

Committee Name and Date of Committee Meeting

Cabinet – 23 December 2019

Report Title

Neighbourhood Road Safety Schemes

Is this a Key Decision and has it been included on the Forward Plan?

No

Strategic Director Approving Submission of the Report

Paul Woodcock, Strategic Director of Regeneration and Environment

Report Author(s)

Andrew Lee, Senior Engineer
01709 254489 or andrew.lee@rotherham.gov.uk

Ian Shelton, Road Safety Engineer
01709 254404 or ian.shelton@rotherham.gov.uk

Ward(s) Affected

Borough-Wide

Report Summary

This report provides an update on the progress made on schemes to be funded from the Community Safety Concerns Fund, during the financial year 2019/20 and the process for the remainder of the three year programme.

Recommendations

1. That Cabinet accept the schemes identified in Figure 1 into the programme for delivery in 2019/20;
2. That Cabinet approve the continued development of the schemes identified in Figure 2 as part of the indicative future programme, and;
3. That Cabinet approve a second round of ward consultation during 2020 to identify new schemes to complete the programme, as detailed in Option 1.

List of Appendices Included

- Appendix 1 Community Concerns Fund Pro-forma
- Appendix 2 Community Concern Sites - Scored
- Appendix 3 Scheme Assessment – Guidance Notes
- Appendix 4 Impact Assessment Screening Form

Background Papers

None

Consideration by any other Council Committee, Scrutiny or Advisory Panel

None

Council Approval Required

No

Exempt from the Press and Public

No

Neighbourhood Road Safety Schemes

1. Background

- 1.1 Council capital funding has been made available to provide small scale engineering interventions in areas highlighted by the public as being areas of road safety concern. It was agreed by Council in February 2019 that this will be used to support the delivery of locally defined safety schemes with a budget of £150,000 per year for three years. There will be an opportunity to review this at the end of the funding period.
- 1.2 Following Cabinet approval of the Transportation Capital Investment Programme 2019/20 on the 8 July 2019 (Minute no. 32 refers), a Members Information day was held at the Town Hall on the 16th July 2019 to introduce the Community Safety Concern Fund.
- 1.3 Members were informed that the funding represented an opportunity for road safety concerns in their area to be raised for consideration of suitable interventions. A period of consultation then commenced on 8th July 2019 during which time Elected Members could submit up to three schemes and rank them as Ward priorities. This consultation closed on the 30 August 2019. An example of the pro-forma template used to submit schemes can be found in Appendix 1.

2. Key Issues

- 2.1 From this consultation a total of 42 potential schemes were identified by the Wards. The suggested schemes and associated scored analysis are outlined in Appendix 2.
- 2.2 Wards were also asked to prioritise their local safety related issues in the following categories: speeding, crossing roads, parked cars/visibility & local environment. Speeding was selected as the most significant issue by ten respondents, crossing roads by four and parked vehicles and visibility by two. Some Wards selected more than one topic as their most significant safety issue.
- 2.3 An initial assessment has demonstrated that 15 of the 42 potential schemes meet the criteria and require little preparatory or legal work and, therefore, subject to confirming programming delivery schedules, should be able to commence before the end of March 2020. These 15 schemes are listed below in Figure 1.

Figure 1: 15 Schemes Proposed for Early Delivery by March 2020

Location	Scheme Proposed	Ward
Dinnington Road/Worksop Road/Gildingwells Road & Sheffield Road, Woodsetts	Vehicle Activated speed signs	Anston & Woodsetts
Lordens Hill, Dinnington	Vehicle Activated speed signs	Dinnington
New Road, Firbeck	Vehicle Activated speed signs	Dinnington
Laughton Road, Dinnington	Supplementary Bollards	Dinnington
Masefield Road & Stokewell Road	School 20mph Zone	Hooper
Main Street, Wentworth	30mph Roundels ¹	Hooper
Rotherham Road, Brampton Bierlow	30mph Roundels ¹	Hooper
Blyth Road near junction with Woodlea Lane	Warning Signs	Maltby
Broom Road, Sitwell School	School 20mph Zone	Sitwell
Various Roads, Swinton Ward	Portable Vehicle Activated Sign	Swinton
Wentworth Road	Red Surfacing	Swinton
Milton St near Highfield Court	Red Surfacing	Swinton
Various Roads, Wath Ward	Vehicle Activated speed signs	Wath
Fleming Way, Wickersley	Road markings and tactile paving	Wickersley
Bassingthorpe & Ginhouse Lane	Warning Signs	Wingfield

