

## BARNSELY METROPOLITAN BOROUGH COUNCIL

This matter is a Key Decision within the Council's definition and has been included in the relevant Forward Plan

### REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PLACE TO CABINET

#### NEIGHBOURHOOD ROAD SAFETY INITIATIVE – PROPOSED PILOT 2021/22

#### 1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 This report sets out the strategy for investing £90,000 of one-off investment funding (Rev GF 067) through the creation of a Neighbourhood Road Safety Initiative pilot.
- 1.2 In addition, this report sets out the process by which local priorities will be identified, evaluated and prioritised for delivery in 2021/22.

#### 2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 **That Cabinet approve the creation of the Neighbourhood Road Safety Initiative Pilot with immediate effect, with a view to delivery of interventions commencing April 1<sup>st</sup> 2021.**

#### 3. INTRODUCTION

- 3.1 In May 2018, a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) Review paper was presented to Cabinet outlining the current demand, the gaps in knowledge and awareness and the financial and operational constraints that exist within the current service arrangement.
- 3.2 A key finding of this report explored how the expectations of Elected Members and the public were aligned with the reality of delivering road safety interventions with reduced financial and operational resources.
- 3.3 Following the TRO report a questionnaire was issued to all local members asking for feedback and comments on a range of TRO related areas and a task and finish group, comprising Elected Members and Officers, was established. The task and finish group reviewed the responses to the questionnaires and highlighted a number of issues;

When asked;  
*Do you feel the Authority's approach to Road Safety is adequate and effective?*

Responses included;  
*We are concerned that the approach relies heavily on accident data.*

*We could do more at a local level.*

*Public perception is that our approach is not entirely effective*

When asked;

*What is the most frustrating element of the TRO process from your personal perspective?*

Responses included;

*There is no process for local priorities.*

*Being told there is no process and no budget for local priorities.*

- 3.4 Building on this insight the Traffic Group sought an understanding of potential solutions from across the wider South Yorkshire authorities and devised a scheme similar to that which is currently being used in Doncaster, Rotherham, and Sheffield Councils.
- 3.5 A business case was established to address the gap in funding the introduction of a new service would present and subsequently the Highway's and Engineering service made a successful application to the One-Off Investment fund for £90,000 (Rev GF 067) to be made available to provide small scale engineering interventions, essentially providing for a range of interventions that would not meet the core service criteria for intervention.
- 3.6 On December 1<sup>st</sup> 2020, the holistic approach to Road Safety was presented to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee (OSC). During the discussion, elected members highlighted the level of funding available to tackle the road safety issues across the network. And, whilst elected members acknowledged the progress that has been made in recent years to improve road safety it was noted that the OSC believe the overall Road Safety agenda is underfunded and there is a lack of funding targeted at preventative interventions.

#### **4. PROPOSAL AND JUSTIFICATION**

- 4.1 As has been discussed previously, as part of the continued pressure on highway service budgets, the Department for Transport has substantially reduced the funding available to the Council for all highway matters. The present funding available for road safety measures comes from the road safety budget and this is targeted to sites on a 'worst first' basis.
- 4.2 The current method used to ascertain the 'worst first' sites is by using Personal Injury Collision (PIC) data obtained by South Yorkshire Police (SYP) using the 'Crash' collision reporting system. This records information about the collision including time, date, location, weather and other causation factors that contributed to the collision. The data is analysed by staff to see if there are any concerns as to the frequency and nature of the collisions. All causation factors are thoroughly investigated and if necessary, any improvement works are programmed accordingly. This type of collision investigation work forms part of the routine annual workload of the Council's Traffic Group.

- 4.3 The Council receives an allocation of Integrated Transport funding from the Department for Transport, via the Sheffield City Region, to carry out improvements at locations where there is a history of PIC collisions. The Council has a statutory duty to monitor all PICs and each year interrogate the database to find the worst sites in Barnsley and then seek to resolve issues with these sites on the 'worst first' basis using the available funding received. For a site to be added to the Priority List it would have to have had at least 6 PICs in 3 years.
- 4.4 The proposed Neighbourhood Road Safety Initiative facilitates an expansion of the existing intervention criteria resulting in a response to community concerns regarding road safety that would not otherwise be met.
- 4.5 This funding represents an opportunity for local road safety concerns to be raised for consideration of suitable interventions. A period of consultation will commence on 15<sup>th</sup> February 2021 during which time Elected Members are requested to submit up to three schemes and rank them as Ward priorities. This consultation will close on 12<sup>th</sup> March 2021. An example of the pro-forma template used to submit schemes can be found in Appendix 1.
- 4.6 Following receipt of the completed pro-formae, proposals will be assessed using a pre-determined assessment matrix, the guidance notes to which can be found in Appendix 2.
- 4.7 The commissioning process for determining priority areas for investment is outlined below;

