

16 June 2006

Our Ref: NHHP June 06
Your Ref:
Contact: Nigel Schofield
Direct Dial: 01462 474590
E-Mail:nigel.schofield@north-
herts.gov.uk

To: The Members of the North Hertfordshire Highways Partnership Joint
Member Panel:

North Hertfordshire District Councillors: P.C.W. Burt, J. Cunningham, Mrs
F. Hill, L. Kercher, M. Kirkland, D. Proudlove, R.A.C. Thake and A.D.
Young.

Hertfordshire County Councillors: D.A. Ashley, Dr N.E. Agar, D. Billing, N.
Brook, D. Drake, K.F. Emsall, A.F. Hunter and M.R.M. Muir.

You are invited to attend a meeting of the

NORTH HERTFORDSHIRE HIGHWAYS PARTNERSHIP JOINT MEMBER PANEL

to be held at

**COMMITTEE ROOM 1, COUNCIL OFFICES,
GERNON ROAD, LETCHWORTH GARDEN CITY**

on

MONDAY, 26 JUNE 2006

at

7.30 p.m.

Yours sincerely,



David Miley
Democratic Services Manager

AGENDA
PART I

ITEM	PAGE
1. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN * To elect a Chairman of the Panel for the 2006/07 Municipal Year.	-
2. ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIRMAN * To elect a Vice-Chairman of the Panel for the 2006/07 Municipal Year.	-
<p>* Note: It is customary for the positions of Chairman and Vice-Chairman to alternate between HCC and NHDC on an Annual basis. For 2006/07, it is the turn of a HCC representative to be Chairman and a NHDC representative to be Vice-Chairman.</p>	
3. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE	-
4. MINUTES To take as read and approve as a true record the Minutes of the meeting of this Joint Member Panel held on 24 April 2006.	-
5. NOTIFICATION OF OTHER BUSINESS Members should notify the Chairman of other business which they wish to be discussed by the Joint Member Panel at the end of the business set out in the agenda. They must state the circumstances which they consider justify the business being considered as a matter of urgency.	-
<p>The Chairman will decide whether any other item(s) raised will considered.</p>	
6. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST To receive from Members of the Joint Member Panel any declarations of interest in respect of any business set out in the agenda. Members should either declare a prejudicial or personal interest and are requested to notify the Chairman of the nature of any interest declared. Members declaring a prejudicial interest should leave the room and not seek to influence the decision on that particular item of business.	-
<p>Also to receive advice from any Member of the Joint Member Panel concerning a party whip direction.</p>	
7. RESPONSE TO PETITIONS REFERRED TO THE JOINT MEMBER PANEL To receive petitions, comments and questions from the public.	1
<p>The North Herts District Manager will provide an update on two petitions.</p> <p>1. Pond Lane/Norton Road, Baldock – waiting restrictions. 2. Bury Lane, Codicote – traffic calming.</p>	

ITEM	PAGE
8. ITEMS REFERRED FROM NHDC AREA COMMITTEES REPORT OF THE NORTH HERTS DISTRICT MANAGER The two specific referrals from NHDC Area Committees are summarised in Item 7 above.	5
9. THE AVENUE AND CHILTERN ROAD, HITCHIN REPORT OF THE STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT MANAGER	7
10. LOCAL ROAD ENHANCED MAINTENANCE PROGRAMME 2006/07 - UPDATE REPORT OF THE NORTH HERTS ASSISTANT DISTRICT MANAGER	11
11. ENFORCEMENT OF SCHOOL KEEP CLEAR MARKINGS REPORT OF THE NORTH HERTS ASSISTANT DISTRICT MANAGER	21
12. JOINT MEMBER PANEL DISCRETIONARY BUDGET REPORT OF THE NORTH HERTS DISTRICT MANAGER	27
13. QUARTERLY REPORT ON OPERATIONAL PERFORMANCE INDICATORS REPORT OF THE NORTH HERTS ASSISTANT DISTRICT MANAGER	35

Future meetings of the North Hertfordshire Highways Partnership Joint Member Panel will be held on:

2006
16 October 2006

2007
29 January 2007
23 April 2007

<p style="text-align: center;">NORTH HERTFORDSHIRE HIGHWAYS JOINT MEMBER PANEL Monday, 26 June 2006</p>

<p>*PART 1 – PUBLIC DOCUMENT</p>	<p>AGENDA ITEM No. 7</p>
---	---

TITLE OF REPORT: RESPONSE TO PETITIONS REFERRED TO THE JOINT MEMBER PANEL

REPORT OF THE NORTH HERTS DISTRICT MANAGER

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To advise the Panel of the District Manager's responses to the subject matter of two petitions which have been previously presented to the respective NHDC Area Committees and then referred on to this Panel.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The first petition was taken to the Baldock & District Committee at its meeting held on 6 March 2006 and relates to obstructive and potentially dangerous vehicle parking at the junction of Pond Lane and Norton Road, Baldock. The petition called for the provision of double yellow lines to stop vehicles parking on the junction and some bollards suitably located to prevent further damage to the verge.
- 2.2 The Committee resolved that the above petition be referred to this Panel and recommended that the District Manager be requested to investigate the road safety issues raised and consider the introduction of waiting restrictions plus bollards at this location.
- 2.3 The second petition was taken to the Southern Rural Area Committee at its meeting held on 27 April 2006 and requested traffic calming measures to address a perceived problem of vehicles mounting the footways of Bury Lane Codicote, causing a hazard for pedestrians.
- 2.4 The Committee resolved that the District Manager should consider the details contained in the petition and produce a report for consideration at this meeting of the Highways Joint Member Panel.

3. ISSUES

- 3.1 Norton Road junction with Pond Lane, Baldock
- 3.2 Norton Road is a local distributor road used by local traffic that links the A507 Station Road and the B656 Hitchin Street and also carries traffic from the Letchworth via Norton Village.

- 3.3 It would appear that the parking on the verges at this junction has increase since the flats were built.
- 3.4 The parking is predominantly on the northern side of Norton Road junction which causes a visibility problem for vehicle exiting out of Pond Lane onto Norton Road. The parked vehicles effectively cause blind spot for motorist pulling out of the junction and causes a safety issue with on coming traffic
- 3.5 Hertfordshire Highways would not be averse to the introduction of double yellow lines "No waiting at any times" waiting restriction and a few strategic placed bollards for road safety terms. Though such measure will require further consultation with the Police and North Herts District Council who will enforce such measures. We should also be aware that such a restriction will displace on street parking and objections may be received from local residents.
- 3.6 Bury Lane Codicote .
- 3.7 In order to assess the need for traffic calming in Bury Lane, a study has been carried out in accordance with the HCC Traffic and Environmental Scheme ranking system. The system has been approved by members and is the accepted method used for the Assessment of such candidate sites in Hertfordshire.
- 3.8 A speed and volume traffic survey was carried out from Thursday 2 February to Wednesday 8 February 2006. The tubes were placed in the carriageway outside 36 Bury Lane, and data was collected for vehicles travelling in both directions. The results of the survey showed that the 85th percentile speed varied between 30.6 and 32.3 miles per hour, which is not considered to be high for this road, where a 30 mph limit is in force.
- 3.9 The site was then assessed using the criteria specified by the ranking system and attained a score of 74. To put that figure in context, for schemes currently funded through the Integrated Works Programme, a score in excess of 300 would be required. The low score of Bury Lane indicates that it has a very low relative priority and therefore should not be considered for traffic calming in the foreseeable future.
- 3.10 In general, candidate sites for traffic calming in North Hertfordshire tend to score lower than those in other parts of the county, particularly those located in the south of the county. This is due in part to the relative traffic flow levels. That said, other potential traffic calming sites have been identified in North Hertfordshire with scores in the range 100 to 200 for which no measures are currently proposed.
- 3.11 In view of the relatively low score attained by this candidate site, it is likely that a local consensus on an acceptable scheme will be difficult to secure and may not be achievable. This, coupled with the low priority of the site as defined by the ranking process, points in the direction of a recommendation not to progress a traffic calming scheme at this location.

4. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 Norton Road junction with Pond Lane, Baldock
- 4.2 If the provision of double yellow waiting restriction lines is to be progressed at this location, a Traffic Regulation Order will be required. As part of the process of creating such an order, a statutory opportunity for objections exists.

5. FINANCIAL AND HUMAN RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

5.1 Norton Road junction with Pond Lane, Baldock

The Baldock & District committee has made a commitment that subject to discussion with the County Council a contribution be made to the work from the District Committee's discretionary funds.

5.2 Human resource needs to be supplied by Hertfordshire Highways staff.

5.3 Bury Lane Codicote

None foreseen at this stage.

6. CONSULTATION WITH EXTERNAL ORGANISATIONS AND WARD MEMBERS

6.1 Consultations to be carried out with petitioners, other residents and local members at appropriate stages.

6.2 Norton Road junction with Pond Lane, Baldock

The specific consultation process associated with a proposed Traffic Regulation Order may result in statutory objections. If it is not possible to resolve these, they may be referred to this Panel.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 Norton Road junction with Pond Lane Baldock :That the Panel notes the responses as detailed above and that we now carryout further investigation of the issues raised and report back with possible options and costs.

7.2 Bury Lane Codicote ; That the Panel notes the responses to the subject matter of the petition and resolves not to proceed with traffic calming measures at this location

8. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

8.1 To assist the District Manager to progress, continue to progress or record the issues raised by the petitioners.

9. CONTACT OFFICERS

9.1 Steve Greenhill, District Manager (North Herts), Hertfordshire Highways.

9.2 Adrian Redrup, Assistant District Manager, Hertfordshire Highways.

9.3 Allan Forsyth, Assistant District Manager, Hertfordshire Highways.

10. BACKGROUND PAPERS

10.1 Minutes of NHDC Baldock & District Area Committee meeting held on 6 March 2006.

10.2 Minutes of NHDC Southern Rural Area Committee meeting held on 27 April 2006.

THIS PAGE IS BLANK

*PART 1 – PUBLIC DOCUMENT	AGENDA ITEM No.
----------------------------------	------------------------

8

TITLE OF REPORT: ITEMS REFERRED FROM NHDC AREA COMMITTEES

REPORT OF THE NORTH HERTS DISTRICT MANAGER

The two specific referrals to the JMP from the five NHDC Area Committees are summarised in Item 7 on this agenda, entitled “Responses to Petitions referred to the Joint Member Panel”.

THIS PAGE IS BLANK

TITLE OF REPORT: THE AVENUE & CHILTERN ROAD, HITCHIN

REPORT OF THE STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT MANAGER
HERTFORDSHIRE HIGHWAYS

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To outline the history of The Avenue & Chiltern Road Scheme. To explain why changes were undertaken to the scheme and why the residents were not informed. To identify the process for further funding of additional safety and speed restriction measures.

2. SCHEME HISTORY

- 2.1 20 December 04 – A Public consultation was undertaken where three options were considered. These involved gateway entry features at the following locations:
1. At the junction of The Avenue and Wymondley Road
 2. At the junction of Chiltern Road and Wymondley Road.
 3. At the junction of The Avenue and Highbury Road.
Upgrade and raising of existing 'Zebra' crossing in Highbury Road.

The stated intention of the features is to “help people cross the road safely and should also slow cars down as they drive into the area”.

- 2.2 4 April 2005 – Internal HH progress meeting the client and Design Team agreed that the height of the entry features will be reduced to 50 mm in response to objections raised from the public consultation. Objectors included cyclists and motorcyclists.

It was also agreed that the 'Zebra' crossing in Highbury Road will not be raised as part of this scheme due to the high costs involved to resolve the drainage problems.

- 2.3 18 April 2005 – This issue was also raised at the Officers Steering Group meeting and the proposal to reduce the height of the entry features to 50mm was agreed for advertising the Road Hump notices.
- 2.4 12 May 2005 – The Hump notices were advertised stating the humps to be 50 mm – No objections were received.
- 2.5 31 August 2005 – The Design Team sent notices to residents informing them of the design change and work start date. Residents expressed their dismay that they were not been consulted on the changes to the design (the height of the entry features).

- 2.6 7 September 2005 – The Design Team wrote to the following Cllrs: Paul Clark, Lawrence Oliver, David Billing, Derrick Ashley, Sarah Wren, Richard Thake and president of the Residents' Association Pat Robinson summarising the consultation results and the reasons for choosing the 50mm tables.
- 2.7 9 September 2005 – More objections and queries were raised from residents questioning the design change and the late notice.
- 2.8 14 September 2005 – A Meeting was arranged with the Residents' Association. The Residents' Association and members had meetings on site to see a sample hump. Example viewed at Whinbush Road, Hitchin. (believed to be 50 mm, later found to be 75mm).
- 2.9 16 September 2005 – Another meeting was held with representatives from The Avenue, Chiltern Road and Finches Residents' Association. It was agreed that the scheme should go ahead providing the table top was constructed in red blocks/bricks and another full traffic survey be carried out to assess the impact of the scheme.
- 2.10 19 September 2005 – Works started on site.
- 2.11 6 October 2005 – The Strategic Client identified that the new table constructed is different to the ones they had visited on site with the Residents in Whinbush Road. The Design Team confirmed the height of the sample viewed by residents association and members in Whinbush Road were not 50mm.
- 2.12 14 October 2005 - A further meeting was held with the Residents' Association, attended by the Divisional Manager of the Design Team and the Strategic Client. The Design Team explained at this meeting the advantages and disadvantages of the different types of traffic calming. It was also highlighted that if the entire road was traffic calmed, there may be additional noise issues to consider and if pinch points were used, there would be some loss of parking spaces. It was explained that the purpose of raised entry feature were to raise the awareness of drivers that they are entering a 30mph environment where they should drive with care. The entry features were not intended to deter traffic, only to slow traffic.
- 2.13 November 2005 – The Strategic Client wrote to residents explaining the reasons for reducing the height of the tables and apologising for the misunderstanding with regard to the example entry feature shown to residents in Whinbush Road. That entry feature had a steeper approach gradient than at first thought.
- 2.14 February 2006 – The Design Team wrote to the Residents' Association explaining the pro's and con's of various types of traffic calming and also addressed the other issues raised. HH are currently awaiting a meeting date to discuss these matters with the Residents' Association.

3. SCHEME PROGRESS

- 3.1 The works on site are completed and no further comments have been received on the scheme.

