

---

**Report to the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation)**

**Date: 5 July 2016**

**Subject: Design & Cost Report for Traffic Management Capital Programme 2016/17**

**Capital Scheme Number: 32568**

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 type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Is the decision eligible for Call-In?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input 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 type="checkbox"/> No

---

**Summary of main issues**

1. One of the key objectives of the Best Council Plan is to 'promote sustainable and inclusive economic growth' through delivering key infrastructure projects. The projects within this report address several key concerns relating primarily to address local traffic issues including parking and the provision of a safer environment for the general public and will contribute towards the Council's goal to reduce the numbers of people killed or seriously injured on the city's roads.
2. This report is aimed at supporting the Council's Best Council objective 'becoming an efficient and enterprising council', in that this report recommends a change in our approach and processes to deliver schemes within the Traffic Management Capital Programme.
3. The aim of this report is to adopt and approve the way schemes funded from the Traffic Management Capital Budget are reviewed and authorised by the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation). This approach enables authorisation of the annual programme in one holistic report, which is a more cost effective and economical way to deliver the programme and will minimise unnecessary delays in the process.
4. The purpose of the report is to agree a programme of works to deliver 21 schemes through the Traffic Capital Budget during the 2016-17 financial year as prioritised in Appendix A of this report and 6 reserve schemes currently unfunded but to be developed as a contingency from the Traffic Management Capital Budget, to ensure full year spend is achieved.

5. This report seeks approval to agree and authorise the preparation and delivery of a programme of works to be funded from the Traffic Management Capital Budget for minor local traffic management improvement schemes during the 2016-17 financial year, through an improved and efficient process.

## **Recommendations**

6. The Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) is requested to:
- i) review and approve the prioritised list of Traffic Management Capital projects to the sum of £288,000 as identified in Appendix A for the 2016/17 capital year allocation;
  - ii) approve the design, consultation and subject to the making of any necessary Traffic Regulation Orders the implementation of the approved programme of works as detailed in Appendix B of this report;
  - iii) give authority and to request the City Solicitor to advertise any draft Miscellaneous Provision Act Orders and Traffic Regulation Orders as listed in Appendix A (Speed Limit Order, Movement Order, Waiting Restriction Order or Experimental Order) as required to address/ resolve the problems identified for each scheme and if no valid objections are received, to make, seal and implement the Orders as advertised;
  - iv) to receive such other further reports as may be needed to address any objections received to advertised Orders or other matters arising from the detailed scheme proposals;
  - v) give authority to incur expenditure of £348,000 inclusive of any legal fees, staff fees and works costs which will be funded £160,000 from the Traffic Management Capital Programme and £188,000 from Section 106 receipts, and to commence the detailed design, consultation and implementation of the schemes described in Appendix B of this report;
  - vi) approve the injection of £188,000 into the Traffic Management Capital Programme 2016/17, from Section 106 receipts; and
  - vii) give authority to incur expenditure of £8,000 for the purchase and installation of additional PARKMAP software to facilitate the computerisation of all Movement and Speed Limit Orders in the Leeds District.

## 1 Purpose of this report

- 1.1 The purpose of the report is to seek approval for the annual programme of Traffic Management Capital Schemes and authorise the detailed development, consultation, preparation and delivery of these scheme subject to the satisfactory completion of any necessary Orders and statutory processes.

## 2 Background information

- 2.1 The Council's annual Capital Programme includes an allocation of funds for Traffic Management schemes. This annual programme is utilised to fund small scale minor traffic engineering works and Traffic Regulation Orders generally in local communities to address road safety, parking and traffic related issues.
- 2.2 Traffic management schemes follow the feasibility, consultation and legal process, the length of which is difficult to determine but can often be in excess 12 months. The current pattern of funding enables the council to accommodate uncertainties over timing of spend while still delivering schemes of local importance in a planned and prioritised manner.
- 2.3 The Traffic Management capital budget is complementary to an operational revenue budget for 2016-17 of £99,890 for implementation of minor works including small scale signing and lining schemes and TRO corrections to ensure all parking restrictions are enforceable.

