DECISION-MAKER:		CABINET			
SUBJECT:		ROAD SAFETY ENGINEERING LTP (LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN) PROJECT – FUNDING APPROVALS			
DATE OF DECISION:		15 OCTOBER 2013			
REPORT OF:		CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORT			
		CONTACT DETAILS			
AUTHOR:	Name:	Carol Bagshaw	Tel:	023 8083 2006	
	E-mail:	il: <u>carol.bagshaw@southampton.gov.uk</u>			
Director	Name:	John Tunney	Tel:	023 8091 7713	
	E-mail:	il: john.tunney@southampton.gov.uk			
STATEMENT OF		ENTIALITY			
N/A					

# **BRIEF SUMMARY**

This report seeks to approve capital variations within and additions to the Environment and Transport Capital Programme and approve expenditure to deliver projects pertaining to the Road Safety Engineering Programme of delivery. This programme comprises local neighbourhood road safety improvements, brought forward according to an annual prioritisation process.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

- (i) To amend the existing Environment & Transport Capital Programme by the following capital variations totalling £332,000:
  - a. To reduce by £332,000 of LTP government grant the capital scheme "City Centre Improvements"
  - b. To increase by £332,000 of LTP government grant the capital scheme "Improved Safety - Engineering".
- (ii) To approve total capital expenditure of £332,000 in 2013/14 for the "Improved Safety Engineering" scheme included within the Environment & Transport Capital Programme.

# **REASONS FOR REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. Financial Procedure Rules require that funding is added to the capital programme and approval to spend is secured to enable the delivery of projects within the Council's Capital Programme.

# ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED

2. An option is not to approve the transfer of funding. This would result in not being able to construct the schemes which have come forward through the Road Safety Engineering Prioritisation Process.

An alternative option would be to reduce casualties through a programme of education and publicity, although this would not be an appropriate intervention where road safety engineering solutions are required.

## **DETAIL (Including consultation carried out)**

- 3. Cabinet approval is sought for a transfer of Environment & Transport Capital Programme budget from the approved City Centre Improvements scheme, within the Public Realm section, to create a new scheme for this project within the Improved Safety (Engineering) section.
- 4. The City Centre Improvements scheme formed an unallocated pot of funding at the time of the Scheme Approvals Report (March 2013) and the precise nature of these schemes had not been identified. Since then a balanced programme of delivery in terms of city-centre and city-wide projects has been developed of which the Road Safety programme is one element. In essence, there are no projects which will not be delivered as a result of this requested transfer, as this pot was originally unallocated.
- 5. Under the Road Traffic Act 1998 (s.39) there is a statutory duty on Highway Authorities to investigate ways of achieving casualty reduction.

The Local Transport Plan (LTP3) highlights that, while there has been good progress on casualty reduction in the city overall, there remain some important challenges. Engineering measures (such as improved lining, signing and other physical measures on the highway) can deliver solutions which are effective and provide good value for money, with an estimated saving of £60,158 per accident (average cost).

These engineering solutions continue to be required, often in response to changing geographical patterns of road casualties. The need for them is therefore "demand led" and each scheme's cost is related to the identified solution – it is these solutions which are the subject of this report.

6. Road Safety Engineering schemes are prioritised as to provide the greatest rate of return on casualty savings. The evidence for this calculation is based on three–year casualty data and post-implementation monitoring is undertaken to identify the success of each scheme in reducing the number of casualties. Individual sites selected for treatment are prioritised on the basis of :

a) The number of casualties over the preceding three year period;

b) A weighting given to the severity of injuries involved (slight injury, serious injury and fatality);

c) The type of road user injured (vulnerable road user categories will score higher than vehicle occupants).

These criteria also serve to highlight a rolling annual programme of locations to be considered for physical works, with investigations designed to identify solutions to casualty reduction at each site. The measure selected will vary according to type of accident history and environment of the site.