- 3.2 As a result of objections received, the height of the entry features were reduced and a new height of 50mm was advertised which received no objections. The changes in height of the entry features were primarily to appease residents not in favour and avoid objections. In hindsight, these issues would have been avoided if residents were advised at the time of advertising the new height of the entry features and the reasons for the reduced height.

4. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 Road Hump Notices were advertised 12 May 2005 and no objections were received by the closing date 7th June 2005.

5. FINANCIAL AND HUMAN RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 The cost of works were to the value of around £61,700 which was funded by HCC from budgets allocated to Hertfordshire Highways, North Herts area and the human resource was supplied by Hertfordshire Highways.
- 5.2 An after study will be undertaken to evaluate the success of the this scheme and should other issues be highlighted additional funding will be sought via HCC budgets allocated to Hertfordshire Highways and will be programme for completion in 2007/08.

6. CONSULTATION WITH EXTERNAL ORGANISATIONS AND WARD MEMBERS

- 6.1 Consultation has been undertaken with the NHDC, the police, local members, residents and the local schools.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 7.1 Members are asked to note the history of The Avenue & Chiltern Road Scheme, the reasons why changes were undertaken and the process for further funding of additional safety and speed restriction measures.

8. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 8.1 Traffic speeds prior to the works were between 27 – 30.5mph. This would not justify traffic calming. An after study will be undertaken. Should there be any improvements required, funding for these improvements will need to be bid for from HCC Funds (LTP objectives).

9. APPENDICES

- 9.1 None

10. CONTACT OFFICERS

- 10.1 Roxanne Glaud – Strategic Cient (Northern Hertfordshire), Hertfordshire Highways

11. BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 11.1 None

THIS PAGE IS BLANK

**TITLE OF REPORT: LOCAL ROAD ENHANCED MAINTENANCE PROGRAMME
2006/07 – UPDATE****REPORT OF THE NORTH HERTS ASSISTANT DISTRICT MANAGER****1. PURPOSE OF REPORT**

- 1.1 To present to the Panel the proposed programme of works for Phase 2 of the Local Road Enhanced Maintenance Programme (LREMP) 2006/07.
- 1.2 To report on the processes for finalising and delivering the programme.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The background and origins of the Local Road Enhanced Maintenance Programme (LREMP) have been detailed in previous reports to the Panel, most recently in the report to the last meeting of the Panel, which accompanied the draft Phase 1 programme of works.
- 2.2 Since then, a partnership contract has been awarded to Lafarge Contracting to deliver the work. A joint office has been established at Hertfordshire County Council's (HCC) Mount Pleasant site, Hatfield and staff from both HCC and Lafarge have been working there since early May, preparing to deliver the programme.
- 2.3 All work being delivered through this contract will be branded "Highways Extra" to emphasise the additional investment being made by HCC. An example of the logo for this organisation is included at Appendix A. The brand will be carried by vehicles involved in the works and on protective clothing worn by workers, as well as on letters and other communications. A publicity campaign to promote the work is underway and will run alongside existing PR activity for Hertfordshire Highways.
- 2.4 The programme of works is also currently being finalised. Members will recall seeing the draft Phase 1 lists at the previous Panel meeting. Phase 1 works are those in the carriageway surface dressing and microasphalt programmes and the footway microsurfacing programmes.
- 2.5 The Phase 2 works comprise the remainder of the overall programme, principally the conventional carriageway and footway surfacing works. These programmes are still under development but draft lists of Phase 2 works are attached at Appendix B.

3. ISSUES

3.1 Projected LREMP for 06/07 Delivery

3.2 Surface Dressing Programme [Phase 1]

Focus on: Mainly rural roads

Main outcomes: Improve Average Condition Index and longer-term condition of network and Best Value Performance Indicators

- £1.05m programme patch & dress in 06/07
 - Works to be delivered early in 06/07
 - Sites selected for ease of delivery
- £0.53m programme of advance patching for 07/08 [Phase 2]
 - Works to be delivered later in 06/07
 - May include sites requiring greater preparation
- All sites selected from the currently ongoing work based on those identified as suitable

3.3 Microasphalt Programme [Phase 1]

Focus on: Mainly less-busy urban roads

Main outcomes: Improve Average Condition Index and longer-term condition of network and Best Value Performance Indicators

- £2.24m programme prepare & surface in 06/07
- Sites selected for ease of delivery
- Sites selected from the currently ongoing work based on those identified as suitable

3.4 Footway Programme

Focus on: Busier (High- and Medium Use) footways

Main outcomes: Improve immediate and longer-term condition and BV187 footway indicator

- £0.77m programme of footway surface treatment work in 06/07 [Phase 1]
- £0.76m programme of footway resurfacing/reconstruction work in 06/07 [Phase 2]
- All sites selected from High and Medium use footways based on current work to identify problem sites and improve BV187

3.5 Carriageway Thin Surfacing and Surfacing [Phase 2]

Focus on: Busier carriageway sites and those in a poorer condition

Main outcomes: Improve immediate and longer-term condition and BVPIs, immediate impact on reducing defects and public dissatisfaction

- £3.64m programme of carriageway surfacing and thin surfacing to take place in the latter part of 06/07
- List of sites to be refined from work done by the deterioration model and by local teams on poor sites
- Sites to be those that can be treated with a thin surfacing or conventional resurfacing without, generally, the need for the replacement of the lower layers of the road to allow maximum impact for the available resources.
- Sites will generally therefore be those with predominantly surface, rather than structural, defects but where condition or use means that microasphalt or surface dressing is not suitable

3.6 The programme budget includes an allowance for staff and other non-works costs

4. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

4.1 None.

5. FINANCIAL AND HUMAN RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

5.1 All projects on the Local Road Enhanced Maintenance element of the Integrated Work Programme will be funded by HCC from budgets allocated to this initiative. Human resource needs to be supplied by HCC and Lafarge Contracting.

6. CONSULTATION WITH EXTERNAL ORGANISATIONS AND WARD MEMBERS

- 6.1 The Phase 1 lists have now been circulated to all Joint Member Panels. Following generally minor amendments based on the JMPs' feedback, the Phase 1 lists have been incorporated into HCC's work programme for the year by delegated authority. Updated versions of the list will be published alongside the IWP as part of the regular monthly bulletin.
- 6.2 Short lists for the Phase 2 works have been drawn up and are attached at Appendix B. Where possible, the short listing process has taken into account comments passed previously by the Joint Member Panel although it has not been possible or appropriate to include every site raised. The comments and feedback made by all ten Joint Member Panels during the creation of the IWP has been considered as part of the process of creating the LREMP and, in particular, the resurfacing element of Phase 2.
- 6.3 Following consideration of the lists by the Panel, confirmation of the finalised Phase 2 lists will be sought using delegated authority. Once these works are confirmed, delivery will commence over the summer.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 7.1 Members are invited to consider and comment on the attached LREMP Phase 2 programme.
- 7.2 When commenting, Panel Members are asked to bear in mind the constraints on the LREMP. In particular, because of the available time and the need to deliver a substantial quantity of work in the next eight or nine months, it will not be possible to substantially alter the Phase 2 programmes. In particular it is unlikely to be possible to add new sites to the Phase 2 programme. It would be especially helpful if Members could indicate which of the sites on the lists they consider particularly important and which are less critical so that delivery of key schemes can be prioritised. The Panel may also wish to consider the 'reserve list' and comment on any schemes that they feel should be promoted to the 'primary list' and vice versa.

8. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 8.1 To allow members the opportunity to consider and comment on the LREMP Phase 2 programme and in particular to advise of the more critical sites to inform the refinement of the programme.

- 8.2 To allow members the further opportunity to inform the development of the Phase 2 LREMP programme.

9. APPENDICES

- 9.1 The following appendices are presented with this report:

Appendix A: Sample Logo for Highways Extra Project

Appendix B: Draft Lists of Phase 2 Works

10. CONTACT OFFICERS

- 10.1 Michael Moralee, Assistant District Manager (North Herts), Hertfordshire Highways.

11. BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 11.1 Report to North Hertfordshire Joint Member Panel 17 October 2005.
11.2 Report to North Hertfordshire Joint Member Panel 24 April 2006.

Local Road Enhanced Maintenance Programme 2006/07

Report to the Joint Member Panel, June 2006

Sample Logo for Highways Extra Project



Highways
EXTRA

THIS PAGE IS BLANK

Local Road Enhanced Maintenance Programme 2006/07, Phase 2

Draft Lists of Phase 2 Works

Background

This Appendix sets out the draft Phase 2 works programmes and is broken down into two lists of sites:

Section 1: Carriageway Resurfacing/Thin Surfacing

Section 2: Footway Resurfacing & Reconstruction

These together form Phase 2 of the works and have now been developed, in to the form of 'short lists'.

It should be remembered that even the 'short lists' include more sites than are likely to be affordable, to include flexibility and choice at this stage of the process. The final number and distribution of schemes that can be delivered will depend on:

- The size and nature of the schemes chosen
- The details of the final designs
- The precise cost of the schemes, based on that final

Section 1: Carriageway Resurfacing/Thin Surfacing

Focus on: Busier carriageway sites and those in a poorer condition

Main outcomes: Improve immediate and longer-term condition and BVPIs, immediate impact on reducing defects and public dissatisfaction

- £3.64m programme of carriageway surfacing and thin surfacing to take place in the latter part of 06/07
- List of sites to be refined from work done by the deterioration model and by local teams on poor sites
- Sites to be those that can be treated with a thin surfacing or conventional resurfacing without, generally, the need for the replacement of the lower layers of the road to allow maximum impact for the available resources.
- Sites will generally therefore be those with predominantly surface, rather than structural, defects but where condition or use means that microasphalt or surface dressing is not suitable

The sites on the list below represent the suitable sites for this type of treatment, drawn from a list prepared by drawing jointly on the carriageway deterioration modelling process and the engineering knowledge of the Herts Highways local teams, taking into account comments and suggestions made by the Joint Member Panel. Based on current estimates the whole of the primary list could be delivered with the available resources. Reserve schemes are included for Member consideration and could be promoted should a main scheme slip or the available funding allow more work to be done. Members' guidance on priorities would be welcomed at this stage although other factors, such as the grouping of works into suitable packages for delivery, will also need to be considered.

LIST
ROAD
TOWN
DESCRIPTION

Primary
Icknield Way
Baldock
Norton Road To Station Road

Primary
Benslow Lane
Hitchin
Highbury Rd To End

Primary
Lavender Way
Hitchin
Lucas Lane To Oughtonhead Lane

Primary
Oughton Head Way
Hitchin
Victoria Way To Bedford Road

Primary
Southfields
Letchworth
Western Way To Eastern Way

Primary
Kneesworth Street
Royston
Melbourn Street To Junc Queens Road

Primary
York Way
Royston
Orchard Rd To Old North Road (Onr End Only)

Primary
Melbourn Street
Royston
Kneesworth Street To A10

Reserve
Norton Road
Baldock
Letchworth Rd To Junc Icknield Way

Reserve
Highbury Road
Hitchin
From B656

Reserve
Rushby Mead
Letchworth
A505 To Pixmore Way

Reserve
School Lane
Preston
B651 To 5u95 St Albans Highway

Reserve
Old North Road
Royston
Queens Road To Roundabout

Section 2: Footway Resurfacing & Reconstruction

Focus on: Busier (High- and Medium Use) footways

Main outcomes: Improve immediate and longer-term condition and BV187 footway indicator.

- £0.76m programme of footway resurfacing work in 06/07 (includes reconstruction and similar more substantial works)

Sites selected from High and Medium use footways based on current work to identify problem sites and improve BV187, many will focus on poor-condition paving slab footways that need replacement.

The sites on the list below represent those sites on the most recent survey of High and Medium use footways that are in need of resurfacing, reconstruction or some similar significant treatment. This is a refinement of the 'long list' of such sites, presented to the Panel in March. Based on current estimates the whole of the primary list could be delivered with the available resources. Reserve schemes are included for Member consideration and could be promoted should a main scheme slip or the available funding allow more work to be done. Members' guidance on priorities would be welcomed at this stage although other factors, such as the grouping of works into suitable packages for delivery, will also need to be considered.

Description	List
Old Hale Way, , Hitchin, Bearton Road To Junction Laurel Way	Primary
Nuns Close, , Hitchin, Junct Park Rd To Junct Paynes Park	Reserve

THIS PAGE IS BLANK

TITLE OF REPORT: ENFORCEMENT OF SCHOOL KEEP CLEAR MARKINGS

REPORT OF THE NORTH HERTS ASSISTANT DISTRICT MANAGER

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To update the Panel on the current project to make all existing School Keep Clear (SKC) markings enforceable.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 At the Panel meeting held on 30 January 2006, it was agreed to progress enforceable Traffic Regulation Orders [TRO's] at the schools listed in Appendix A as having advisory markings only, subject to funding being made available.
- 2.2 The Panel also agreed the proposal for consultation with individual schools, Hertfordshire County Council (HCC) and North Herts District Council (NHDC) members, the Parish councils and the NHDC Chief Engineer on a site specific basis.

3. ISSUES

- 3.1 SKC markings are placed to keep the space outside of schools free from parked vehicles in order that children can be more easily seen when crossing the road. Many of North Herts schools have advisory SKC markings only and are therefore not enforceable.
- 3.2 The Hertfordshire County Council's Highways and Transport Panel has allocated £10,000 to each District to convert existing advisory SKC markings to mandatory markings. Due to this generous allocation it is anticipated that although it was resolved to prioritise and implement a three year rolling programme it may be possible to implement all the appropriate sites within North Herts in year one.
- 3.3 A review of the prioritised list has concluded that there are 13 schools (St. Francis College and York Road nursery have subsequently been added) in North Herts which have an advisory SKC marking as shown in Appendix A. However a Safer Routes to School [SRTS] project is at present being finalised at Offley Endowed Primary School and Hertfordshire Highways is proceeding with this mandatory Traffic Regulation Order [TRO] per se.

