SCE (R)	0.0						
Departmental USB	0.0						
Corporate USB	0.0						
Any Other Income (Specify)	0.0						
Total Funding	175.0	0.0	0.0	175.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Balance / Shortfall =	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Parent scheme number: 99609
Title: LTP Transport Policy Capital Programme

9.3 Revenue Implications

There are no revenue cost implications envisaged as a result of this capital scheme.

10 Legal Implications, Access to Information and Call In

10.1 The scheme is not eligible for call in because it falls below the relevant thresholds.

11 Risk Management

11.1 Failure to continue with this rolling programme of refurbishment will result in an increase of ageing signal stock with the subsequent loss of efficiency, safety and flexibility to allow for the best utilisation of existing road network.

11.2 All works will be carried out in accordance with the Highways Agency's Code of Practice for Traffic Control and Information Systems (MCH 1869).

12 Conclusions

12.1 The replacement of ageing/obsolescent traffic signal equipment provides a more flexible, efficient and safe traffic signal network for the benefit of all users.

13 Recommendations

2.1 The Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) is requested to:

- i) note the contents of this report;
- ii) approve the proposal at the total cost of £80,000; and
- iii) give authority to incur expenditure of £72,000 works costs and £8,000 staff costs, to be funded from the LTP Transport Policy Capital Programme (100% Government grant funding).

14 Background documents¹

14.1 None.

¹ The background documents listed in this section are available to download from the Council's website, unless they contain confidential or exempt information. The list of background documents does not include published works.

Appendix 1

Equality, Diversity, Cohesion and Integration Screening



As a public authority we need to ensure that all our strategies, policies, service and functions, both current and proposed have given proper consideration to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration.

A **screening** process can help judge relevance and provides a record of both the **process** and **decision**. Screening should be a short, sharp exercise that determines relevance for all new and revised strategies, policies, services and functions. Completed at the earliest opportunity it will help to determine:

- the relevance of proposals and decisions to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration.
- whether or not equality, diversity, cohesion and integration is being/has already been considered, and
- whether or not it is necessary to carry out an impact assessment.

Directorate: City Development	Service area: Transport Policy
Lead person: Richard Tallant	Contact number: 2476760

1. Title: Traffic Signal Equipment Refurbishment			
Is this a:			
<input type="checkbox"/> Strategy / Policy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Service / Function	<input type="checkbox"/> Other	
If other, please specify			

2. Please provide a brief description of what you are screening
<p>The screening process looks at the proposals to refurbish aged traffic signal equipment sites within Leeds. The introduction of this form of control will provide a safer and more efficient service for our customers and allows the traffic signals use up to 70% less energy whilst providing more reliable equipment.</p> <p><i>Each year Leeds replaces outdated signal equipment. Last year 5 junctions were upgraded, however, this is an ongoing process as the general view on traffic signal equipment is that it has a life expectancy of around 15 years. In addition, as technology moves rapidly on, a number of the older models become un maintainable due to unavailability of spares. Older equipment can be more unreliable, leading to longer down time.</i></p> <p><i>In Leeds around 4% of traffic signal controllers are over 20 years old, and 20% are between 15 and 20 years old. The average age of controllers is 10 years, this obviously increases if no action is taken.</i></p> <p><i>A continuous programme of refurbishment is necessary to keep the numbers of old controllers at a manageable level.</i></p> <p>Depending on specific site details, new equipment has a lower energy footprint, is</p>

more flexible in terms of control, and can be more easily adapted for bus priority. Thus upgrading equipment has benefits for all users

3. Relevance to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration

All the council's strategies/policies, services/functions affect service users, employees or the wider community – city wide or more local. These will also have a greater/lesser relevance to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration.

The following questions will help you to identify how relevant your proposals are.

When considering these questions think about age, carers, disability, gender reassignment, race, religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation and any other relevant characteristics (for example socio-economic status, social class, income, unemployment, residential location or family background and education or skills levels).

Questions	Yes	No
Is there an existing or likely differential impact for the different equality characteristics?	X	
Have there been or likely to be any public concerns about the policy or proposal?		X
Could the proposal affect how our services, commissioning or procurement activities are organised, provided, located and by whom?		X
Could the proposal affect our workforce or employment practices?		X
Does the proposal involve or will it have an impact on <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Eliminating unlawful discrimination, victimisation and harassment• Advancing equality of opportunity• Fostering good relations		X

If you have answered **no** to the questions above please complete **sections 6 and 7**

If you have answered **yes** to any of the above and;

- Believe you have already considered the impact on equality, diversity; cohesion and integration within your proposal please go to **section 4**.
- Are not already considering the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration within your proposal please go to **section 5**.

4. Considering the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration

If you can demonstrate you have considered how your proposals impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration you have carried out an impact assessment.

Please provide specific details for all three areas below (use the prompts for guidance).

• **How have you considered equality, diversity, cohesion and integration?** (think about the scope of the proposal, who is likely to be affected, equality related information, gaps in information and plans to address, consultation and engagement

<p>activities (taken place or planned) with those likely to be affected)</p> <p>Consultation will be undertaken in the Wards affected if there is an obvious change to the operation of the signal installation.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key findings (think about any potential positive and negative impact on different equality characteristics, potential to promote strong and positive relationships between groups, potential to bring groups/communities into increased contact with each other, perception that the proposal could benefit one group at the expense of another) <p>Positive Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal will make crossing the road easier and safer for people with mobility issues and those who are visually impaired by fitting push button units with both audible and tactile components. • The equipment currently installed is now at the end of it's current life span and can become unreliable if not replaced. New equipment will benefit all users as signal aspects will be more visible and reliable.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Actions (think about how you will promote positive impact and remove/ reduce negative impact)

<p>5. If you are not already considering the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration you will need to carry out an impact assessment.</p>	
Date to scope and plan your impact assessment:	N/A
Date to complete your impact assessment	N/A
Lead person for your impact assessment (Include name and job title)	N/A

<p>6. Governance, ownership and approval Please state here who has approved the actions and outcomes of the screening</p>		
Name	Job title	Date
Gordon Robertson	UTMC Manager	

<p>7. Publishing</p> <p>Though all key decisions are required to give due regard to equality the council only publishes those related to Executive Board, Full Council, Key Delegated Decisions or a Significant Operational Decision.</p> <p>A copy of this equality screening should be attached as an appendix to the decision making report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governance Services will publish those relating to Executive Board and Full

Council.

- The appropriate directorate will publish those relating to Delegated Decisions and Significant Operational Decisions.
- A copy of all other equality screenings that are not to be published should be sent to equalityteam@leeds.gov.uk for record.

Complete the appropriate section below with the date the report and attached screening was sent:

For Executive Board or Full Council – sent to Governance Services	Date sent:
For Delegated Decisions or Significant Operational Decisions – sent to appropriate Directorate	Date sent:
All other decisions – sent to equalityteam@leeds.gov.uk	Date sent: