

Committee	EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE		Item No.
Report Title	AN INTEGRATED APPROACH TO TRAFFIC CALMING, ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENTS AND SAFER ROUTES TO SCHOOLS IN LEWISHAM		
Wards			
Contributors	Bill Tarplett		
Class	PART 1	Date	25 July 2001

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1. To inform Members of further work carried out on a strategy for future area traffic calming work throughout the Borough and to seek approval of a priority list of areas to be investigated.

2. Policy Context

- 2.1. The Council's current UDP policies for transport include an undertaking in GEN.TRN 3 to:

Sustain a road system and to manage by restraint, road traffic and parked vehicles so as to: -

- Facilitate the movement of essential traffic only
- Improve the quality of the environment
- Improve access to premises
- Reduce the number and severity of road accidents and improve the safety of all road users.

- 2.2 National targets have been set by the Government to reduce road casualties. These targets are to be achieved by 2010 compared with the average for 1994 to 1998. The interpretations of these targets for Lewisham's **borough** roads are included in the table below:

Casualty Category	Reduction (% on Base)	Base (Average 1994/98)	Target (by 2010)	Reduction
Numbers of people killed or seriously injured	40%	111	67	44
Numbers of children killed or seriously injured	50%	29	15	14
Numbers of people slightly injured (per 100 million vehicle kilometres)	10%	740	666	74

- 2.3 Specific London-wide targets have been set by Transport for London. These have been converted to targets for Lewisham's **borough** roads in the following table:

Casualty Category	Reduction (% on Base)	Base (Average 1994/98)	Target (by 2010)	Reduction
Pedestrians killed or seriously injured	40%	47	28	19
Cyclists killed or seriously injured	40%	8	5	3
Motorcyclists killed or seriously injured	40%	13	8	5

3. Recommendations

- 3.1. To approve the prioritised list of areas to be treated as laid out in Appendix B.
- 3.2. To approve the underlying methodology of area studies including its use to co-ordinate the street scene within residential areas.

4. Background

- 4.1. A report on the various traffic work presently being undertaken was presented to the Executive Committee on 24 January 2001. This report explained the proposed approach to deal with requests for action associated with traffic management, traffic calming and accidents. Principally this set up the Area Traffic Calming and Safer Routes to Schools Programme (Area Studies), the Accident Investigation and Prevention Programme (AIP) and a priority list for Traffic Management and Pedestrian Facilities. A further report to the Executive Committee on 21 March 2001 discussed the Area Studies programme in more detail and sought to explain the proposed prioritised data led approach to address traffic problems in residential areas by traffic calming measures.
- 4.2. Requests for traffic calming and Safer Routes to Schools have continually increased over the last 10 years placing greater pressure on the limited staff and financial resources. The requests are generally for measures to be introduced in residential areas or close to schools or other community facilities. On the positive side a significant amount of work has already been done in terms of traffic calming in the Borough; a list of schemes already introduced is attached as **Appendix A**. There is a need for a priority list in this area of work due to the existing high demand for measures and the limited staff and financial resources available to match the demand. To operate efficiently and effectively, it is vital that priorities are determined in order to ensure that the Council's resources are used to best effect at all times.
- 4.3. At its meeting on 21 March 2001 the Executive Committee agreed that
- Officers should formulate an interdisciplinary team in order to divide the borough into areas for traffic calming and to prioritise these against the criteria approved by Committee.
 - The proposed areas and their rankings should be presented to Members for approval.
 - £200,000 of the Traffic Management budget be allocated for Traffic Calming