### **The Commissioning Process**

- Step 1 – An initial 4 week consultation will be undertaken with the Wards between 15<sup>th</sup> February and 12<sup>th</sup> March 2021.
- Step 2 – From this consultation all potential schemes will be identified by the Wards to produce a long list.
- Step 3 – Detailed analysis of the long list will take place during March/April 2021; this will involve scoring each suggestion and an assessment of legal requirements for road signing & markings, compliance with the legislation and relevant guidance.
- Step 4 – Review all results and make a recommendation as to the sites to be taken forward.
- Step 5 – Agree results and proposed recommendations for each Ward.
- Step 6 – Circulate results to all members for information purposes.
- Step 7 – Produce programme for design and implementation of proposals during 2021/22, up to the available budget.

Step 8 – Regular (quarterly) updates will be prepared and circulated to inform Members of progress.

Step 9 – Any schemes which cannot be delivered in 2021/22 will be consolidated and re-considered for delivery in future years, subject to further funding being made available.

Step 10 – Delivery of selected schemes anticipated to commence April / May 2021.

## **5. CONSIDERATION OF ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES**

5.1 Discussions took place at an early stage to assess whether the secured funding would be better put to use through the addition of an additional, temporary post within the Traffic Group. The post would add much needed capacity to help respond to the high demand for service.

5.2 However, It was felt, that on balance, the secured funding would be better utilised via a pilot investment scheme to deliver targeted local interventions, thereby reducing demand on the core Traffic Group over time and realising real improvements for residents.

## **6. IMPLICATIONS FOR LOCAL PEOPLE/SERVICE USERS**

6.1 There is a high confidence that the schemes proposed will improve levels of road safety for residents.

## **7. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

7.1 Consultation on the financial implications has taken place with colleagues in Financial Services on behalf of the Service Director and Section 151 Officer – Finance.

7.2 The engineering works included within the pilot will cost an additional £90,000 in 2021/22.

7.3 This expenditure will be financed from the One-off Investment funding approved for project Rev GF 067.

7.4 The financial implications to this report are summarised in the attached Appendix A.

## **8. EMPLOYEE IMPLICATIONS**

8.1 The pilot will be delivered by Highway's & Engineering although support will be sought from the Stronger Communities Service to help promote and co-ordinate at a Local Level.

## **9. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

9.1 Projects within the programme may have legal requirements for which the assistance of Legal Services will be required, for example, the development of Traffic Regulation Orders, as may be required.

## **10. COMMUNICATIONS IMPLICATIONS**

- 10.1 A standard approach to communications is expected however local Wards may wish to promote any selected schemes locally.

## **11. CONSULTATIONS**

- 11.1 Consultation with the following services has taken place and comments have been taking account of in this report;

Stronger Communities  
Safer Communities  
Legal Services  
Economic Regeneration  
Transport Services

## **12. RISK MANAGEMENT ISSUES**

- 12.1 Through the feasibility and design process, elements of the design can change or projects can become out of scope and undeliverable from a cost and engineering perspective. However, these risks will be managed through good project and programme management processes to continually monitor design and delivery to ensure available funding is not exceeded.
- 12.2 There is a risk that the programme will be oversubscribed and the allocated funding will be insufficient to meet all needs. The evaluation matrix will be relied upon to identify the most beneficial schemes for delivery. Once the short list of priority schemes has been determined a follow up report will be brought back to Cabinet with the resulting financial gap identified.

## **13. HEALTH, SAFETY AND EMERGENCY RESILIENCE ISSUES**

- 13.1 Schemes have the potential to assist the visually impaired and those with mobility issues in crossing the road and accessing public transport. For example, Tactile paving and pedestrian refuges.

## **14. COMPATIBILITY WITH THE EUROPEAN CONVENTION ON HUMAN RIGHTS**

- 14.1 Schemes may assist the visually impaired and those with mobility issues in crossing the road and accessing public transport by the proposed addition of Tactile paving, pedestrian refuges and the introduction of lower speed limits.

## **15. LIST OF APPENDICES**

Appendix A: Financial Implications  
Appendix 1: *Community Concerns Fund Pro-forma*  
Appendix 2: *Scheme Assessment – Guidance Notes*

**Report author: Matthew Bell – Head of Highways & Engineering**  
**Damon Brown – Traffic Manager**

## **APPENDIX 1**

### **Community Safety Concerns Fund Pro-forma**

Ward  
Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Submitted  
by: \_\_\_\_\_

Through the Cabinet Member for Environment & Transport, one-off funding has been made available to provide small scale engineering interventions in areas highlighted as having an area of road safety concern. This proforma allows each Ward to submit and prioritise 3 schemes to be assessed as well as an opportunity to rank the importance of road safety issues within the Ward.

#### **Ward Priorities**

Please rank the following from 1 to 4 (1 being the most significant and 4 least significant)

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Ranking</b>
Speeding	
Parked cars/visibility	
Crossing Roads	
Local environment	

#### **Scheme Ideas**

<b>Scheme name</b>	
<b>Location</b>	
<b>Issues to be addressed</b>	
<b>Recommended suggestion</b>	
<b>Your ward priority (Rank 1 to 3)</b>	

<b>Scheme name</b>	
<b>Location</b>	
<b>Issues to be addressed</b>	
<b>Recommended suggestion</b>	
<b>Your ward priority (Rank 1 to 3)</b>	

<b>Scheme name</b>	
<b>Location</b>	
<b>Issues to be addressed</b>	
<b>Recommended suggestion</b>	
<b>Your ward priority (Rank 1 to 3)</b>	

Please complete and send back to [traffic@barnsley.gov.uk](mailto:traffic@barnsley.gov.uk) or Highways & Engineering, Environment & Transport, Place Directorate, Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council, PO Box 601, Barnsley, S70 9FA

Any queries regarding the completion of this form or the content, please contact Damon Brown, Principal Engineer - Traffic [damonbrown@barnsley.gov.uk](mailto:damonbrown@barnsley.gov.uk)

**To be submitted by 26th February 2021**

## **APPENDIX 2 – Scheme Assessment Guidance Notes**

### **General**

This is a working document and will be subject to further modification, please ensure that the most recent version of this document is used. The advice and comments made in each sub-section relate to that sub section only and scores should only be applied on that basis, for example -

- Sub section 4C relates to improving access to public transport, this is under the "Socially Disadvantaged" heading and as such may differ from the score for sub section 3C which refers to conditions for all users and not just socially disadvantaged users.

### **1. Environmental**

**A1, Air Quality** - Features in the road that will slow traffic have been considered generally to increase vehicle emissions. For example:-

- Features that substantially remove traffic from the treated route and displace traffic to alternative "approved" routes (+2)
- Other features that reduce traffic queues (+1)
- Features on residential streets with alternative "approved" routes may be scored as (neutral)
- Features on residential streets leading into a housing estate only (-1)
- Features on residential streets with access for HGV's to development sites or on a moderately serviced bus route - 3 plus services hour (-2)

**A2, Noise** - Similar to above - Buildout calming features generally considered to give a negative score, with vertical features attracting a more negative score.

**A3, Vibration** - Similar to above - also consider displaced HGV's

**B, Traffic Volume** – It is generally accepted that traffic calming such as humps, cushions and similar features reduce traffic volume on that road or street by 20% or more

- Where traffic is significantly (>25%) displaced to a strategic route a score of (+2) may be appropriate
- Where traffic is displaced significantly (>25%) to other "approved" routes consideration of a (+1) score may be appropriate
- In a cul-de-sac environment, or road with no alternative route, it has been assumed that traffic volumes will remain stable and hence a neutral score
- Slight (>10%) displacement to "non-approved" routes such as calming to through streets with parallel alternatives (-1)
- Where substantially (>75%) all traffic displaced to "non-approved" routes (-2)  
- Point closures may have this effect

**C, Residential Environment** - Use of plants and other landscaping... Will residents find the immediate area more attractive to use.

