

**REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENT  
ENVIRONMENTAL AND PUBLIC PROTECTION COMMITTEE  
16<sup>th</sup> JANUARY 2017  
HIGHWAY INFRASTRUCTURE & ROAD SAFETY IMPROVEMENT  
PROGRAMME  
PROPOSED CRITERIA FOR ASSESSMENT OF REQUESTS**

<b>Head of Service &amp; Designation.</b> <b>S G Pilliner</b> <b>Head of Transportation and Highways</b>	<b>Directorate</b>  <b>Environment</b>	<b>Telephone No.</b>  <b>01267 228150</b>
<b>Author &amp; Designation</b> <b>B Jenkins</b> <b>Strategy and Implementation Manager</b>	<b>Directorate</b>  <b>Environment</b>	<b>Telephone No</b>  <b>01267 228153</b>

## 1. Introduction and Background.

The County Council employs a number of measures to improve road safety and to prevent road traffic casualties in accordance with its statutory responsibilities. Such measures include a mix of initiatives under three broad headings:

- Education (training and publicity campaigns)
- Engineering (traffic management and a number of road safety improvements)
- Enforcement. (parking plus speed)

The overall strategies are outlined in the Road Safety Plan, as well as the Joint Transport Plan for south west Wales.

In terms of engineering, road safety improvements include local footway widening, highway improvements and other associated minor works. Such schemes are funded via the authority's capital programme. The demand for such schemes always outstrips the amount of resources available; as at 1<sup>st</sup> December 2016, there are 355 separate requests for improvement schemes. To date, schemes have been developed, approved and delivered through an assessment process formerly approved by Executive Board in 2011.

Amendments to the existing appraisal process have been considered, to ensure the assessment criteria is more relevant to the current environment. It is proposed to amend the assessment criteria to facilitate greater integration between the authority's strategic investment and highway maintenance. This will help secure maximum value from the level of funds available. Additional factors will therefore include:

- A revision to top slice ten percent of the annual budget to facilitate low cost high value interventions to address road safety issues at high risk sites and to reduce the pressure on revenue. Such measures will include for example: signage, road marking, fencing and minor surfacing.
- Greater weighting to personal injury and severity of accidents and adjustments to the weighting for the level of deliverability and improvement.
- Stage two assessment reduced from fifty sites to twenty sites, as the current level of funding limits the number of schemes that can be delivered in any year.
- The potential of the scheme to address an existing maintenance priority to enable integration between the authority's transport strategic investment and highway maintenance.

The report sets out the criteria to be adopted to determine a maximum number of twenty schemes that will progress to delivery stage within the programme.

## **2.0 The Revised Assessment Criteria and Process**

A three stage assessment process for determining the priority of all requests for Highway Infrastructure and Road Safety Improvements is proposed.

### **Stage 1 – All Requests**

Only those requests with Recorded Personal Injury Accidents will be considered for inclusion in Stage 2 of the Assessment process (see below).

10% of any Capital Programme allocation will be utilised for low cost, high value measures to address road safety issues at high risk sites or to reduce revenue costs from school transport costs. Measures could include road markings, improved signage, safety fencing, surfacing and the like or short sections of linking footway to create 'safe' walking routes.

## Stage 2a – All Requests with associated Recorded Personal Injury Accidents

The following criteria will be used to assess all requests that pass to Stage 2a with scores being allocated for each of the following-

**Accident Assessments** – this will comprise three elements.

Recorded personal injury accidents

Recorded personal injury accidents for pedestrians and / or cyclists

Accident locations in close proximity to other recorded accidents along route

Number of vehicles involved

The scoring matrix proposed is set out in the tables below

Priority Score	Severity of Accident
10	Slight
30	Serious
50	Fatal

Priority Score	Severity of Pedestrian Accident
20	Slight
50	Serious
100	Fatal

Requests with only a single associated Recorded Personal Injury Accident will not proceed to the next stage of the assessment process (Stage 2b) which will combine two elements.