¹Note: 30mph roundel suggestion not legally possible these will be amended to 30mph Vehicle Activated Sign schemes.

- 2.4 A further 16 out of the 42 potential schemes, shown in Figure 2, require further checks and investigation before they can be developed for implementation and, subject to these assessments, may form part of an indicative programme for 2020/21.

Figure 2: 16 Potential Schemes for the indicative programme 2020/21

Location	Scheme Proposed	Ward
Worksop Road (Between Grange Avenue & Warren Place)	Priority Give Way System	Anston & Woodsetts
Wellgate	Bollards around car park entrance	Boston Castle
Flash Lane, Bramley	Controlled Pedestrian Crossing	Hellaby
Alpina Way	Double Yellow Lines	Holderness
Millard Lane junction with Muglet Lane	Waiting Restrictions	Maltby
Monkwood Road near Monkwood School	Pedestrian Refuge Island	Rawmarsh
Blyth Avenue junction with Dale Road	Junction Widening	Rawmarsh
Bradgate	20mph Zone	Rotherham West
Spinneyfields	Waiting Restrictions	Sitwell
Doncaster Road & Middle Lane South	Pedestrian Crossings x 2	Valley

Station Road, Wales at the shops	Lowered Kerb crossing	Wales
Colliery Road, Kiveton Park	Traffic Calming	Wales
Listerdale & Black Carr Road, Wickersley	20mph Zone & Prohibited turn	Wickersley
St Johns Avenue	Tactile surface & Road Markings	Wickersley
Coach Road, Greasborough	Zebra Improvements	Wingfield
Main Street, Greasborough	Zebra Improvements	Wingfield

- 2.5 This leaves 11 out of the 42 potential schemes which are not feasible and cannot be progressed in their current form.
- 2.6 However, it is proposed to undertake a second round of Ward consultation, providing an opportunity for these 11 ideas to be revised and reconsidered, alongside new Ward suggestions for potential schemes.
- 2.7 These new and revised ideas would supplement those already on the proposed indicative programme for 2020/21, and it is anticipated that this process would provide sufficient schemes for development and delivery in 2021/22, completing the remainder of the three year programme.
- 2.8 This process would follow that undertaken earlier this year, and would be submitted and reviewed using similar methods to those outlined in Appendices 1, 2 and 3.

3. Options considered and recommended proposal

- 3.1 **Option 1** is to accept the 15 schemes identified in Figure 1 into the programme for delivery in 2019/20; to establish an indicative programme for 2020/21 including those schemes identified in Figure 2; and to undertake a second round of Ward consultation to provide a full indicative programme for delivery in 2020/21 and 2021/22.
- 3.2 **Option 2** is to hold back delivery until a second round of Ward consultation is undertaken, and all schemes have been fully assessed, to provide a full programme for delivery in 2020/21 and 2021/22.
- 3.3 **Recommended Proposal** is Option 1, which enables the early delivery of feasible schemes and still allows a second round of consultation and scheme assessment to provide a comprehensive programme for delivery.

4. Consultation on proposals

- 4.1 As specific schemes move towards the delivery phase then formal consultation will be undertaken where required with key stakeholders, such as Ward Members and members of the public through the usual Council and statutory consultation processes.

5. Timetable and Accountability for Implementing this Decision

- 5.1 Subject to Cabinet approval work will start to deliver the schemes highlighted in Figure 1 immediately subject to programme delivery.