### 2.4 Traffic Management Capital budget 2015-16 year end and 2016/17 budget

2.4.1 The year-end out turn position is shown below. The 'allocated' over spend of £40,000 which is primarily due to the delivery of schemes listed as reserve schemes within the approved 2015/16 Traffic Management Capital report. There have also been some slight variations between initial estimates and final costs on some schemes.

- 2015/16      Overspend on "Allocated to schemes" (A)      £40,000

The 'allocated to scheme' spend is calculated from schemes which were approved by the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) in 2015/16, but have incurred final accounts in 2016/17.

- 2016/17      Carry over schemes "Allocated to schemes" (B)      £ 60,000
- 2016/17      New Traffic Management Capital Budget injection (C): £200,000  
                    Minus £100,000 (A+B) from 2015/16 (D)      £100,000
- 2016/17      Injection of Section 106 funds (E):      £188,000

Total available budget for 2016/17 scheme prioritisation is therefore (D+E)

$$(\text{£}100,000 + \text{£}188,000) = \text{£}288,000$$

## **2.5 Scheme authorisation and reporting procedure.**

2.5.1 As a minor schemes budget, the approval of a Traffic Management scheme is delegated to the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation), who takes decisions by reference to the Highways and Transportation Board. Previous arrangements for reporting such schemes to the Highways and Transportation Board, often resulted in multiple reports for individual schemes, which was inefficient in terms of the process and the timely delivery of those measures of importance to local communities. As such a review of the process was undertaken in 2013/14 in relation to the Council's financial regulations and constitution and this report reflects a simplified method of reporting which was designed to reduce inefficiency, whilst maintaining full consultation and compliance with the necessary statutory procedures.

2.5.2 The re-evaluation of the approval process embodied by this report enables schemes to be delivered more efficiently, reduces workload for the Traffic Management, Finance and Administration Sections; whilst helping to ensure that the committed expenditure is spent and that schemes are more reliably completed within the budgeted year.

2.5.3 Subject to the approval of this report, all schemes in the programme will be reviewed with the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) on a monthly basis at Highways and Transportation Board for consideration and approval. Where any scheme which results in objections (namely Traffic Regulation, Movement or Speed Limit Orders) these will be reported back with recommendations to the Highways and Transportation Board for a formal decision by the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) as hitherto.

## **3 Main issues**

### **3.1 Design Proposals and Full Scheme Description.**

3.1.1 This report is seeking authority to take forward an agreed programme of Traffic Management schemes as detailed in Appendix B to this report. This section of the report therefore describes how this programme has been assembled.

3.1.2 Throughout the year, the Traffic Management Section receives a range of requests from Ward Members, Parish Councils, West Yorkshire Police, local residents, the general public and businesses for action to address local traffic issues of concern. At the same time operational matters on the network become apparent which also require remedial actions. All these issues are recorded, and from this a list of schemes is assembled to be prioritised against the annual funding allocation. This year there have been a total of 110 individual schemes requested, where initial evaluation by Traffic Engineers has determined that remedial action is warranted and supported.

3.1.3 To ensure value for money, some schemes in the same locality/electoral ward have been combined to save legal and advertisement costs which have seen the true number of request fall from 110 sites to 41 identified schemes.

3.1.4 Each request has been assessed for their deliverability and for their general value for money in terms of being able to deliver realistic transport improvements. The schemes were also compared against the general aims of the overarching LTP transport themes in

order to enable comparison to be made of the range of benefits of each scheme. (These themes are Road Safety, Economic Growth, Sustainable Travel Choices, Congestion Issues and Equality of Accessibility).