- Will tidy a large area where many people will benefit such as a shopping precinct or a school entrance (+2)
- Will tidy a smaller area where a lesser number of people would benefit, such as along a minor residential street (+1)
- Where no landscaping works are proposed (Neutral)

- Where a scheme excludes minor opportunities to improve the local environment, such as on a residential street or not reinstating a damaged grass verge or not providing planting where the opportunity exists in a proposal (-1)
- Where a scheme will exclude obvious opportunities to improve a large area which is used by many people (-2)

## 2. Regeneration

**A, Business** - Will the proposed scheme have any effect on existing or potential business sites as identified in the BMBC - UDP - For example:-

- An improved junction might make a particular site more attractive for development, it might ease access to and from the site - A (+2) score might include traffic signals or a roundabout. Whereas improved visibility or an improved crossing point from a bus stop to a potential site might give a (+1) score.
- Humps might attract a (-1) score
- Point closures might attract a (-2) score

**B, Accessibility** - Introduction of improved crossing facilities and routes to the facilities, consideration of the knock on effect of limited waiting near facilities, to discourage all day parking by shop owners etc.

- Improving conditions for access to a collection of facilities or a medium sized development site creating work for 20 or more people might attract a score of (+2)
- Improving conditions for access to a single facility or a "use unknown" development site might attract a score of (+1)
- Neutral
- Removing access for a single facility or "use unknown" development site might attract a score of (-1)
- Removing access to a collection of facilities or a medium sized development site (-2)

## 3. Travel Mode

**A, Walking or cycling** – Improved conditions for non-motorised users.

- Traffic calming to an area or the creation of a new footway or cycleway that would benefit a large number of users, such as a new route to a shopping area / school or a link between a bus interchange and large development site or housing area, benefiting many locals and visitors to the area >20 peak peds hr a score of (+2) may be appropriate
- Similar to above, but benefiting only a limited number of locals <20 peak peds hr (+1)
- Neutral
- Removal of or increasing the journey length by 50m for pedestrians or 150m for cyclists on a low use route <20 peak peds hr (-1)
- Removal of or increasing the journey length by 50m for pedestrians or 150m for cyclists on a route used frequently >20 peak peds hr (-2)

## **B, Walking or cycling to schools**

- Linkage with proposals from a Safe Routes to Schools project or in response to a related request from a parent or school (+2)
- Any other scheme which could provide a safer route to a school, but has not been part of any consultation process with the above (+1)
- Schemes remote from any school journey are score as neutral
- Schemes on school safe routes that increase the number of road crossings along a route, reduce the width of footway (including verge) to below 1.8m, or increase walking distance by 50m or cycling distance by 150m (-1)
- Schemes on school safe routes that remove existing facilities without providing an alternative (-2)

## **C, Public transport** - Improved conditions, reduced delays and better access to facilities

- Schemes linked directly with a QBC or improving links to existing interchange or terminus or known busy stop (+2) - Although it is recognised that although a signal controlled crossing will introduce some PSV delay, the benefits to the pedestrians will partially outweigh the dis-benefits to total journey time and hence could still score (+2) on a regularly use crossing. However a less well used crossing might attract a lower score of (+1) due to the impact on journey time reliability.
- Schemes improving provision to other public transport routes and stops not covered above (+1)
- Schemes other than listed below, that would directly worsen conditions for public transport are scored at (-1)
- Schemes on a QBC or near an existing interchange or terminus or known busy stop, that would directly worsen conditions for public transport are scored at (-2)

## **4. Social Disadvantage**

### **A, Physically disadvantaged**

- Introduces new drop crossings and tactile paving at sites of high use, such as near shopping areas or bus interchanges (+2)
- Improves existing crossings at lower use sites such as residential streets or isolated bus stops (+1)
- Neutral
- Removes low use (<20 peak peds hr) facilities or changes existing network to a degree that might confuse disabled people - for example changing a one way street to two way and vice versa or raising an existing low kerb to full height kerb (-1)
- Removes higher use (>20 peds hr) facilities (-2)

### **B, Personal safety and security**

- Provides improved personal safety and security at high use facilities such as bus stops, safe routes to schools and shopping areas (+2)
- As above but on low use facilities such as residential streets not on route to any specific facility mentioned above (+1)
- Neutral

- Reduces personal safety and security on low use facilities such as residential streets not on safe routes to schools or routes not leading to bus stops and shopping areas(-1)
- As above but at high use facilities such as bus stops, safe routes to schools and shopping areas (-2)

### **C, Access to public transport**

- Provides facilities specifically improving access to facilities and services, such as pedestrian crossings / improved footways near bus stops or raised level bus stops (+2)
- Provides improved facilities on routes to bus stops such as pedestrian crossings remote to a bus stop but en-route or (+1)
- Neutral
- Reduces access on routes to bus stops and interchanges (-1)
- Reduces access at facilities, such as the removal of an existing pedestrian facility that currently serves a bus stop (-2)

## **5. Safety**

Quantification of a reduction has been calculated based on a subjective appraisal of how a proposed scheme might reduce accidents. This appraisal is to be based primarily upon the current accident and speed reductions guidance and where appropriate reference to the "DTLR Road Safety Good Practice Guide" or current ROSPA guidelines.

