

Report to	<b>Lead Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment</b>
Date	<b>25 June 2007</b>
Report By	<b>Director of Transport and Environment</b>
Title of Report	<b>Revised policy for the introduction of traffic calming</b>
Purpose of Report	<b>To approve amendments to the procedure for the priority assessment of traffic calming.</b>

---

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**To approve amendments to the policy for the priority assessment of traffic calming as shown in Appendix 2 to this report.**

---

---

**1. Financial Appraisal**

1.1 Speed management schemes are primarily funded from the County Council's capital programme for Local Safety Schemes and Minor Works. The allocation for speed management in 2007/08 is £310,000. In addition to this, a further £80,000 has been made available from the Sussex Safer Roads Partnership, an estimated £10,000 from parish and town councils, and finally an additional £350,000 one-off allocation in 2007-08 approved by County Council at its meeting on 20 February 2007.

**2. Supporting Information**

2.1 The procedure for prioritising traffic calming schemes was last updated in April 2006. It is attached at Appendix 1.

2.2 New guidance on setting local speed limits was published in August 2006 by the Department for Transport. The guidance gives local authorities more flexibility when considering the need to introduce local speed limits and advocates that a speed limit of 30 mph should be the norm for villages, where appropriate.

2.3 The assessment of villages as part of the speed limit review will bring forward sites which will require supporting traffic calming to enable the reduction of the speed limit. As the current assessment procedure for traffic calming is biased towards urban sites, it was felt appropriate to review the traffic calming priority assessment framework to better reflect rural issues such as footways, severance, public rights of way, and equestrian activity.

2.4 In developing a revised policy for setting local speed limits, an issues paper was forwarded to all district, town and parish councils in December 2006, and they were given the opportunity to comment on the additional factors being considered as well as put forward any suggestions of their own.

2.5 Feedback received on the issues paper was outlined to parish and town councils at the Road Safety and Freight Management Conference held at Uckfield Civic Centre on 4 April 2007. As a result of that feedback, the assessment procedure has been

revised as shown in the appendix to the revised policy summary (Appendix 2), with the introduction of four additional factors i.e. :-

Part 5 Footways  
Part 7 Equestrian Activity  
Part 8 Public Access  
Part 10 Severance

### **3. Conclusion and Reason for Recommendation**

3.1 The recommended revisions to the assessment procedure for traffic calming are designed to take account of rural issues, and give a better balance between urban and rural sites. However, the procedure will continue to be biased towards casualty reduction in order to maximise the level of return on the investment.

RUPERT CLUBB  
Director of Transport and Environment  
13 JUNE 2007  
LMTE: 25 JUNE 2007 – TRAFFIC CALMING POLICY

Contact Officer: Bryn Kemp  
Local Member: All

Tel. No. 01273 482106

### **BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS**

None

**TRAFFIC CALMING REQUESTS - Priority Assessment Procedure**

**Part 1a - Total Treatable Accident Rating**

Treatable Accidents Involving Personal Injury for the latest 3 years:-

Total Fatal ..... x 3 points	=	.....
Total Serious ..... x 2 points	=	.....
Total Slight ..... x 1 points	=	.....
		<hr style="width: 100%;"/>
.....points	=	
Multiply by study length in metres /1000	=	
points		

Score:

**Part 1b - Vulnerable Road User (VRU) Accident Rating**

Treatable accidents Involving VRUs (i.e. pedestrians & cyclists), whether or not the VRU was one of the casualties

Total Fatal ..... x 3 points	=	.....
Total Serious ..... x 2 points	=	.....
Total Slight ..... x 1 points	=	.....
		<hr style="width: 100%;"/>
Total	=	.....
points		
Multiply by study length in metres /1000	=	
points		

Score:

**Part 2 - Speed/Volume Relationship**

Speed 85th %ile mph	Vehicles per day (two-way AAWDT Flow)				
	<2000	2001 - 3000	3001 - 4000	4001 - 5000	>5000
25 - 29	1	2	3	4	5
30 - 34	2	3	4	5	6
35-39	3	4	5	6	7
>39	4	5	6	7	8

Score:

### Part 3 - Traffic Flow

Property Facade to Centre Line of Carriageway (metres)	Vehicles per day				
	<2000	2001 - 3000	3001 - 4000	4001 - 5000	>5000
7+	0	½	1	1½	2
6 - 6.9	½	1	1½	2	2½
5 - 5.9	1	1½	2	2½	3
4 - 4.9	1½	2	2½	3	3½
<4	2	2½	3	3½	4

Score:

