

Report To: ENVIRONMENT & REGENERATION COMMITTEE **Date:** 31 August 2017

Report By: CORPORATE DIRECTOR,
ENVIRONMENT, REGENERATION &
RESOURCES **Report No:** ERC/ENV/WR/17.312

Contact Officer: STEVEN WALKER **Contact No:** 01475 714800

Subject: TRAFFIC CALMING POLICY – REVISED GUIDELINES AND ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

1.0 PURPOSE

- 1.1 The purpose of the report is to seek Committee approval of the revised Guidelines and Assessment Criteria within the Traffic Calming Policy.

2.0 SUMMARY

- 2.1 The current Traffic Calming Policy was approved at the Economic Development Services Committee on 7 December 1999.
- 2.2 The policy has been used to assess and prioritise requests for traffic calming. Although it is an effective method to prioritise schemes, it is felt that a review of the policy is necessary to ensure that it is up to date in terms of current good practice.
- 2.3 Following a review of other Local Authorities' policies, revised Guidelines and Assessment Criteria have been prepared within our Traffic Calming Policy for use in Inverclyde have been drafted for approval by this Committee.

3.0 RECOMMENDATION

- 3.1 That the Committee approve the revised Guidelines and Assessment Criteria within the Traffic Calming Policy.

Willie Rennie
Head of Environmental and Commercial Services

4.0 BACKGROUND

- 4.1 Due to the number of requests for traffic calming submitted by the general public and received by Elected Members, a Policy was approved by the Economic Development Services Committee on 7 December 1999.
- 4.2 The committee report introducing the existing Policy is shown in Appendix 1. It has been used to assess requests by considering traffic speeds and volumes, accident data and local factors such as the presence of schools, shops, etc. Appendix 1
- 4.3 Following experience of using the Policy, it was felt that it would benefit from being updated. A review of other Local Authorities' Traffic Calming Policies was therefore undertaken.
- 4.4 As a result of this review, revised Guidelines and Assessment Criteria have been drafted for the existing Traffic Calming Policy. The policy including the revised Guidelines and Assessment Criteria is attached in Appendix 2. Appendix 2
- 4.5 If approved, it is proposed that this would be used to assess requests for Traffic Calming from 2018 onwards.
- 4.6 The revisions to the Guidelines and Assessment Criteria include:
- A greater points allocation given to collisions involving vulnerable road users such as pedestrians and cyclists.
 - More detailed consideration of the facilities on the road in question such as schools, bus stops, shops, etc.
 - More detailed points allocation as based on the number of vehicles using the road.
 - A points allocation for the assessed width of the road as it becomes more difficult for pedestrians to cross wider roads.
- 4.7 Traffic Calming takes different forms. It can be simple methods such as signing and lining or more complex physical measures such as changes to the vertical and horizontal alignment of the road. The majority of vertical and horizontal traffic calming measures require a consultation process with Police Scotland, Strathclyde Fire and Rescue, Scottish Ambulance Service and road users affected by the proposals. The consultation process follows a similar process to Traffic Regulation Orders.
- 4.8 It is proposed that on A and B class roads and other distributor roads that vertical and horizontal features are not likely to be appropriate, and that the use of signs, road markings, and vehicle actuated speed signs to encourage road users to reduce their speed will be adopted on such roads.

5.0 IMPLICATIONS

Finance

- 5.1 There are no financial implications arising from this report.

Cost Centre	Budget Heading	Budget Years	Proposed Spend this Report	Virement From	Other Comments
			£0		

Legal

5.2 There are no legal implications arising from this report.

Human Resources

5.3 There are no HR implications arising from this report.

Equalities

5.4 There are no equality issues arising from this report.

Repopulation

5.5 There are no repopulation implications arising from this report.

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

6.1 The Head of Legal and Property Services and the Chief Financial Officer have been consulted on this report.

7.0 LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS

7.1 None.

Appendix 1

Report to: Economic Development Services Committee of 7 December 1999

Report by: Depute Chief Executive

Originator: Head of Transportation and Roads

SUBJECT: ASSESSMENT CRITERIA FOR TRAFFIC CALMING / TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT SCHEMES

1. Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 To seek the Committee approval for the criteria utilised by the Transportation and Roads Service in prioritising the promotion of traffic calming / traffic management schemes.