*Note - National targets are - 40% reduction in KSI accidents, 10% reduction in slight accidents and 50% reduction in child KSI*

### **A, Reduction in total number of accidents**

- Meets or exceeds National targets (+2)
- Average of the **three** National Target areas (KSI, Child KSI and Slight) is equal to or exceeds 20% (+2)
- Falls below either of the above but shows an accident saving (+1)
- Where no accidents exist a neutral score has been given.
- Where an increase in slight (excluding child) accidents are expected (-1)
- Where an increase in Child (KSI and slight) or KSI accidents is expected (-2)

### **B, Reduction in total number of accidents involving children**

- Meets or exceeds National targets (+2)
- Average of the **two** target areas (Child KSI and Child Slight) is equal to or exceeds 20% (+2)
- Falls below the above but shows an child accident saving (+1)
- Where no child accidents exist a neutral score has been given.
- Where Child KSI and Child Slight are not reduced and amount to between 10% and 25% of accidents at a site (-1)
- Where Child KSI and Child Slight are not reduced and amount to more than 25% of accidents at a site (-2)

### **C, Reduction in perceived accident risk**

- The general public perceives road humps, point closures, wider footways, speed enforcement cameras and improved crossing facilities as a good safety feature, a score here of (+2) may be appropriate

- Features such as mini-roundabouts, junction improvements, improved road markings, improved signs and red light enforcement cameras may have a lesser perception, a score of (+1) may be appropriate
- Schemes that remove existing facilities without providing an alternative (-1)

#### **D, Reduction in vehicle speeds**

- Meets or is below the speed standards outlined in the prevailing national guidance on local speed limits (+2) - *Note - would require speed measurement*
- Expected speed reduction will be typically 5mph or greater - (+2)
- Expected speed reduction will be typically below 5mph - (+1)
- Where no speed reduction is expected a neutral score is given
- Where speeds are expected to increase to the detriment on road users, an increase of up to 5mph will score (-1) and an increase of above 5mph will score (-2)

#### **E, Safety for Pedestrians and Cyclists**

- Schemes that provide off highway routes, including highway crossing points on that route (+2)
- Controlled crossing points or traffic calming (+2)
- Schemes providing a degree of segregation from vehicular traffic (+1)
- Schemes that increase the number of crossings along a route, reduce the width of footway (including verge) to below 1.8m, or increase walking distance by 50m or cycling distance by 150m (-1)
- Schemes that remove existing facilities without providing an alternative (-2)

### **6. Maintaining Infrastructure**

#### **A, Improves condition of Infrastructure**

- Scheme replaces 25% or more of existing road pavement to sub-base level or replaces 50% or more of existing road surfacing or removes 10% or more of heavy traffic >7.5t without displacing to other "similar" roads (+2)
- Scheme removes 50% or more of light traffic <7.5t without displacing to other "similar" roads (+1)
- Scheme increases light traffic (within the scheme) without maintenance to existing pavement <7.5t (-1)
- Scheme increases heavy traffic (within the scheme) without maintenance to existing pavement >7.5t (-2)

#### **B, Specific linkage to QBC**

- Where major maintenance has been included, such as pavement renewal or multiple inspection chamber replacement (+2)
- Where minor maintenance has been included, such as road marking renewal or a single inspection chamber replacement (+1)
- Where no maintenance in the short term is expected a neutral score is given
- Where minor maintenance has been excluded (-1)
- Where major maintenance has been excluded (-2)

**C, Linkage to other projects and initiatives** - Regeneration schemes, Safe Routes to Schools, etc.

- Linkage to multiple other initiatives, giving benefits to all vulnerable users in an area, such as an area calming scheme or pedestrian access improvements to local facilities (+2)
- Linkage to another initiative, giving benefits to some users, such as an individual crossing scheme (+1)
- A potential conflict with other known initiatives (-1)
- A direct and clear conflict with another known initiatives (-2)