- 7. Where appropriate, consultation is carried out with local residents and road users and information regarding the individual schemes will be disseminated to local Members and other interested parties.
- 8. The following schemes have been identified by the process detailed above and are ready for implementation:
  - Cumberland Place/Bedford Place;
  - West End Road/Townhill Way/Mousehole Lane Roundabout;
  - Chilworth Roundabout.
  - Archers Road / Carlton Road
- 9. The following schemes, for which funding is also sought, are ready for design and build in 2013/2014:
  - Northam Road / Brintons Road junction
  - Mayfield Road / Woodcote Road junction
  - Spring Road / Deacon Road zebra crossing
- 10. In addition, studies will be carried out in 2013/14 for works to be undertaken in 2014/2015 (assuming an appropriate solution is found) at the following locations:
  - Bassett Green Road / Stoneham Way junction Thornhill Park Road / Thornhill Avenue junction;
  - The Avenue / Burgess Road junction;
  - Northam Road / Princes Street junction;
  - Spring Road / Deacon Road junction;
  - London Road / Carlton Crescent junction.
- 11. The funding is likely to achieve a saving to the local economy of an average of £58,682.87 per casualty reduction, giving a cost to benefit return of between 80% and 925% per scheme. (N.B. This sum is slightly lower than the cost of an **accident**, as there is often more than one casualty involved in a single collision).

For details of what each scheme comprises, please see Appendix 2: Scheme Details.

## **RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS**

## Capital/Revenue

- 12. Cabinet approval is sought to amend the existing Environment & Transport Capital Programme by capital variations totalling £332,000. This is a reduction by £332,000 of LTP government grant from the scheme "City Centre Improvements", and an increase by £332,000 of LTP government grant to the scheme "Improved Safety - Engineering".
- 13. The report seeks approval for the capital expenditure on this scheme of  $\pounds$  332,000 in 2013/14.

- 14. Of the total sum, £248,000 is ready to be allocated by the Integrated Transport Board and Environment & Transport Capital Board to implement "ready to go" projects; the remainder, £84,000, will be allocated by that Board at a later date. Following this proposed capital variation the "City Centre Improvements" project will have a remaining budget of £81,000 all phased in 2013/14.
- 15. There will be no additional maintenance costs as it will be incorporated into the existing Highways Maintenance Contract with the City Council's Highways Maintenance Contractor.

## Property/Other

16. These do not impact upon any property interests as all the works are contained within the existing public highway.

# LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 17. The Road Traffic Act 1998 (s.39) establishes a statutory road safety duty on Highway Authorities to investigate ways of achieving casualty reduction through engineering measures, enforcement activity and education.
- 18 The project will be delivered in accordance with a variety of Highways and Environmental legislation, including, but not limited to, the Highways Act 1980, Road Traffic Regulation Act 1994 and the Traffic Management Act 2004.

## Other Legal Implications:

19. It may be necessary to introduce or make changes to Traffic Regulation Orders as a part of the schemes. The overall project, including the design and construction of any highway infrastructure changes, will be delivered in accordance with the Equalities Act 2010, having particular regard to the public sector equalities duty and the need to ensure that public space and realm is accessible to all. Regard will also be had to s.17 Crime & Disorder Act 1998 when designing the scheme to ensure that, to the extent possible, opportunities for environmental crime and other forms of crime & disorder will be eliminated or minimised.

## POLICY FRAMEWORK IMPLICATIONS

- 20. The City Council is a Local Transport Authority as prescribed in the Transport / 2000 and the Council's relevant Policy Framework is the City of Southampton Local Transport Plan (LTP3) of which road traffic casualty reduction is a key objective.
- 21. The project is compatible with the objectives of the Community Strategy and Economic Development Strategy.

## **KEY DECISION?** Yes

WARDS/COMMUNITIES AFFECTED: All

# SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

# Appendices

1.	Safety Engineering Programme				
2.	Scheme Details				
Documents In Members' Rooms					
1.	Local Transport Plan 3				
Equal	ity Impact Assessment				
Do the implications/subject of the report require an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) to be carried out.			No		
Equal	Background Documents ity Impact Assessment and Oth ction at:	ner Background	documents ava	ilable for	
Title of Background Paper(s)		Informati 12A allov	Relevant Paragraph of the Access to Information Procedure Rules / Schedule 12A allowing document to be Exempt/Confidential (if applicable)		
4	Nana				

1. None	
---------	--