2. Background

- 2.1 There is at present an increasing demand from the public and via residents associations, community councils and members for the introduction of traffic calming schemes in roads where they perceive there to be a road safety problem. Due to the resources available to the Transportation and Roads Service there is, therefore, a requirement to select and prioritise these requests on an objective basis in order that the available funds can be targeted at the areas which are in most need and where the best value can be achieved.
- 2.2 Traffic calming is the term that is used in the UK for the application of traffic engineering and other physical measures designed to control traffic speeds and encourage driver behaviour appropriate to the prevailing environment. The measures can include the use of 'traditional' traffic engineering techniques eg signing and lining, as well as a variety of other measures more recently introduced into the UK such as humps, gateways, speed cameras, 20 mph zones and various forms of horizontal deflections. Also included are the use of visual messages, either explicit such as signing, or implicit such as landscaping.
- 2.3 The essence of traffic calming lies in the use of specific measures but in the overall objectives to improve road safety and provide better environmental conditions. The strategic objectives are:
- providing the greatest potential for reduction of accidents,
 - improving driver behaviour, concentration and awareness,
 - reducing speed, disturbance and anxiety,
 - enhancing the environment, eg less air and noise pollution
- 2.4 The former Strathclyde Regional Council, as Roads Authority, approved site selection criteria for speed control humps based solely on the need to tackle established accident problems. In order to be considered for speed control humps a road was required to meet all of the following three criteria:

- i) Three or more reported accidents involving injury to pedestrians over a 100 metre section of road per three year period
 - ii) Measured average vehicle speeds greater than 25 mph
 - iii) a residential road, preferably not a bus route.
- 2.5 Whilst the criteria set out above is very limiting in determining worthy sites it is proposed to broaden the scope of the selection criteria to all forms of traffic calming in varying conditions and layouts.

3. Guidelines for Initial Selection

3.1 There are a range of circumstances where traffic calming would be considered appropriate. There is, therefore, no single threshold figure, but a series of factors which increase the justification for a scheme. Priority should be given to sites which either have a particularly acute problem, or which can be objectively assessed as measurable parameters.

3.2 Measurable Parameters

- i) Accidents involving injury to pedestrians or cyclists should remain a significant factor. Other accidents involving injuries and those involving damage only to vehicles should also be considered, but with a lesser weighting.
- ii) The measured speed of vehicles at the site under consideration is also significant. Such observations are commonly expressed as the 85 th percentile speed, which is the speed exceeded only by the fastest 15% of vehicles.
- iii) There is also a case for traffic calming where vulnerable people are likely to cross the road such as near nursery schools, primary schools, playgrounds, day care centres, post offices, etc.
- iv) Both the volume of traffic and the amount of 'Rat Run' traffic in residential areas can cause concern to local people. In this context, 'Rat Run' traffic comprises traffic which does not require access to addresses in the immediate vicinity but uses the road as a short cut. Such traffic can often take an alternative route.

4. Proposed Guidelines

4.1 It is proposed that when a request for traffic calming is received set parameters relating to 3.2 i) - iv) above are determined for the area in question. If they match or exceed any of the following they will be considered further and prioritised as indicated in Section 5 below.

4.2 Parameters

- i) Two or more pedestrian injury accidents per three years throughout the length of the proposed scheme.
- ii) The observed 85 percentile speed is at or above the speed limit on the road in question.
- iii) The length of road of the proposed scheme is directly associated with pedestrian movements from a facility such as a school, hospital, sheltered housing complex, etc.
- iv) The through traffic in both directions exceeds 180 vehicles in the peak hour.

5. Prioritisation of Sites

5.1 After the initial selection of sites as indicated in Section 3 above it is proposed that a points system be introduced in order to prioritise schemes meeting the justification criteria. Points would be allocated under the following headings:

- Accidents
- Speed
- Volume of Traffic
- Location/Type of vulnerable facility

on the following basis:

- Accidents

Fatal, Serious, Slight = x 10

Damage Only = x 5

-Speed

	Relationship of 85th percentile speed to speed limit	Rating
	Speed (mph)	
	Speed Limit	0
85th	1 - 5 mph \geq Speed Limit	3
85th	> 5 mph above Speed Limit	5
85th	\leq 10 mph below Speed Limit	- 5

-Volume of Traffic

Maximum Volume (vehicles/hour)	Rating
180 - 250	1.0
251 - 350	2.5
> 351	5.0

- Location/Type of vulnerable facility

Type	Rating (cumulative for each situation)
Residential frontage	5 high - 1 low
Associated with high pedestrian generator school, hospital, etc	5 high - 1 low
Forward/Junction Visibility	5 poor - 1 good
Problem with on road parking	5 poor - 1 good
Problem with pedestrians	5 poor - 1 good

- Expected benefit

Cost / Benefit

5 high - 1 poor

- 5.2 The priority ratings achieved from the above criteria will take account of local knowledge and concerns, engineering judgement and expected best value regarding the particular concern.
 - 5.3 For the sites being considered the priority ratings achieved from each of the above criteria will be summed and the sites prioritised.
 - 5.4 Because of the limited finance available to the Transportation and Roads Service it is proposed the traffic calming / traffic management schemes will only be considered for those sites obtaining the highest priority rating from the summation of each of the above criteria. It is also proposed, as necessary, that any other remedial measures will be investigated for those sites with lower priority ratings.
6. Financial Implications
- 6.1 There are no direct financial costs arising from this report which is advisory in content. It is proposed, each year, to submit a bid for capital funds to enable a number of schemes with the highest priority to be undertaken.
7. Recommendation(s)
- 7.1 That the Committee approves the criteria utilised by the Transportation and Roads Service in prioritising the promotion of traffic calming / traffic management schemes.