## Stage 2b – All Requests with Serious or Fatal Recorded Personal Injury Accidents or multiple Slight Recorded Personal Injury Accidents

Accident location close to other accident sites along route (within distance of 1 kilometre).

Priority Score	Accident Location close to other Accident Sites along Route
5	Less than 1 kilometre

**Traffic Volumes and Pedestrian Flows** – this will comprise two elements.

Volume of vehicular traffic

Number of pedestrians and / or cyclists

Priority Score	Volume of Traffic (24 Hr Average)
2	Very Low (< 1000 vehicles per day)
4	Low (1000 - 2499 vehicles per day)
6	Medium (2500 – 4999 vehicles per day)
8	High (5000 – 9999 vehicles per day)
10	Very High (< 10000 vehicles per day)

Priority Score	Number of Pedestrians and / or Cyclists
4	Very Low (< 25 per 10 hour day)
8	Low (25 – 49 per 10 hour day)
12	Medium (50 – 99 per 10 hour day)
16	High (100 – 199 per 10 hour day)
20	Very High (< 200 per 10 hour day)

A Total Score will be determined for each of the requests which will determine an initial ranking of priority for further assessment (Stage 3). Further criteria will be used to assess the **Top 20** requests based on the initial assessment.

### Stage 3 – Top 20 Requests

An initial appraisal of potential options for improvement will be based on a site visit. These options could include improvements to road markings and signing, introduction or reduction of speed limits, traffic calming or other traffic management works, footway improvements, visibility improvements or major highway improvement or realignment.

The following further criteria will be used to assess the **Top 20** requests with scores being allocated for each of the following-

**Level of Improvement** – This assesses the degree of likely reduction in accidents resulting from the scheme being implemented and is linked to studies undertaken by ROSPA, Department for Transport and the Transport Research Laboratory.

Priority Score	Level of Achievement
1	Very Low (Minimal improvement)
5	Low (Marginal improvement)
10	Medium (Improvement)
25	High (Major improvement)

**Deliverability** – This assesses the timescale to implement the scheme should funding be available.

<b>Priority Score</b>	<b>Deliverability</b>
1	Over 5 Years
2	Between 2 and 5 Years
10	Between 1 and 2 Years
20	Less than 1 Year

**Value For Money** – This assesses the initial estimated capital cost of the scheme.

<b>Priority Score</b>	<b>Deliverability</b>
0	> £250,000
1	Between £100,000 and £249,999
5	Between £50,000 and £99,999
10	Between £25,000 and £49,999
25	Between £10,000 and £24,999
50	Less than £10,000

**Potential for Additional Funding** – This assesses whether any Council capital funding allocated to a scheme could be eligible to lever additional monies from other funding sources such as Local Transport Fund / Road Safety Capital funding (revenue or capital) or developer contributions such as Section 106 contributions (linked to planning applications) by being used as match funding.

Priority Score	Potential for Additional Funding
0	No additional funding
5	Potential Additional Funding
10	Confirmed Additional Funding

**Potential for Future Revenue Savings** – This assesses whether a scheme would generate future revenue savings (e.g. reduced School Transport costs).

Priority Score	Potential for Future Revenue Savings
0	Increased Revenue Costs
5	Neutral Impact on Revenue Costs
10	Decreased Revenue Costs

**Potential for Addressing Maintenance Priority** – This assesses whether a scheme would address a current maintenance priority.

Priority Score	Potential for Addressing Maintenance Priority
0	No maintenance priorities
5	Potential maintenance priorities
10	Confirmed maintenance priorities

The overall Total Scores for both Stages will be ranked to determine the priority of each request and the rolling 3 Year Highway Infrastructure and Road Safety Improvement Programme.

New requests will be assessed on a yearly basis with the overall list of requests being reviewed every 2 years. Committed schemes within a Programme will not be included in any review.

A typical example of the prioritisation model is included in Appendix One of this report.

### **3.0 Recommendations.**

The report is for the Committee's information and comment.