5. Identification of areas and priority ranking criteria

- 5.1. In order to formulate the Priority List, an initial meeting was held with a multi-disciplinary team for the first time on 25 April 2001. Representatives from Planning, London Buses, TfL Bus Priority Unit, Metropolitan Police, Pedestrian Association and various sections of the Regeneration Directorate attended the meeting. This approach was the same as that proposed in the report to the Executive Committee on 21 March 2001. At the initial meeting it was felt that an 'area' based approach for the design and implementation of traffic calming in residential areas would be the most appropriate. It was agreed that the areas should consist of discrete areas bounded by either 'principal' roads which are considered acceptable for carrying through traffic, or other features such as railways and rivers which would not easily allow traffic to transfer into an adjoining area once treatment of a particular area began. It was felt that such an approach would; ease local pressure from individual roads, make it easier to deal with such requests, and less likely to result in merely transferring a problem from one road to another as measures were implemented. In total 28 different areas were identified.
- 5.2. Using the team's experience and local knowledge combined with existing data, the effects of traffic and environmental impact on each of the areas were assessed with respect to:
- (a) Accidents; total number and broken down by type;
 - (b) 'Rat-running' - volume and speed;
 - (c) Parking problems, e.g. insufficient kerbside space for residents due to nature of road or external intrusion such as commuter parking around a railway station;
 - (d) General impact of traffic-intrusion, vibration, above average HGV numbers particularly with respect to the nature of the road e.g. narrow roads with properties close to the carriageway;
 - (e) Number and location of community attractions - e.g. schools, shopping parades, elderly peoples centres, sports and social clubs; and
- 5.3. As proposed in the Executive Committee report on 21 March 2001 the above items, (b) to (e), were assessed by each individual member of the team for each area and points awarded according to the level of severity of the problem. The items (b) to (e) were marked between 0 (no problem) and 5 (severe problem). At the initial meeting accident data was not available as the areas had not been defined. However, it was agreed that accidents were the single most important traffic related problem and that they should be given a heavier weighting (0 to 10). It was also felt that Child Pedestrian accidents and accidents involving vulnerable road users (pedestrians and cyclists) should be given a higher weighting than other accidents. These accidents were given a double weighting. Furthermore, it was considered that the accident data would provide the most objective of all the assessments and that accidents are often symptomatic of other problems. In addition, a particularly high accident level in an area would also allow the possibility of a successful bid within the Interim Local Implementation Plan thus providing additional finance for the project.

- 5.4. The points awarded by each member of the team for each area were then averaged and then totalled to place the areas in priority order according to the overall rating of each area.
- 5.5. After this accident data was obtained for each of the 28 identified areas. The length of roads in each area was also taken into account when assessing the accident problems, as areas with greater road lengths were likely to have more accidents than areas with less length of roads. A copy of the final Priority List for which Members approval is sought is attached as **Appendix B**. From Appendix B it can be seen that the top ten areas, in order of priority, are as follows:
- (a) St. John's
 - (b) Evelyn
 - (c) Marlowe
 - (d) Pepys
 - (e) Drake & Ladywell
 - (f) Blackheath
 - (g) Sydenham East
 - (h) Hither Green
 - (i) Lewisham
 - (j) St. Margaret / Blythe Hill (Joint 10th place)
- 5.6. The Pilot Study areas that have or are being treated are shown below. These areas would have ranked around the middle of the priority list.
- (a) Rushey Green West
 - (b) North Downham
 - (c) Glenbow
 - (d) Manor Lee
- 5.7. When the prioritised list for Area Traffic Calming has been approved, the rate of investigation and implementation of the zones depends on political will, money and the staff resources available. Within reason the 'cloth can be cut to fit' e.g. one area treated a year or several according to the resources available.
- 5.8. **The area studies programme will incorporate recommendations of the Lewisham Culture and Urban Development Commission Report. It is also hoped to incorporate the Home Zones and Safe Routes to Schools initiatives to encourage environmentally friendly modes of transport by making walking and cycling safer and more attractive.** By encouraging more walking and cycling, greater health benefits should also be obtained. This approach fits well with the Government's White papers "Saving Lives: Our Healthier Nation" and "A New Deal for Transport: Better for Everyone". It is also hoped, in consultation with other departments to co-ordinate the street scene as part of this programme of work thereby enhancing the environment. The process of area based traffic calming could then act as a vehicle for change within discrete residential areas by addressing a number of issues such as general maintenance (highway, footway, street lighting and signs), environmental maintenance (grass, cleansing and planted areas), urban design (a Co-ordinated Street Scene Strategy will be reported to the Executive Committee in the Autumn) accessibility to public transport and housing issues, as well as actual and perceived safety problems. This would show the Council in a good light by co-ordinating services in an area in consultation with local residents, to deliver a safer and more pleasant environment in which to live.