Appendix 2

Inverclyde Council – Environmental & Commercial Services
Traffic Calming Policy (August 2017)

Guidelines for Initial Selection

1. There are a range of circumstances where traffic calming would be considered appropriate. There is, therefore, no single threshold figure, but a series of factors which increase the justification for a scheme. Priority should be given to sites which either have a particularly acute problem, or which can be objectively assessed as measurable parameters.
2. Measurable parameters
 - i. Accidents involving injury to pedestrians or cyclists should remain a significant factor. Other accidents involving injuries and those involving damage only to vehicles should also be considered, but with a lesser weighting.
 - ii. The measured speed of vehicles at the site under consideration is also significant. Such observations are commonly expressed as the 85th percentile speed, which is the speed exceeded only by the fastest 15% of vehicles.
 - iii. There is also a case for traffic calming where vulnerable people are likely to cross the road such as near nursery school, primary schools, playgrounds, elderly lunch clubs, shops, etc.
 - iv. Both volume of traffic and the amount of 'Rat Run' traffic in residential areas can cause concern to local people. In this context, 'Rat Run' traffic comprises traffic which does not require access to addresses in the immediate vicinity but uses the road as a short cut. Such traffic can often take an alternative route.
3. When a request for traffic calming is received the set parameters in 2(i) to (iv) above are determined for the area in question. If they match or exceed any of the following they will be considered further and prioritised as indicated in Section 5 below.
4. Parameters:
 - i. Two or more vulnerable road user injury accidents per three years through the length of the proposed scheme.
 - ii. The observed 85th percentile speed as at or above the speed limit on the road in question.
 - iii. The length of road of the proposed scheme is directly associated with pedestrian movements from a facility such as a school, hospital, nursing home, etc.
 - iv. The through traffic in both directions exceeds 180 vehicles in the peak hour.

Prioritisation of Sites

5. After the initial section of sites as indicated in the Initial Selection Process above the points system below will be used to prioritise scheme meeting the justification criteria. Points will be allocated under the following headings:

- Accidents
- Speed
- Location/ Type of vulnerable facilities
- Volume of traffic
- Width of road

Criterion Range Priority Factor

		Points
Vehicle speed (85th percentile) <i>Assessment criteria</i> (mph above speed limit)	1-5 above	10
	6-10 above	15
	>10 above	20
Accident level, vehicle occupants (personal injury accidents/km over 3 year study period)	fatal	x6
	serious	x4
	slight	x2
	non-injury	x1
Accident level, vulnerable road users (personal injury accidents/km over 3 year study period)	fatal	x7
	serious	x5
	slight	x3
Pedestrian generators (this list is not exhaustive)	school entrances	6
	shops	3
	bus stops	3
	community centres	3
	hospital/ medical centres	3
	elderly, nursing homes	3
	hospitals	3
	elderly lunch clubs, nurseries, play groups	3
play park	3	
Vehicle Flow vehicles/hour (per 100 vehicles for peak hours)	per 100	1
	Over 1000	10
Crossing width (widths above 5.5m)	5.6m-8.5m	3
	>8.5m	5

6. The priority ratings achieved from the above criteria will take account of local knowledge and concerns, engineering judgement and expected best value regarding the particular concern.
7. For the sites being considered the priority ratings achieved from each of the criteria will be summed and the sites prioritised.

8. Due to the limited finance available to the Service it is proposed the traffic calming/ traffic management schemes will only be considered for those sites obtaining the highest priority from the summation of each of the above criteria. It is also proposed, as necessary, that any other remedial measures will be investigated for those sites with lower priority ratings.

Notes:

Traffic Calming takes different forms. It can be simple methods such as signing and lining or more complex physical measures such as changes to the vertical and horizontal alignment of the road. The majority of vertical and horizontal traffic calming measures require a consultation process with Police Scotland, Strathclyde Fire and Rescue, Scottish Ambulance Service and road users affected by the proposals. The consultation process follows a similar process to Traffic Regulation Orders.

On A and B class roads and other distributor roads that vertical and horizontal features are not likely to be appropriate, and that the use of signs, road markings, and vehicle actuated speed signs to encourage road users to reduce their speed will be adopted on such roads.