- 3.4 Whilst the police have traditionally enforced waiting restrictions the introduction of decriminalised parking enforcement provides an opportunity to enforce waiting restrictions more rigidly. Such arrangements apply in North Herts where NHDC took control of the enforcement of parking restrictions in January 2005. NHDC employs its own Parking Attendants to carry out enforcement, and this enables satisfactory coverage of the existing restrictions. However the enforcement of SKC markings would be particularly resource intensive, as it requires visits at both specific times and specific locations, which would have to be done by a mobile parking attendant. The current staffing levels would not permit the extensive coverage necessary to provide regular enforcement. Having said that, it is recognised that there is a 'parent parking' problem at many schools and there is a need to introduce a suitable deterrent. It is suggested therefore, that enforcement would be on a needs led basis and would tend then to be reactive rather than proactive.
- 3.5 Initial comments from York Road nursery school indicates their preference for an advisory-only marking and NHDC initially indicate their preference for retaining advisory-only markings in rural areas due to current staffing levels.
- 3.6 Appendix A shows the current list of schools and any comments including initial feedback from NHDC.

4. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 The conversion of the markings from advisory to enforceable status does require the publication of a Traffic Regulation Order with the usual consultation, legal notices and advertisement process.

5. FINANCIAL AND HUMAN RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 This project on the Integrated Work Programme will be funded by HCC from budgets allocated to Hertfordshire Highways, North Hertfordshire area.
- 5.3 Human resources to progress schemes within this area will be provided by Hertfordshire Highways establishment.

6. CONSULTATION WITH EXTERNAL ORGANISATIONS AND WARD MEMBERS

- 6.1 It is considered that it would be expedient if the panel agreed to advertise the legal TRO's for all the appropriate sites and that any objections received should be resolved by discussion between local JMP members and District Manager.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 7.1 That the Panel notes the current situation regarding School Keep Clear markings in North Herts.
- 7.2 That the Panel notes the funding allocated to this project by HCC's Highways & Transport Panel.

- 7.3 That the Panel ratifies the proposal to implement the TRO process for converting from advisory to mandatory markings for the appropriate schools from the list in Appendix A and that any objections be resolved by discussion between local JMP members and District Manager. In particular that the Panel indicate the emphasis to be placed on the response from the enforcement authority (NHDC) in deciding whether to convert a particular site.

8. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 8.1 To keep members informed regarding School Keep Clear markings in North Herts.
- 8.2 To inform the Panel of the funding allocation for this project.
- 8.3 To allow the Panel the opportunity to inform the implementation process for the delivery of the mandatory SKC markings and in particular the emphasis to be placed on the response from the enforcement authority (NHDC) in deciding whether to convert a particular site.

9. APPENDICES

- 9.1 Appendix A: Schedule of schools with advisory School Keep Clear markings.

10. CONTACT OFFICERS

- 10.1 Ken Clowes, Assistant District Manager (Hitchin & Hitchin Rural), Hertfordshire Highways.

11. BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 11.1 Report to the North Hertfordshire Highways Joint Member Panel on 30 January 2006, "Enforcement of School Keep Clear Markings".

THIS PAGE IS BLANK

APPENDIX A - Prioritised list of

School Keep Clear marking sites in North Herts -- ADVISORY ONLY

	A	B	C	D	E	K
1	HCC No	DfES No	School	Road	District	Comments
8	63	3357	Offley Endowed Primary	School Lane	OFFLEY	NHDC object to TRO. Order to be progressed by Safer Routes to School project
13	31	4009	Hitchin Girls	Highbury Road	HITCHIN	
19	22	2228	Northfields Infant & Nursery	Northfields	LETCHWORTH	
30	79	4140	Meridian (The)	Garden Walk	ROYSTON	
35	9	1000	St Marys Nursery School	Weston Way	BALDOCK	
36	53	3006	Barley C of E (VC) First	Church End	BARLEY	NHDC object to TRO
42	21	2068	Grange JM	Sparhawke	LETCHWORTH	
55	58	3030	Ickleford Primary	The Green	ICKLEFORD	School preference for advisory only
66	18	2070	Westbury Primary and Nursery	West View	LETCHWORTH	
70	46	2287	Whitehill Junior	Whitehill Road	HITCHIN	
75	85	2417	Studlands Rise First	Studlands Rise	ROYSTON	
78	49		York Road Nursery School	York Road	HITCHIN	Nursery preference for advisory only
79	Ind.	2010	St. Francis College	Broadway	LETCHWORTH	
80						

TITLE OF REPORT: JOINT MEMBER PANEL DISCRETIONARY BUDGET**REPORT OF THE NORTH HERTS DISTRICT MANAGER****1. PURPOSE OF REPORT**

- 1.1 To provide the Panel with progress reports on approved 2006/2007 schemes.
- 1.2 To provide information on previously identified candidate schemes for 2006/2007.
- 1.3 To introduce further candidate schemes for 2006/2007.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 At the January 2006 Panel meeting, it was agreed that the themes for 2006/2007 would be:-
 - i) Schemes generally likely to make a contribution to community safety.
 - ii) Projects funded jointly with Parish or Town Councils, NHDC or the Letchworth Garden City Heritage Foundation.
 - iii) Support measures for 20 mph areas where these are consistent with the Speed Management Strategy.
 - iv) Enhancement of Town centres.
 - v) Environment and the link between pedestrians and motor traffic.
 - vi) Road safety measures, especially when the accident criteria applicable to Safety Schemes is not met.
 - vii) Street Lighting.

3. ISSUES**3.1 2006/2007 Approved Projects Update**

- i) Vehicle Activated Signs Rota.

Following the provision of permanent signs in Barley, Barkway, Pixmore Way Letchworth, and High Street Codicote, only one rota of part time signs now exists. The locations are:-

Baldock Road, Royston.
Bedford Road, Hitchin
Moormead Hill, Hitchin
Stevenage Road, Knebworth
The Causeway, Therfield
Police Row, Therfield

Two signs are currently available for rotation at the above six locations. At the January 2006 meeting of the Panel, it was agreed that a further four sign faces would be purchased, at a cost of **£9,000** in order to make the remaining six rota

sites permanent during 2006/2007. These signs will be purchased as part of the order for the new vehicle activated signs due to be installed at Wymondley Road Hitchin and Willian village. No design fee provision is required for this scheme as it will be delivered by the local Assistant District Manager.

ii) Enhanced Maintenance of Town Centres

This project area reflects a recognition of the difficulty in delivering a satisfactory standard of maintenance to town centre street scenes. A major difficulty in this context is the cost of the high quality materials used in enhancement schemes. When repairs are required, those materials costs impact very heavily on highway maintenance budgets. A consequence of this has been the use of inappropriate materials, such as macadam in areas of block and slabbed pavings. Unsurprisingly, this has resulted in a significant level of complaint.

For the year 2005/2006, a sum of £15,000 was allocated to work in Churchgate and Market Place, Hitchin. Some work has been carried out but delays have been experienced in obtaining specialist surfacing materials. In order to complete the scheme, a bid has been submitted to carry over £5,000 of the 2005/2006 budget allocation into 2006/2007. At the April 2006 meeting of this panel, it was agreed that it would be prudent to commit a sum of **£5,000** from the 2006/2007 discretionary works budget.

As part of the previous package of town centre works in Letchworth Garden City (during 2005/2006), the work planned for Leys Avenue was not undertaken due to higher than expected costs and the complexity of the works in Eastcheap. At the January 2006 panel meeting, a sum of **£17,000** was committed to works in Leys Avenue. This will focus upon the block paving and drainage channels within the carriageway, much of which is in a hazardous condition and in urgent need of replacement. It is anticipated that the work will require the road to be closed to vehicles. This will take place on Sundays only. No design fee provision is required for this scheme as it will be delivered by the local Area Engineer within the district team.

iii) Codicote (The Green) – Improved Lighting

A scheme to upgrade the existing two lighting units to current standards at an estimated cost of £2,000 was approved at the March 2005 meeting of this Panel. The effect of this scheme will be to provide higher levels of lighting with reduced light spillage into nearby house windows.