### **3.1.5 Where Schemes Originate:**

3.1.6 Schemes originate from a range of sources. Some schemes are promoted internally, e.g. in response to changes in the regulations which prescribe the detail of signage and road markings or following identification of a road safety risk. However most are initiated externally following representation from the public and business, generally backed by support from Elected Members, Parish Councils and other representative bodies.

3.1.7 The issues that the service is approached to resolve can be emotive in local communities and schemes are only progressed where the case is supported by evidence and research (parking patterns, traffic speeds, accident records etc) and has a sound, cost effective solution.

3.1.8 The Traffic Management capital budget fills the middle ground between the small traffic revenue schemes and the larger LTP budget schemes and is subject to increasing demands; this is partly due to other budgets being cut in real terms. More significant however, is the increasing public desire for solutions to localised problems associated with traffic volumes, speeds, accessibility and parking. The latter are often associated with commuter, business and shopper parking, especially around large traffic generators such as shopping centres, Universities and hospitals.

3.1.9 The outcome of supporting this report is a justifiable and evidenced scheme programme that is aimed at meeting the expectations of the local communities in relation to:-

- Supporting road safety
- Supporting business
- Encouraging community cohesion
- Enhancing quality of life for residents
- Supporting all highway users
- Making best use of the highway network

3.1.10 There are always many more issues identified than the allocated budget can support and so a points scoring system is used to rank the schemes in terms of their local benefits and effectiveness. This approach ensures that the localism agenda is embedded within the process and that schemes are developed in accordance with local transport issues and priorities. The basic scoring categories cover the schemes impact in terms of:-

- Accident history and severity.
- The change in level of service to road users including pedestrians cyclists, public transport users and HGV impact; and
- Environmental impact.

- 3.1.11 Initial cost estimates have been prepared for those requests and a recommended prioritised list of schemes has been developed to enable schemes to be moved forward through design and consultation to implementation. Due to the limited funding available not all scheme requests are able to be supported and promoted at this time.
- 3.1.12 The prioritisation assessment has identified that 21 schemes and 6 reserve schemes can be delivered against the current £288,000 allocation for the 2016/17 budget year.
- 3.1.13 A copy of the prioritisation criteria and scoring system is attached as Appendix C.

**3.2 Programme** – Subject to approval being granted, it is proposed to design and consult on the schemes, advertise any related draft Traffic Regulation Orders and implement the works within the 2016/17 financial year.

## **4 Corporate Considerations**

### **4.1 Consultation and Engagement**

4.1.1 The majority of the schemes in the proposed programme have originated from local communities either from Ward Member, local residents or businesses. At this stage therefore the detail and prioritisation has been assembled with input from the relevant officers from the Highway and Transportation service disciplines, but as the works programme develops, consultation on individual projects will be carried out as appropriate.

4.1.2 Subject to approval of the programme each individual scheme will be subject to full consultation with Ward Members, Parish/Town Councils, local residents and businesses as appropriate prior to final detailed scheme being progressed. This will include any relevant statutory process, such as for Traffic Regulation Orders, where any objections received will be formally reported to the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation). The Executive Member for Regeneration, Transport and Planning has been consulted on the prioritisation methodology and proposed programme detailed herein. Ward Members are aware of the outcomes relating to proposals in their wards and the approved proposals have been published on the Council's website. The progress of the overall programme and each individual scheme will be monitored by the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) and Heads of Service via a regular presentation/ update on a monthly basis at the Highways and Transportation Board meeting. This process covers scheme design, consultation, statutory process and project delivery.

### **4.2 Equality and Diversity / Cohesion and Integration**

4.2.1 An Equality, Diversity, Cohesion and Integration Screening (attached as an Appendix) has been completed and indicated that an EIA was not required. Generalised positive and negative impacts have been identified but each individual scheme on the

programme will require a specific EDCI screen and any issues will be presented to the members of the Highways and Transportation Board for consideration and approval.