6. Financial and Procurement Advice and Implications

- 6.1 Council agreed in February 2019 to support the delivery of locally defined safety schemes with a capital budget allocation of £450,000, providing £150,000 in each of the three years.
- 6.2 Assessment and analysis of the schemes including viability tests will result in a final programme of schemes set out in the Strategic Outline Case up to the value of the capital allocation.

7. Legal Advice and Implications

- 7.1 Adequate consultation with all stakeholders should be ensured.
- 7.2 Projects within the programme have legal requirements for which the assistance of Legal Services may be required, for example the acquisition of land in third party ownership, and the development of Traffic Regulation Order.

8. Human Resources Advice and Implications

- 8.1 The schemes identified in Appendix 2 will be delivered through existing staff resources within the Transportation and Highways Design Service within Planning, Regeneration and Transportation. Specialist consultants will be used where required.

9. Implications for Children and Young People and Vulnerable Adults

- 9.1 Some of the schemes are designed to specifically benefit young pedestrians such as 20mph speed limits outside schools.

10. Equalities and Human Rights Advice and Implications

- 10.1 Several of these schemes assist the visually impaired and those with mobility issues in crossing the road and accessing public transport by the proposed addition of Tactile paving, pedestrian refuges and the introduction of lower speed limits.

11. Implications for Ward Priorities

- 11.1 The proposals have been developed through engagement with Ward Members and seeking to address local Ward Priorities. As stated in section 1.3 Elected Members were asked for proposals in order to develop schemes for assessment.

12. Implications for Partners

12.1 None

13. Risks and Mitigation

13.1 The projects identified in Appendix 2 are at varying stages of development. Through the feasibility and design process, elements of the design can change or projects can become out of scope and undeliverable from a cost and engineering perspective. However, these risks will be managed through good project and programme management processes to continually monitor design and delivery to ensure available funding is not exceeded.

14. Accountable Officers

Andrew Lee, Senior Engineer, Transportation Infrastructure Service

Bronwen Knight, Head of Planning and Transport

Approvals obtained on behalf of Statutory Officers:-

	Named Officer	Date
Chief Executive	Sharon Kemp	12/12/19
Strategic Director of Finance & Customer Services (S.151 Officer)	Judith Badger	04/12/19
Head of Legal Services (Monitoring Officer)	Bal Nahal	03/12/19

Report Author: *Andrew Lee, Senior Engineer*
 01709 254489 or andrew.lee@rotherham.gov.uk

Ian Shelton, Road Safety Engineer
01709 254404 or ian.shelton@rotherham.gov.uk

This report is published on the Council's [website](#).

APPENDIX 1

Community Safety Concerns Fund Pro-forma

Ward Name: _____

Submitted by: _____

Through the Cabinet Member for Waste, Roads and Community Safety, Council Capital funding has been made available to provide small scale engineering interventions in areas highlighted as having an area of road safety concern. This proforma allows each Ward to submit and prioritise 3 schemes to be assessed as well as an opportunity to rank the importance of road safety issues within the Ward.

Ward Priorities

Please rank the following from 1 to 4 (1 being the most significant and 4 least significant)

Topic	Ranking
Speeding	
Parked cars/visibility	
Crossing Roads	
Local environment	

Scheme Ideas

Scheme name	
Location	
Issues to be addressed	
Recommended suggestion	

Your ward priority (1 to 3)	
Scheme name	
Location	
Issues to be addressed	
Recommended suggestion	
Your ward priority (1 to 3)	

Scheme name	
Location	
Issues to be addressed	
Recommended suggestion	
Your ward priority (1 to 3)	

Please complete and send back to transportation@rotherham.gov.uk or Transportation Infrastructure Service, Riverside House, Main Street, Rotherham, S60 1AE

Any queries regarding the completion of this form or the content, please contact Andy Lee, Senior Road Safety Engineer, andrew.lee@rotherham.gov.uk