The design was quickly completed but difficulties in obtaining the correct type of lantern have prevented works being carried out by 31 March 2006. Again it was agreed at the April 2006 Panel meeting that it would be prudent to make a commitment of **£2,000** from the 2006/2007 discretionary works budget to ensure delivery of this approved scheme, which is now complete. Design costs are estimated at £500 for this year.

iv) Letchworth Garden City – Street Signing Review

This was conceived by this Panel as a jointly funded project, the three funding partners being North Hertfordshire District Council, Letchworth Garden City Heritage Foundation and the discretionary budget of this Panel. The scheme comprises a full review of all highway signing within the Garden City. The scheme objectives include; upgrading to current standards, removal of

redundant signs, avoidance of street scene clutter and provision of appropriate sized signs. Both vehicle and pedestrian signs are included in the scheme. The initial survey of all existing signs is now complete and discussions with the funding partners have taken place in order to agree priorities for works.

A works budget commitment of £5,000 was made by each partner in 2005/2006 and at that time it was envisaged that it would be possible to deliver work on site during that budget year. It is now clear that the project is very complex, in that it needs to address a number of objectives such as strategic routing to and from the Town Centre car parks, access for goods vehicles to the industrial areas and pedestrian routes for a range of journeys. In addition, the Heritage Foundation has plans for redevelopment of the town centre retail area, which will have a very significant effect upon the developing signing strategy.

These factors have brought about a realisation that the design phase of this scheme will take longer than expected and as a result it has not been possible to implement works during the year 2005/2006. It was hoped that it would be possible to bring to this meeting of the Panel a detailed works programme but at the time of writing this report the scheme design continues to progress. One of the inputs to the design is a set of comments from the highways consultant appointed by the Heritage Foundation.

At the April 2006 meeting of the Panel, a provisional works budget of **£10,000** was allocated. The design fee spend for 2006/2007 is currently projected at £6,000

- v) Traffic calming in Redhill Road, Hitchin near Oughtonhead Primary School. Local members' views on the options available have been sought and obtained. Preference was expressed for more comprehensive scheme than the available budget would permit, but a modest scheme of signing has now been agreed. In order to safeguard this scheme, a commitment of **£10,000** was approved at the April 2006 meeting of the Panel against the 2006/2007 discretionary works budget. The design fee expenditure for 2006/2007 is currently projected at £1,000

- iii) Bury Plantation Footpath, Royston - Additional Street Lighting. The local member has informed the District Manager about this area, where the standard of lighting is perceived by residents to be inadequate and there is a perceived threat to the community in terms of personal safety and vandalism. A lighting improvement scheme has been designed, the estimated works cost is **£4,000**, as approved at the January 2006 Panel meeting. The design fee expenditure for 2006/2007 is currently projected at £900.

- iv) Vehicle Activated Sign in Wymondley Road Hitchin
At the January 2006 Panel meeting, **£4,000** was approved as a contribution to this project, the balance of the cost to be provided from NHDC discretionary budgets. Costs are currently estimated at £5,000 for works and £2,500 for design fees.

- v) Vehicle Activated Sign in Willian village
At the January 2006 Panel meeting, **£1,000** was approved as a contribution to the works cost of providing a second sign in the village. The remainder of the total works cost to be provided by a combination of a developer contribution

obtained by NHDC in association with a planning application plus a funding element from NHDC discretionary budgets. Costs are currently estimated at £5,000 for works and £2,500 for design fees.

3.2 Identified Schemes for 2006/07- Further Information

- i) Peters Green – Additional Street Lighting plus Kerbing
Kimpton Parish Council, expressed its thanks and satisfaction with the previous lighting scheme carried out in Claggy Road / Lawn Avenue and requested that another area within the parish be given consideration for improved street lighting. The location is Lawrence End Road, Peters Green. At the April 2006 meeting, the Panel resolved that a cost estimate should be prepared for this candidate scheme. The works are estimated at **£25,000**, and the design fee estimate is £8,000.

In addition, further consultation with the parish council has identified a desire for kerbing along the front of the green, in order to deter overrunning by vehicles. The estimated cost of this is **£15,600**. No design fee would be required for this scheme as it would be delivered by the Area Engineer within the district team.

3.3 Further Candidate Schemes for 2006/2007

- a) At the April 2006 meeting of the Panel, four schemes were put forward and further investigation of them was requested. These schemes were:-
 - i) Convert the pedestrian crossing at Broadway (adjacent to Morrisons supermarket) in Letchworth Garden City to a Pelican crossing;
 - ii) Change the phasing at the Pelican crossing at Paynes Park (adjacent to Lairage Car Park) to give more time to pedestrians;
 - iii) Provide a pedestrian phase to the traffic light control at Cadwell Lane, Hitchin;
 - iv) Provide a pedestrian phase to the traffic light control at junction of A505 and A507 in Baldock.

The results of an initial appraisal of these candidates are as follows:-

- i) The conversion proposed would involve two crossings, separated by the central reservation of Broadway. Very approximate costings are £40,000 for works, plus £16,500 design fees. Delivery of this scheme would not be possible within the current budget year, due to both the lack of available works budget and insufficient time to design and implement a technically complex scheme. Should members wish to progress this proposal, a feasibility study could be undertaken this year within a capped fee commitment of £2,000.
- ii) The change of phasing proposed, although technically feasible, may result in delays to through traffic, leading to drivers seeking less acceptable alternative routes through the town centre. If this proposal is to be pursued it is suggested that a traffic modelling exercise be undertaken. The design fee required for this activity has not been accurately estimated but it has been indicated that a figure of £2,000 should be sufficient.
- iii) Improvements to the Cadwell Lane signal controlled junction are already included in a joint HCC/NHDC project which has secured funding via a GAF2 bid. The project lead is the Transport Officer at NHDC, supported by the HCC Head of Transportation Planning and Policy. It would therefore not be appropriate to commit the Panel's discretionary budget to this project.

- iv) The provision of a pedestrian phase at this junction (now the A507/B656) is a major element of the emerging Baldock Town Centre Enhancement Scheme, which is currently under development jointly by HCC and NHDC officers. Funding is potentially available through this scheme, therefore a commitment from the Panel's discretionary budget would not be appropriate in this instance.
- b) The NHDC Hitchin Area Committee, at its meeting held on 7 March 2006, resolved "That the North Hertfordshire Highways Partnership – Joint Member Panel be advised that the Hitchin Committee considers that the following schemes be financed from the Panel's 2006/07 Discretionary Budget under the theme of "Speed of traffic and road calming measures":-
1. Speed reduction measures along the whole length of Old Hale Way;
 2. Bedford Road – Vehicle Activated Sign;
 3. St. Michael's Road – Vehicle Activated Sign;
 4. Cadwell Lane Traffic Lights – improved pedestrian facilities;
 5. Stevenage Road (Stevenage bound carriageway) – Vehicle Activated Sign;
 6. A new pedestrian crossing on Bedford Road (near its junction with Elmside Walk and across to Waitrose)."