- The installation of safety schemes including; traffic signals, pedestrian crossing facilities, speed limit changes and traffic calming schemes by the service has a positive effect on local communities, different age groups and the mobility impaired.
- Parking restrictions improve quality of life in streets of terraced properties, assist disabled parking, and support access to businesses and the reliability of public transport operations.

#### 4.2.2 Negative Impacts

- Requests for schemes continue throughout the year however the service will be unable to deliver identified schemes within a reasonable timescale due to the budget restriction. This will have an adverse effect on the perception of the service and the council generally.

The negative impacts will be reduced/removed by:-

4.2.3 The introduction of this one year approval reporting process will ensure schemes can be delivered in a more efficient way and that better monitoring throughout the year can be undertaken to ensure schemes are delivered within the financial year.

4.2.4 A screening document will be prepared and an independent impact assessment will be completed for each project during the detailed design process as required. The screening document and/or the independent impact assessment once approved by the service will be sent to the Equality Team to be approved and publishing.

### 4.3 Council policies and City Priorities

4.3.1 Local Transport Plan: The proposals contained in this report are in accordance with Local Transport Plan 3 – Strategic Approaches:-

Travel Choice Connectivity	P10	Promote the benefits of active travel
	P18	Improve safety and security
	P22	Develop networks and facilities to encourage cycling and walking.

4.3.2 Disability / Mobility: The schemes will provide a positive improvement to local residents by removing indiscriminate and obstructive parking which create road safety concerns. The schemes will also provide a safer environment for the general public.

### 4.4 Resources and value for money

#### 4.4.1 Full scheme estimate

4.4.2 The cost to promote the 21 prioritised schemes from the Traffic Management Capital Budget 2016/17 is £288,000, which is split into the following categories:-

Works	£186,500
Staff Fees	£ 79,500
Legal Fees	£ 22,000

In addition to the annual LCC capital resource funding in 2016/17 the team has resourced additional Section 106 funding of £188,000 to supplement the 2016/17 Traffic Management Capital Programme, through identified unallocated Section 106 receipts, which can be used to fund Highways Traffic Management capital expenditure.

The £288,000 is £100,000 new Traffic Management Capital budget in 2016/17 and £188,000 new unallocated Section 106 receipts that have been identified, which can be used to fund Highways Traffic Management capital expenditure.

Note that also £60,000 of carry over scheme costs from 2015/16 year will be charged to the 2016/17 year Traffic Management Capital Programme budget.

So total expenditure in 2016/17 year will be £348,000.



#### 4.4.3 Capital Funding and Cash Flow.

Complete the embedded table below:-

<b>Funding Approval :</b>	<b>Capital Section Reference Number :-</b>						
<b>Previous total Authority to Spend on this scheme</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>TO MARCH 2016</b>	<b>FORECAST</b>				
			<b>2016/17</b>	<b>2017/18</b>	<b>2018/19</b>	<b>2019/20</b>	<b>2020 on</b>
	<b>£000's</b>	<b>£000's</b>	<b>£000's</b>	<b>£000's</b>	<b>£000's</b>	<b>£000's</b>	<b>£000's</b>
LAND (1)	0.0						
CONSTRUCTION (3)	0.0						
FURN & EQPT (5)	0.0						
DESIGN FEES (6)	0.0						
OTHER COSTS (7)	0.0						
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>
<b>Authority to Spend required for this Approval</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>TO MARCH 2016</b>	<b>FORECAST</b>				
			<b>2016/17</b>	<b>2017/18</b>	<b>2018/19</b>	<b>2019/20</b>	<b>2020 on</b>
	<b>£000's</b>	<b>£000's</b>	<b>£000's</b>	<b>£000's</b>	<b>£000's</b>	<b>£000's</b>	<b>£000's</b>
LAND (1)	0.0						
CONSTRUCTION (3)	0.0						
FURN & EQPT (5)	0.0						
DESIGN FEES (6)	0.0						
OTHER COSTS (7)	0.0						
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>348.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>348.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>
<b>Total overall Funding (As per latest Capital Programme)</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>TO MARCH 2016</b>	<b>FORECAST</b>				
			<b>2016/17</b>	<b>2017/18</b>	<b>2018/19</b>	<b>2019/20</b>	<b>2020 on</b>
	<b>£000's</b>	<b>£000's</b>	<b>£000's</b>	<b>£000's</b>	<b>£000's</b>	<b>£000's</b>	<b>£000's</b>
LCC Supported Borrowing	160.0		160.0				
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	188.0		188.0				
Government Grant	0.0						
SCE ( C )	0.0						
SCE ( R )	0.0						
Departmental USB	0.0						
Corporate USB	0.0						
Any Other Income ( Specify )	0.0						
<b>Total Funding</b>	<b>348.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>348.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>
<b>Balance / Shortfall =</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