To be submitted by 30th August 2019

APPENDIX 2

Assessment Matrix Summary - Community Concerns Fund 2019 - 2020 - NO WEIGHTING																																
Weighting >		Total Score			1, Environment			2, Regeneration			3, Travel Mode			4, Social Disadvantage			5, Safety			6, Maintaining Infrastructure			7, Public Interest		8, Cost							
Scheme	Ward	Sub Total	Rank	A - Impact on air quality / noise / vibration	B - Impact on traffic volume	C - Impact on residential environment	Sub Total	A - Site accessibility & job creation	B - Access to local facilities	Sub Total	A - Conditions for walking or cycling	B - Walking or cycling to schools	C - Conditions for public transport	Sub Total	A - Physically disadvantaged	B - Personal safety & security	C - Access to public transport	Sub Total	A - Reduction in number of accidents	B - Number of accidents involving children	C - Impact on perceived accident risk	D - Impact on vehicle speeds	E - Safety for pedestrians and cyclists	Sub Total	A - Improves condition of infrastructure	B - Specific linkage to OBC	C - Linkage to other project	Sub Total	A - Level of public interest	Sub Total	A - Total cost of the scheme	Sub Total
Dinnington Road/Worksop Road/Gildingwells Road & Sheffield Road, Woodsetts	VAS speed signs Anston & Woodsetts	9.00	10	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	1	1	0	2.00	0	0	0	0.00	1	0	1	1	0	3.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	4	4.00
Worksop Road (Between Grange Avenue & Warren Place)	Priority Give Way System Anston & Woodsetts	6.00	27	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	1	1	0	2.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	4	4.00
Broom Valley Road	Road Humps & mobile speed limit signs Boston Castle	9.00	10	0	1	0	1.00	0	0	0.00	1	1	0	2.00	0	0	0	0.00	1	0	2	1	1	5.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	1.00
Welham Drive	Waiting Restrictions Boston Castle	4.00	38	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	-1	0	-1.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	5.00
Wellgate	Bollards around car park Boston Castle	7.00	18	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	1	0	1	2.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	5.00
Lordens Hill, Dinnington	VAS speed signs Dinnington	10.00	4	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	1	1	0	2.00	0	0	0	0.00	1	0	1	1	0	3.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	5.00
New Road, Firbeck	VAS speed signs Dinnington	9.00	10	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	1	1	0	2.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	1	1	0	2.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	5.00

Laughton Road, Dinnington	Supplementary Bollards	Dinnington	8.00	14	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	1	0	0	1.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	1	0	1	2.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	5.00
Flash Lane, Bramley	Controlled Ped Crossing	Hellaby	12.00	1	0	0	0	0.00	0	1	1.00	1	1	0	2.00	1	0	1	2.00	1	0	1	0	2	4.00	0	0	0	0.00	1	1.00	2	2.00
Aughton Road	Lay-by & Waiting Restrict	Holderness	5.00	32	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	1	0	0	1.00	0	0	0	0.00	1	1.00	3	3.00
Alpina Way	DYs	Holderness	7.00	18	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	1	0	0	1.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	1	0	0	1.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	5.00
Swallow nest Crossroads	Traffic Signal Improvem	Holderness	5.00	32	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	1	0	0	1.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	4	4.00
Masefield Road & Stokew ell Road	School 20mph Zone	Hoover	10.00	4	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	1	1	0	2.00	0	0	0	0.00	1	0	1	1	0	3.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	5.00
Main Street, Wentworth & Rotherham Road, Brampton Bierlow	30mph Roundels	Hoover	9.00	10	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	1	1	0	2.00	0	0	0	0.00	2	2.00	5	5.00
Millard Lane jw Muglet Lane	Waiting Restrictions	Maltby	6.00	27	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	1	0	0	1.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	5.00