Such an area based approach may also offer maximum opportunities for leveraging in external funding e.g. SRB, NDC, lottery, Section 106 etc.

- 5.9. The listing of areas for study in priority order should not be viewed as completely inflexible and there should be opportunities if circumstances arise (e.g. opportunistic funding from S106, SRB,NDC etc.) for areas further down the list to be treated in advance if there was no call on the resources dedicated for the planned prioritised approach. It would be helpful, to establish a mechanism to afford an opportunity to reconsider the priority list through regular reviews. It is therefore recommended that a review of the areas and their rankings should be reported to Committee at least every two years. In ideal circumstances it is hoped to report annually, the main controlling factor being the availability of funding and progress made in tackling the priority areas in the interim.

6. Implementation of Schemes

Initial consultation

- 6.1. As proposed on the report on 21 March 2001 it is hoped to make the project as interactive with the local community as possible, such that the needs and desires of the local community can be designed into the scheme wherever possible. It may be possible to involve the local school children in the process and at the same time use the project as a means to draw attention to road safety issues, particularly as the child pedestrian and cyclist groups are two of the areas in which a much better accident reduction is required.
- 6.2. It is recommended that a staffed public exhibition is held in the areas to be treated, advertised by posters and a leaflet drop to all houses. The leaflet would outline the process that is being adopted, explain traffic calming and Safer Routes to Schools and include a pre-paid questionnaire where residents could identify particular problems. It is suggested that the exhibition is advertised as 'Preliminary Consultations' and no proposals are initially put forward. The exhibition could include accident plots and survey data collected to identify possible problems in the area. A stand could also show different types of traffic calming and Safer Routes to Schools measures that could be used and highlight their advantages and disadvantages. Visitors could speak to staff and identify problems that they knew about in their roads and area. Visitors would also be encouraged to suggest possible solutions to the problems they identified. The exhibition could also provide a focus for the public to raise other types of problems in the area as discussed previously e.g. maintenance etc. that can then be addressed via other sections/departments during the process.
- 6.3. Throughout this early process local Ward Members would be kept informed of what was going on so that if local people approached them they could explain the process and present situation. Ward Members would also be also invited to an early preview of the exhibition to allow information to be disseminated and to gain Members views. During this time consultations would also take place with other Council Departments to try and ensure the co-ordination of the street scene and environment as part of this programme of work.

Design process

- 6.4. Using the results of the first round of consultations plus feedback received from our Road Safety Officers, correspondence received from the area over the previous three or four years, internal surveys and investigations, and the designs and ideas put forward by the school children, teachers and governors, the design process would start

- 6.5. The basic concept would not only be to improve the environment by the removal or 'civilising' of traffic but also to ensure that the design of the individual elements of the overall scheme are of a high quality and generally improved the environment in themselves. To this end it is envisaged that the design team would where possible comprise of people from different disciplines.
- 6.6. The results of the initial consultation will be reported to the relevant Planning and Highways Committee along with the proposed measures that will form the basis of the second consultation.