### Part 4 - Through Traffic

Volume of Through Traffic	Vehicles per day				
	<2000	2001 - 3000	3001 - 4000	4001 - 5000	>5000
Very High	2	2½	3	3½	4
High	1½	2	2½	3	3½
Moderate	1	1½	2	2½	3
Low	½	1	1½	2	2½
Very Low	0	½	1	1½	2

Score:

### Part 5 - Pedestrian Activity

Level of Pedestrian Activity	Vehicles per day				
	<2000	2001 - 3000	3001 - 4000	4001 - 5000	>5000
High All Day	2	2½	3	3½	4
High in peaks, moderate at other times	1½	2	2½	3	3½
Moderate all day	1	1½	2	2½	3
Moderate in peaks, low at other times	½	1	1½	2	2½
Low all day	0	½	1	1½	2

Score:

### Part 6 - Cycling Activity

Level of Cycling Activity	Vehicles per day				
	<2000	2001 - 3000	3001 - 4000	4001 - 5000	>5000
High All Day	2	2½	3	3½	4
High in peaks, moderate at other times	1½	2	2½	3	3½
Moderate all day	1	1½	2	2½	3
Moderate in peaks, low at other times	½	1	1½	2	2½
Low all day	0	½	1	1½	2

Score:

## Part 7 - Cycle Routes

Proximity of Assessment Length to Cycle Route (metres)	National Cycle Network	Other Strategic Route
On Route	4	3
<250	3	2
251 - 500	2	1
501 - 1,000	1	0

Score:

## Part 8A - Schools

Proximity of Assessment Length to Schools (metres)	Points
On Route	4
<250	3
251 - 500	2
501 - 1,000	1

Score:

## Part 8B - Schools

Number of Pupils	Vehicles per day				
	<2000	2001 - 3000	3001 - 4000	4001 - 5000	>5000
<300	½	1	1½	2	2½
301 - 600	1	1½	2	2½	3
601 - 900	1½	2	2½	3	3½
>900	2	2½	3	3½	4

Score:

## Part 9 - Development

% of developed residential/shopping frontage within 10m of carriageway

	Points
<20%	0
20 - 39%	1
40 - 59%	2
60 - 79%	3
>80%	4

Score:

## Summary

Total Score:

Part

$$\begin{array}{cccccccc} 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8A \\ \square & + & \square & + & \square & + & \square & + & \square & + & \square & + & \square & + & \square & + & \square & + & \square & + \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{cc} 8B & 9 \\ \square & + & \square \end{array}$$

Total Score =

Comments

**LEAD MEMBER – TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT APPENDIX 2**  
**POLICY SUMMARY**

<b>TRAFFIC CALMING</b>		<b><u>PS 4/25</u></b>
<b>PURPOSE OF POLICY</b>		
To reduce road casualties and minimise the adverse effects of motorised traffic by traffic calming techniques.		
<b>SPECIFIC POLICIES</b>		
<u>Pre-Qualification Criteria</u>		
1. Sites will only be considered for traffic calming if:		
a) an initial review indicates there is a problem that might be solved by a general lowering of speeds and that traffic calming is an appropriate solution, and,		
b) either the 'treatable accident' rating is '4' or more, or a vulnerable road user was involved in a 'treatable accident'. For this purpose, accidents will not be regarded as treatable if it is clear they could not have been prevented by traffic calming. The accident rating is calculated over the most recent three-year period by scoring 1 for each treatable slight accident, 2 for each treatable serious accident and 3 for each treatable fatal accident. Where the assessment length is greater than 1km the resulting score will be divided by the study length in metres and multiplied by 1000 to give a rate per kilometre.		
<u>Detailed Assessment</u>		
2 Sites that are to be considered will be prioritised using an approved assessment procedure that takes into account factors such as treatable accidents, speeds, traffic flow, through traffic, pedestrian and cycle flows, severance, schools and development. (See Appendix A to this policy)		
3 Where traffic calming one route could displace traffic onto equally unsuitable routes an area-wide study will be undertaken.		
4 Proposals to impose or change speed limits as part of a traffic calming scheme should follow the principles contained in Policy PS4/2 (Local Speed Limits) and Policy PS4/30 (20mph Speed Limits).		
5 Where possible and beneficial, traffic calming measures will be considered as part of highway, traffic management, safety, structural maintenance and development schemes.		
6 Provided they are acceptable in highway terms, sites that are externally funded may be progressed irrespective of their priority on the County Council's programme.		
<b>SUPPORTING STATEMENT</b>		
Traffic Calming Schemes are expensive and invariably the cost of treating all the sites awaiting treatment far outweighs the available funding. A policy is therefore required to ensure that appropriate sites are selected for investigation and that effective use is made of resources by only progressing worthwhile schemes. Traffic calming measures can adversely affect emergency vehicles and bus operations and inconvenience local residents. Schemes should therefore only be progressed where it can be demonstrated that the potential benefits outweigh these disadvantages.		
<b>REFERENCES – FURTHER INFORMATION</b>		<b>DATE OF APPROVAL</b>
Lead Member Meeting - Agenda Item 8		16.10.2006
Lead Member Meeting - Agenda Item 7		03.03.2003
Lead Member Meeting - Agenda Item 5		04.03.2002
Cabinet Committee - Agenda Item 19		12.12.2000