#### 4.5 Legal Implications, Access to Information and Call In

4.5.1 A variety of Road Traffic Regulation Orders will be required using the powers contained within the Roads Traffic Regulations Act 1984.

## **4.6 Risk Management**

4.6.1 This report is aimed at approving and monitoring of all Traffic Management schemes to reduce the risk of not delivering the Traffic management Budget within the approved Financial Year.

4.6.2 Due to the nature of the schemes delivered via the Traffic Management budget, there is always the risk objections are received which can delay introduction, whilst resolution discussions are undertaken. The streamlined process introduced in 2013/14 enables these expected delays to be monitored and programmed more efficiently.

## **5 Conclusions**

- 5.1 The proposed Traffic Management Capital programme for 2016-17 consists of 21 priority schemes to the value of £288,000 designed to address key issues of local importance within local communities which have been selected on a prioritised basis from requests and issues identified during the previous 2015-16 financial year. The programme has been developed to maximise the best possible outcomes for road safety, businesses and communities from the allocated budget.
- 5.2 Approval to the development and delivery of the overall programme as detailed in this report will enable schemes to be delivered in a timely and efficient manner and will produce positive outcomes for road safety, businesses and communities. As with all schemes having a regulatory component all Orders will be consulted on a developed within the required statutory guidelines and process and where objections are received these will be formally considered by the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation).

## **6 Recommendations**

6.1 The Chief Officer (Highways & Transportation) is requested to:

- i) review and approve the prioritised list of Traffic Capital projects to the sum of £288,000 as identified in Appendix A for the 2016/17 capital year allocation;
- ii) approve the design, consultation and subject to the making of any necessary Traffic Regulation, Speed Limit or Movement Orders the implementation of the approved programme of works;
- iii) give authority and to request the City Solicitor to advertise any draft Miscellaneous Provision Act Orders and Traffic Regulation Orders as listed in Appendix A (Speed Limit Order, Movement Order, Waiting Restriction Order or Experimental Order) as required to address/ resolve the problems identified for each scheme and if no valid objections are received, to make, seal and implement the Orders as advertised;
- iv) to receive such other further reports as may be needed to address any objections received to advertised Orders or other matters arising from the detailed scheme proposals;

- v) give authority to incur expenditure of £348,000 inclusive of any legal fees, staff fees and works costs which will be funded £160,000 from the Traffic Management Capital Programme and £188,000 from Section 106 receipts, and to commence the detailed design, consultation and implementation of the schemes identified in Appendix A;
- vi) approve the injection of £188,000 into the Traffic Management Capital Programme 2016/17, from Section 106 receipts; and
- vii) give authority to incur expenditure of £8,000 for the purchase and installation of additional PARKMAP software to facilitate the computerisation of all Movement and Speed Limit Orders in the Leeds District.

## **7 Background documents<sup>1</sup>**

- 7.1 Appendix A – Traffic Management Proposed Programme 2016-17
- 7.2 Appendix B - Traffic Management Scheme Works Description
- 7.3 Appendix C - Prioritisation Criteria and Scoring System
- 7.4 Appendix D – Equality, Diversity, Cohesion and Integration Screening

---

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