The District Manager's initial comments on the above suggestions are as follows:-

1. In order to obtain a meaningful estimate of the cost of such a scheme, an extensive public consultation exercise would be required. Experience of other traffic calming schemes of a similar magnitude indicates that a proposal such as this has the potential to consume the entire annual design fee allocated to the discretionary budget, with no guarantee of a successful outcome in terms of an agreed and deliverable scheme. It is therefore not recommended to progress this proposal.
2. The provision of a sign is feasible, subject to agreement by local members on a suitable site. Members may wish to receive traffic speed data in order to be confident that a speeding problem exists. It may be appropriate at this site to consider the incorporation of a legend alerting drivers to the presence of the nearby school. Budget figures for works and design are £5,000 and £2,500 respectively, the latter figure being based upon a minimal consultation exercise.
3. The provision of a sign at this location is also feasible, subject to agreement of a suitable site. Again, members may wish to receive traffic speed data before deciding to progress this proposal. Budget figures for works and design are £5,000 and £2,500 respectively, again based upon minimal consultation.
4. Please see the comments in a) iii) above.
5. The provision of a sign at this location is also technically feasible, subject to agreement of a suitable site. Again, members may wish to receive traffic speed data before deciding to progress this proposal. Budget figures for works and design are £5,000 and £2,500 respectively.
6. The viability of this proposal would need to be assessed by means of a feasibility study, the estimated design fee for which is £3,000. Members may however wish to bear in mind the draft NHDC Hitchin Vision, which proposes changes to traffic routes in this part of Hitchin. The effect of those changes, if

implemented, may result in the re-routing of through traffic away from the site of the proposed crossing, thus rendering its provision unnecessary.

In the event that members resolve to proceed with any of the above suggestions from the NHDC Hitchin Area Committee, it would be appropriate for contributions to be sought from the discretionary budget of that committee to be sought in order to progress the projects as joint ventures.

c) Verge Areas Subject to Repeated Damage

Within the four principal urban areas of the district, maintenance of the highway verges is undertaken by North Hertfordshire District Council. This function includes grass cutting, tree maintenance and the restoration of damaged verge areas. For most instances of damage, repair work is successful in that it provides a lasting solution. But for a relatively small number of locations, repeated damage has been caused and restoration alone is not felt to be a wise use of resources. At these locations, vehicles overrunning the verge cause unsightly muddy ruts and engineering measures are needed to ensure that further damage does not occur. Examples of these measures are the installation of bollards or barriers where overrun by vehicles can be prevented or the hard surfacing of the verge area where overrunning can be permitted.

A list of sites affected by repeated damage has been prepared and currently features some fifty locations. The list has been considered jointly by the District Manager and the NHDC Chief Engineer and it is felt that a number of the sites are worthy of attention but, when viewed solely from the perspective of the available maintenance budgets, would not be regarded as a priority. The detrimental effect upon the street scene does however continue to be an issue.

It is proposed that **£20,000** be allocated from the discretionary works budget of the Panel for works to address the highest priority sites. No design fee would be required for this scheme as it would be delivered by the Area Engineers within the district team. In order to take this project forward, a short list of sites would be established through the joint officer liaison process, where the most appropriate treatment would be suggested for each site. The short list would then be presented to the next meeting of the Panel for approval.

4. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Traffic regulation orders may be required in order to move some of the schemes forward.

5. FINANCIAL AND HUMAN RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

5.1 For 2006/2007, the allocation for works associated with this budget is £90,000, an increase of £10,000 over the 2005/2006 budget figure.

5.2 The design fee allocation for the year 2006/2007 is £30,000.

5.3 Provision for Uncompleted 2005/2006 Schemes - Works

At the time of writing, the hoped for carry over from 2005/2006 had not been confirmed. It is therefore still necessary to make this provision from the current year budget.

i)	Enhanced Maintenance of Hitchin Town Centre	5,000
ii)	Codicote Lighting	2,000
iii)	Letchworth Signing	5,000
iv)	Redhill Road Hitchin Traffic Calming	10,000
	Total Provision	<u>£22,000</u>
5.4	<u>Approved Schemes 2006/2007 – Works Costs</u>	
a)	VA Signs – Rota to Permanent	9,000
b)	Enhanced Maintenance of Town Centres – Letchworth	17,000
c)	Bury Plantation Footpath Royston – Lighting	4,000
d)	Letchworth Signing	10,000
e)	VA Sign Wymondley Road Hitchin	4,000
f)	VA Sign Willian Village	1,000
	Total works cost - approved schemes	<u>£45,000</u>
5.5	<u>Approved Schemes 2005/2006 and 2006/2007 - Design Fee Costs</u>	
	Enhanced Maintenance of Town Centres - Hitchin	Nil
	Codicote Lighting	500
	Letchworth Signing	6,000
	Redhill Road Hitchin	1,000
	VA Signs – Rota to Permanent	Nil
	Enhanced Maintenance of Town Centres – Letchworth	Nil
	Bury Plantation Footpath Royston	900
	VA Sign – Wymondley Road Hitchin	2,500
	VA Sign – Willian Village	2,500
	Total fee - approved schemes	<u>£13,400</u>
5.6	<u>Proposed Additional Schemes – Works Costs</u>	
a)	Peters Green – Lighting	25,000
b)	Peters Green – Kerbing	15,600
c)	Verge protection works	20,000
	Total works cost – proposed additional schemes	<u>£60,600</u>
5.7	<u>Proposed Additional Schemes - Design Fee Costs</u>	
	Peters Green Lighting	8,000
	Total fee –proposed additional schemes	<u>£8,000</u>
5.8	<u>Further Candidate Schemes – Works Costs</u>	
	Broadway Letchworth – Pedestrian Crossings	40,000
	Paynes Park Hitchin – Pedestrian Crossing Investigation	Nil
	Bedford Road Hitchin – VA Sign	5,000
	St Michael’s Road Hitchin – VA Sign	5,000
	Stevenage Road Hitchin – VA Sign	5,000
	Verge Protection Measures	20,000

5.9 Further candidate Schemes – Design Fee Costs

Broadway Letchworth – Pedestrian Crossings	16,500
Broadway Letchworth – Pedestrian Crossings (Feasibility only)	2,000
Paynes Park Hitchin – Pedestrian Crossing Investigation	2,000
Bedford Road Hitchin – VA Sign	2,500
St Michael’s Road Hitchin – VA Sign	2,500
Stevenage Road Hitchin – VA Sign	2,500
Verge Protection Measures	Nil

5.10 Human resources to progress schemes within this area will be provided by the Hertfordshire Highways establishment.

6. **CONSULTATION WITH EXTERNAL ORGANISATIONS AND WARD MEMBERS**

6.1 Consultations to be carried out on a project specific basis.

7. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

7.1 That the Panel notes the update on current year schemes.

7.2 That the additional schemes proposed for 2006/2007 are approved by the Panel as a basis for allocation of funding.

7.3 That the Panel propose further schemes for 2006/07 programme, in accordance with agreed themes.

8. **REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

8.1 To maintain the flow of information to members regarding the schemes.

8.2 To progress schemes and other measures in accordance with the agreed themes for the discretionary budget of the Panel.