Appendix A - TRAFFIC CALMING REQUESTS - Priority Assessment Procedure

**Part 1a - Total Treatable Accident Rating**

Treatable Accidents Involving Personal Injury for the latest 3 years:-

Total Fatal .....x 3 = ..... points  
 Total Serious .....x 2 = ..... points  
 Total Slight .....x 1 = ..... points

\_\_\_\_\_

Total = .....points

Where length is greater than 1km  
 Multiply by study length in metres /1000 =.....points

Score:

**Part 1b - Vulnerable Road User (VRU) Accident Rating**

Treatable accidents Involving VRUs (i.e. pedestrians & cyclists), whether or not the VRU was one of the casualties

Total Fatal .....x 3 = ..... points  
 Total Serious .....x 2 = ..... points  
 Total Slight .....x 1 = ..... points

\_\_\_\_\_

Total = .....points

Where length is greater than 1km  
 Multiply by study length in metres /1000 =.....points

Score:

**Part 2 - Speed/Volume Relationship**

Mean Speed above appropriate limit mph	Vehicles per day (two-way AAWDT Flow)				
	<2500	2501 - 4000	4001 - 6000	6001 - 8500	>8500
0 - 4	1	2	3	4	5
5 - 9	2	3	4	5	6
10-14	3	4	5	6	7
>14	4	5	6	7	8

Score:



### **Part 3 - Traffic Flow**

Property Facade to Centre Line of Carriageway (metres)	Vehicles per day				
	<2500	2501 - 4000	4001 - 6000	6001 - 8500	>8500
7+	0	½	1	1½	2
6 - 6.9	½	1	1½	2	2½
5 - 5.9	1	1½	2	2½	3
4 - 4.9	1½	2	2½	3	3½
<4	2	2½	3	3½	4

Score:

### **Part 4 - Pedestrian Activity**

Level of Pedestrian Activity	Vehicles per day				
	<2500	2501 - 4000	4001 - 6000	6001 - 8500	>8500
High All Day	2	2½	3	3½	4
High in peaks, moderate at other times	1½	2	2½	3	3½
Moderate all day	1	1½	2	2½	3
Moderate in peaks, low at other times	½	1	1½	2	2½
Low all day	0	½	1	1½	2

Score:

### **Part 5 – Footways**

	Width <1.2	Width >1.2
No footway provision	4	4
Footway one side	3	2
Footway both sides	1	0

Score:

### **Part 6 - Cycling Activity**

Level of Cycling Activity	Vehicles per day				
	<2500	2501 - 4000	4001 - 6000	6001 - 8500	>8500
High All Day	2	2½	3	3½	4
High in peaks, moderate at other times	1½	2	2½	3	3½
Moderate all day	1	1½	2	2½	3
Moderate in peaks, low at other times	½	1	1½	2	2½
Low all day	0	½	1	1½	2

Score:

## **Part 7 – Equestrian Activity**

Level of Equestrian Activity	Vehicles per day				
	<2500	2501 - 4000	4001 - 6000	6001 - 8500	>8500
High All Day	2	2½	3	3½	4
High in peaks, moderate at other times	1½	2	2½	3	3½
Moderate all day	1	1½	2	2½	3
Moderate in peaks, low at other times	½	1	1½	2	2½
Low all day	0	½	1	1½	2

Visible presence of stables in assessment length add 2

Score:

## **Part 8 – Public Access**

Proximity of Assessment Length to Public Access Route (metres)	National / Strategic Route NCN, South Downs Way, Weald Way or similar	Locally Promoted Route	Un - Promoted Local Route
On Route	4	3	2
<250	3	2	1
251 - 500	2	1	1/2
501 - 1,000	1	0	0

Score:

## **Part 9 - Schools**

Proximity of Assessment Length to Schools (metres)	Points
On Route	4
<250	3
251 - 500	2
501 - 1,000	1

Score:

## **Part 10 – Severance**

600m band each side of the centre line over the assessed length

% of built development split by assessed length

Points

50% - 50%	4
40% - 60%	3
30% - 70%	2
20% - 80%	1
10% - 90%	½
0% - 100%	0

Score:

## Summary

Total Score:  
Part

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
9	10						
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>						

Total Score =

+

Comments