Blyth Road nr jw Woodlea Lane	Warning Signs	Maltby	7.00	18	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	1	0	0	1.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	1	0	0	1.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	5.00
Monkw ood Road nr Monkw ood Schc	Ped Refuge Island	Raw marsh	7.00	18	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	1	0	1.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	1	0	1	2.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	4	4.00
Broad Street, Raw marsh	Controlled Ped Crossing	Raw marsh	10.00	4	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	1	1	0	2.00	1	0	1	2.00	1	0	1	0	2	4.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	2.00
Blyth Avenue jw Dale Road	Junction Widening	Raw marsh	3.00	39	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	1	0	0	1.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	2.00
Bradgate	20mph Zone	Rotherham West	7.00	16	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	1	0	0	1.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	1	1	0	2.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	4	4.00
Kilnhurst Road o/s Sandhill School	Traffic Calming	Silverw ood	7.00	16	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	1	1	0	2.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	1	1	2	4.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	1.00
Kilnhurst Road near chip shop	Traffic Calming	Silverw ood	7.00	16	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	1	1	0	2.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	1	1	2	4.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	1.00
Broom Road, Sitw ell School	School 20mph Zone	Sitw ell	8.00	12	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	1	0	1.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	1	1	0	2.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	5.00
Spinneyfields	Waiting Restrictions	Sitw ell	5.00	30	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	5.00

Worrygoose Island/Broom Lane	Pedestrian Refuge	Sitwell	8.00	12	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	1	1	0	2.00	1	0	0	1.00	0	0	1	0	0	1.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	4	4.00
Various Roads, Swinton Ward	Portable VAS	Swinton	8.00	12	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	1	0	1	1	0	3.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	5.00	
Wentworth Road & Milton St nr Highf	Red Surfacing	Swinton	5.00	30	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	1	0	0	1.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	4	4.00	
Doncaster Road & Middle Lane South	Pedestrian Crossings x	Valley	10.00	4	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	2	0	2	4.00	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	2.00	
Kiveton Lane, Hard Lane & Station R	Traffic Signals	Wales	11.00	2	1	0	0	1.00	0	2	2.00	0	0	0	0.00	2	0	2	4.00	0	0	1	0	2	3.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	1.00	
Station Road, Wales at the shops	Lowered Kerb crossing	Wales	7.00	16	0	0	0	0.00	0	1	1.00	0	0	0	0.00	1	1	0	2.00	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	4	4.00	
Colliery Road, Kiveton Park	Traffic Calming	Wales	6.00	25	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	1	0	0	1.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	2	1	1	4.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	1.00	
Todwick School, DYL extension	Waiting Restrictions	Wales	6.00	25	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	1	0	0	1.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	5.00	
Various Roads, Wath Ward	VAS speed signs	Wath	7.00	16	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	1	1	0	2.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	5.00	
Fleming Way, Wickersley	Road markings and tacti	Wickersley	11.00	2	0	0	0	0.00	0	1	1.00	0	1	0	1.00	2	0	0	2.00	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	5.00	
Listerdale & Black Carr Road, Wicker	20mph Zone & Prohibite	Wickersley	6.00	25	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	1	0	1	1	0	3.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	3.00	

St Johns Avenue	Tactile surface & Road f	Wickersley	5.00	30	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	1	0	0	1.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	4	4.00
Bassingthorpe & Ginhouse Lane	Warning Signs	Wingfield	5.00	30	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	1	0	0	1.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	4	4.00
Coach Road, Greasborough	Zebra Improvements	Wingfield	10.00	4	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	1	0	1	1	1	4.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	5.00
Main Street, Greasborough	Zebra Improvements	Wingfield	10.00	4	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	1	0	1	1	1	4.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	5.00

High score >	100%	12.00	
Percentile >	85%	10.00	< Schemes meeting or exceeding the percentile are highlighted
Average score >	50%	7.49	< Schemes with a below average score are not highlighted

APPENDIX 3 – Scheme Assessment Guidance Notes

General

This is a working document and will be subject to further modification, please ensure that the most recent version of this document is used. The advice and comments made in each sub section relate to that sub section only and scores should only be applied on that basis, for example -

- Sub section 4C relates to improving access to public transport, this is under the "Socially Disadvantaged" heading and as such may differ from the score for sub section 3C which refers to conditions for all users and not just socially disadvantaged users.