9. **APPENDICES**

9.1 None.

10. **CONTACT OFFICERS**

10.1 Steve Greenhill, District Manager (North Herts), Hertfordshire Highways.

11. **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

11.1 Report to the North Hertfordshire Highways Joint Member Panel 30 April 2006.

TITLE OF REPORT: QUARTERLY REPORT ON OPERATIONAL PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

REPORT OF THE NORTH HERTS ASSISTANT DISTRICT MANAGER

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To report details of the performance of Hertfordshire Highways, for the six month period November 2005 to April 2006 inclusive. This report includes data for the North Hertfordshire area and also in the countywide context.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 Performance indicators are a mechanism for monitoring performance against agreed and published performance standards. The Joint Member Panel has a role in monitoring performance in the local context.
- 2.2 As part of the Best Value Initiative, it is necessary to demonstrate that an appropriate level of service is being provided at optimum cost. The indicators used for the highway service have been developed with regard to recent advice from the Department of Environment Transport and the Regions (DETR) and are drawn from three sources:-
- The Audit Commission
 - Charter Mark guidance
 - Best Value
- 2.3 The performance indicators are collated and recorded in two ways. Those relating to the Hertfordshire Highways Works Team performance are produced centrally at Highways House in Welwyn Garden City. The data is recorded in two formats, district specific and countywide. These two data sets are shown in Appendices A and B respectively. It is therefore possible to identify local performance and compare it with the countywide scenario. Performance indicators relating specifically to the operation of the Area Office, located at Antelope House Stevenage, are tabulated in Appendix C.

3. ISSUES

- 3.1 The data contained in the Appendices A and B attached to this report relate to Works Team performance for the six months from November 2005 to April 2006 inclusive. Appendix A shows data specific to the North Herts District and Appendix B contains countywide data. The “Number of Calls in System” equates to the number of defects reported and “Number of Calls on Time” equates to the number of defects rectified on time.
- 3.2 Potholes. The Charter Mark promise is to address these within 24 hours. Performance in North Herts is now better than 95%.
- 3.3 Hazardous pavements. These hazardous footway trips are also to be addressed within 24 hours. Performance for this service area in North Herts has recovered to 96% for April after falling below 95% in March.
- 3.4 Exposed wiring (in street lighting units). The charter promise is to deal with these in 24 hours. In North Herts the performance is now generally 100%.
- 3.5 Customer reported street lighting faults. (Listed as “5 day lighting” in Appendices A and B). Performance both countywide and within North Hertfordshire is now consistently above 95%. The number of reported faults shows the expected seasonal variation.
- 3.6 Pedestrian Crossings with Facilities for the Disabled. The total number of crossings listed has decreased as the criteria for this PI was altered to remove the Zebra Crossings.

4. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 None

5. FINANCIAL AND HUMAN RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 No financial resource implications
- 5.2 All human resource requirements are met within the existing Hertfordshire Highways contractual arrangements.

6. CONSULTATION WITH EXTERNAL ORGANISATIONS AND WARD MEMBERS

- 6.1 Via the Joint Member Panel.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 7.1 That the Panel notes the supplied data and continues to receive an update report at each future meeting.

8. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 8.1 To ensure that members continue to be informed of the performance on key service activities.

9. APPENDICES

- 9.1 Appendix A – Works Team performance In North Herts.
- 9.2 Appendix B – Works Team performance countywide.
- 9.3 Appendix C – Local area office performance indicators.

9. CONTACT OFFICERS

- 10.1 Michael Moralee, Assistant District Manager (North Herts), Hertfordshire Highways.

10. BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 11.1 None

THIS PAGE IS BLANK

Appendix A

Works Team Performance Indicators November 2005 to April 2006 - North Herts District

		Nov-05	Dec-05	Jan-06	Feb-06	Mar-06	Apr-06
Charter Mark Potholes	Number of Calls in System	87	97	193	117	184	177
	Number of Calls On Time	85	89	179	114	176	169
	% of Calls On Time	98%	92%	93%	97%	96%	95%
Charter Mark Hazardous Pavements	Number of Calls in System	24	28	26	26	26	27
	Number of Calls On Time	24	26	24	25	24	26
	% of Calls On Time	100%	93%	92%	96%	92%	96%
Charter Mark Exposed Wiring	Number of Calls in System	18	11	10	5	11	4
	Number of Calls On Time	18	11	10	5	11	4
	% of Calls On Time	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Charter Mark 5 Day Street Lights	Number of Calls in System	278	158	201	131	131	61
	Number of Calls On Time	232	139	182	131	129	60
	% of Calls On Time	83%	88%	91%	100%	98%	98%

Appendix B

Works Team Performance Indicators November 2005 to April 2006 - Countywide

		Nov-05	Dec-05	Jan-06	Feb-06	Mar-06	Apr-06
Charter Mark Potholes	Number of Calls in System	618	566	1311	966	1619	1,050
	Number of Calls On Time	590	543	1261	927	1566	1009
	% of Calls On Time (Target 100%)	95%	96%	96%	96%	97%	96%
Charter Mark Hazardous Pavements	Number of Calls in System	437	253	387	401	467	364
	Number of Calls On Time	418	241	384	392	450	353
	% of Calls On Time (Target 100%)	96%	95%	94%	98%	96%	97%
Charter Mark Exposed Wiring	Number of Calls in System	161	111	116	109	122	118
	Number of Calls On Time	161	111	115	109	122	118
	% of Calls On Time (Target 100%)	100%	100%	99%	100%	100%	100%
Charter Mark 5 Day Lighting	Number of Calls in System	1,780	1,300	1,292	1,024	1,097	647
	Number of Calls On Time	1,635	1,206	1,244	1,011	1,083	637
	% of Calls On Time (Target 100%)	92%	93%	96%	99%	99%	98%

Appendix C

North Herts District Team - Local Performance Indicators November 2005 to April 2006

Indicator	Type & Frequency	Measure						
			Nov-05	Dec-05	Jan-06	Feb-06	Mar-06	Apr-06
Working with local people and groups to improve the quality of the environment.	Charter Mark (CM 3.2) quarterly	List of contacts with community groups	2	6	2	0	0	1
A name provided with all contacts with the public.	Charter Mark (CM 4.1) monthly	Number of staff surveyed	13	10	3	4	12	12
		Number of staff wearing name badges	13	7	3	4	12	8
		% staff wearing name badges (target 100%)	100%	70%	100%	100%	100%	67%
Ditto	Charter Mark (CM 4.1) monthly	Number of public letters sampled	76	31	52	89	93	46
		Number with contact name and telephone number	76	31	52	89	92	46
		% with contact name and telephone number (target 100%)	100%	100%	100%	100%	99%	100%
% of letters answered within 3 days	Charter Mark (CM 4.2) monthly	Number of public letters received.	76	31	52	89	93	46
		Number requiring 3 day response	57	19	37	40	61	31
		Number of "no reply necessary" letters	19	12	1	29	32	15
		Number answered within 3 days	57	17	35	40	59	30
		% answered within 3 days (target 100%)	100%	90%	95%	100%	97%	97%
Number of pedestrian crossings with facilities for disabled	BV 165 monthly	Number of pedestrian crossings	62	59	61	62	62	44
		Number of crossings with facilities for disabled	52	42	48	52	52	30
		% with facilities (target 100%)	84%	71%	79%	84%	84%	67%