Second consultation

- 6.7. A second consultation consisting of a leaflet with questionnaire, together with a staffed exhibition showing the proposals would then be held. Posters advertising the exhibition and consultation as "Consultation on Proposals" would be displayed throughout the area and leaflets distributed to every household, school, business etc. Draft proposals would be contained in this second consultation. Members would be kept informed of the progress throughout, by letters, briefing meetings and Committee reports.
- 6.8. The above process has already been successfully tested for the Rushey Green, North Downham, Glenbow Road and Manor Lee area traffic calming and Safer Routes to Schools schemes, this interactive approach is receiving positive comments from the community, staff and members.

Detailed design and implementation

- 6.9. The results of the second consultation and recommendations would be stated in a report submitted to the Planning and Highways Committee.
- (a) If the Committee agree or do not comment on the recommendations made the Head of Transport and Engineering will implement the recommendations using delegated powers.
- (b) If the Committee do not agree the recommendations then a report would be submitted to the Executive Committee for their decision.

Funding

- 6.10. It is estimated that the minimum required for even the most basic scheme in any area would be £200K. It is acknowledged that there is only ever likely to be a limited amount of capital funding for such work and therefore every potential avenue for funding should be explored e.g. Section 106 monies, highway maintenance, street lighting, Single Regeneration Bids, Capital Challenge etc. By the areas being ranked with a weighting towards the level of accidents within the areas it means that the first areas to be treated are also likely to be eligible for SCA as accident reduction schemes.

7. Work Programme for 2001/2002

- 7.1. At the Executive Services Committee on 24 January 2001, £200,000 was allocated to the first area to be treated. The top area in the list that Members are asked to approve is the St. John's area. The finance available will limit the amount of work that can be carried out in the area and as stated above the cloth will have to be cut to fit. As with other programmes further funding would allow further areas to be treated. Every opportunity will be taken however to work in partnership with others to either secure additional funding or work jointly to maximise the effect of the limited budget.
- 7.2. In order to assist in the 2002/03 programme it is proposed that the initial consultation for Evelyn (South) is carried out during 2001/02. This way if further monies become available it will help to ensure full implementation and spend on the schemes.
- 7.3. Members should be aware that the following will also be consulted on and implemented during 2001/02 using opportunistic funding sources:
- (a) Rushey Green stage 2 (east). This will be funded as part of the Rushey Green Renewal Area.
 - (b) Honor Oak Estate. Funded through the 15% housing capital receipts monies.
 - (c) Evelyn (North). Housing Estate Traffic Management and Access Improvements.

8. Financial Implications

- 8.1. The data led area approach is cost effective as it means that whole areas are considered and a complete set of measures applied at one time rather than over a number of studies of individual roads.

9. Public Consultation

- 9.1. As outlined in the body of the report.

10. Legal Implications

- 10.1. The Head of Legal Services advises that all traffic calming methods must be designed and implemented within statutory powers and guidance.

11. Implications for Cyclists and Pedestrians

- 11.1. Any measures introduced within this programme will generally result in a reduction in traffic speeds and make the road environment more attractive for pedestrians and cyclists. Specific measures at known high accident locations should further reduce dangers to pedestrians and cyclists.

12. Implications for People with Disabilities

- 12.1. An overall reduction in traffic speeds in the area concerned should make crossing the road less hazardous for blind and partially sighted people and for people with impaired mobility. The use of raised junctions and similar measures

for traffic calming also result in providing a near level crossing point, which should help people with impaired mobility.

13. Equality Implications

- 13.1. The data led approach will ensure that the highest priority areas will be treated first.

14. Prevention of Crime & Disorder Implications

14.1. There are no implications for the prevention of crime & disorder.

If there are any queries on this report or you require further information, please contact Bill Tarplett, Transport and Engineering, Fleet Building, Wearside Service Centre (telephone 020 8314 2570)

14.2. Background Papers

<u>Short Title of Document Information</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>File Location</u>	<u>File Ref</u>	<u>Contact Officer</u>	<u>Exempt</u>
Committee Report (Exec.)	24/1/01			Colin Chick	
Committee Report (Exec.)	21/3/01			Bill Tarplett	