1, Environmental

A1, Air Quality - Features in the road that will slow traffic have been considered generally to increase vehicle emissions. For example:-

- Features that substantially remove traffic from the treated route and displace traffic to alternative "approved" routes (+2)
- Other features that reduce traffic queues (+1)
- Features on residential streets with alternative "approved" routes may be scored as (neutral)
- Features on residential streets leading into a housing estate only (-1)
- Features on residential streets with access for HGV's to development sites or on a moderately serviced bus route - 3 plus services hour (-2)

A2, Noise - Similar to above - Buildout calming features generally considered to give a negative score, with vertical features attracting a more negative score.

A3, Vibration - Similar to above - also consider displaced HGV's

B, Traffic Volume - It's generally accepted that traffic calming such as humps, cushions and similar features reduce traffic volume on that road or street by 20% or more

- Where traffic is significantly (>25%) displaced to a strategic route a score of (+2) may be appropriate
- Where traffic is displaced significantly (>25%) to other "approved" routes consideration of a (+1) score may be appropriate
- In a cul-de-sac environment, or road with no alternative route, it has been assumed that traffic volumes will remain stable and hence a neutral score
- Slight (>10%) displacement to "non-approved" routes such as calming through streets with parallel alternatives (-1)
- Where substantially (>75%) all traffic displaced to "non-approved" routes (-2)
- Point closures may have this effect

C, Residential Environment - Use of plants and other landscaping... Will residents find the immediate area more attractive to use.

- Will tidy a large area where many people will benefit such as a shopping precinct or a school entrance (+2)
- Will tidy a smaller area where a lesser number of people would benefit, such as along a minor residential street (+1)
- Where no landscaping works are proposed (Neutral)
- Where a scheme excludes minor opportunities to improve the local environment, such as on a residential street or not reinstating a damaged grass verge or not providing planting where the opportunity exists in a proposal (-1)
- Where a scheme will exclude obvious opportunities to improve a large area which is used by many people (-2)

2, Regeneration

A, Will the proposed scheme have any effect on existing or potential business sites as identified in the RMBC - UDP - For example:-

- An improved junction might make a particular site more attractive for development, it might ease access to and from the site - A (+2) score might include traffic signals or a roundabout. Whereas improved visibility or an improved crossing point from a bus stop to a potential site might give a (+1) score.
- Humps might attract a (-1) score
- Point closures might attract a (-2) score

B, Introduction of improved crossing facilities and routes to the facilities, consideration of the knock on effect of limited waiting near facilities, to discourage all day parking by shop owners etc.

- Improving conditions for access to a collection of facilities or a medium sized development site creating work for 20 or more people might attract a score of (+2)
- Improving conditions for access to a single facility or a "use unknown" development site might attract a score of (+1)
- Neutral
- Removing access for a single facility or "use unknown" development site might attract a score of (-1)
- Removing access to a collection of facilities or a medium sized development site (-2)

3, Travel Mode

A, Conditions for walking or cycling

- Traffic calming to an area or the creation of a new footway or cycleway that would benefit a large number of users, such as a new route to a shopping area / school or a link between a bus interchange and large development site or housing area, benefiting many locals and visitors to the area >20 peak peds hr a score of (+2) may be appropriate
- Similar to above, but benefiting only a limited number of locals <20 peak peds hr (+1)
- Neutral
- Removal of or increasing the journey length by 50m for pedestrians or 150m for cyclists on a low use route <20 peak peds hr (-1)
- Removal of or increasing the journey length by 50m for pedestrians or 150m for cyclists on a route used frequently >20 peak peds hr (-2)

B, Walking or cycling to schools

- Linkage with proposals from a Safe Routes to Schools project or in response to a related request from a parent or school (+2)
- Any other scheme which could provide a safer route to a school, but has not been part of any consultation process with the above (+1)
- Schemes remote from any school journey are score as neutral
- Schemes on school safe routes that increase the number of road crossings along a route, reduce the width of footway (including verge) to below 1.8m, or increase walking distance by 50m or cycling distance by 150m (-1)
- Schemes on school safe routes that remove existing facilities without providing an alternative (-2)

C, Conditions for public transport - Delays and access to facilities

- Schemes linked directly with a QBC or improving links to existing interchange or terminus or known busy stop (+2) - Although it is recognised that although a signal controlled crossing will introduce some PSV delay, the benefits to the pedestrians will partially outweigh the dis-benefits to total journey time and hence could still score (+2) on a regularly use crossing. However a less well used crossing might attract a lower score of (+1) due to the impact on journey time reliability.
- Schemes improving provision to other public transport routes and stops not covered above (+1)
- Schemes other than listed below, that would directly worsen conditions for public transport are scored at (-1)
- Schemes on a QBC or near an existing interchange or terminus or known busy stop, that would directly worsen conditions for public transport are scored at (-2)

4, Social Disadvantage

A, Physically disadvantaged

- Introduces new drop crossings and tactile paving at sites of high use, such as near shopping areas or bus interchanges (+2)
- Improves existing crossings at lower use sites such as residential streets or isolated bus stops (+1)
- Neutral
- Removes low use (<20 peak peds hr) facilities or changes existing network to a degree that might confuse disabled people - for example changing a one way street to two way and vice versa or raising an existing low kerb to full height kerb (-1)
- Removes higher use (>20 peds hr) facilities (-2)

B, Personal safety and security

- Provides improved personal safety and security at high use facilities such as bus stops, safe routes to schools and shopping areas (+2)
- As above but on low use facilities such as residential streets not on route to any specific facility mentioned above (+1)
- Neutral
- Reduces personal safety and security on low use facilities such as residential streets not on safe routes to schools or routes not leading to bus stops and shopping areas(-1)
- As above but at high use facilities such as bus stops, safe routes to schools and shopping areas (-2)

C, Access to public transport

- Provides facilities specifically improving access to facilities and services, such as pedestrian crossings / improved footways near bus stops or raised level bus stops (+2)
- Provides improved facilities on routes to bus stops such as pedestrian crossings remote to a bus stop but en-route or (+1)
- Neutral
- Reduces access on routes to bus stops and interchanges (-1)
- Reduces access at facilities, such as the removal of an existing pedestrian facility that currently serves a bus stop (-2)

5, Safety

Quantification of a reduction has been calculated based on a subjective appraisal of how a proposed scheme might reduce accidents. This appraisal is to be based primarily upon the accident and speed reductions outlined in the "RMBC Road Safety Strategy" (Appendix 2) and where appropriate reference to the "DTLR Road Safety Good Practice Guide" or current ROSPA guidelines.

Note - National targets are - 40% reduction in KSI accidents, 10% reduction in slight accidents and 50% reduction in child KSI

A, Reduction in total number of accidents

- Meets or exceeds National targets (+2)
- Average of the **three** National Target areas (KSI, Child KSI and Slight) is equal to or exceeds 20% (+2)
- Falls below either of the above but shows an accident saving (+1)
- Where no accidents exist a neutral score has been given.
- Where an increase in slight (ex child) accidents are expected (-1)
- Where an increase in Child (KSI and slight) or KSI accidents is expected (-2)

B, Reduction in total number of accidents involving children

- Meets or exceeds National targets (+2)
- Average of the **two** target areas (Child KSI and Child Slight) is equal to or exceeds 20% (+2)
- Falls below the above but shows an child accident saving (+1)
- Where no child accidents exist a neutral score has been given.
- Where Child KSI and Child Slight are not reduced and amount to between 10% and 25% of accidents at a site (-1)
- Where Child KSI and Child Slight are not reduced and amount to more than 25% of accidents at a site (-2)

C, Reduction in perceived accident risk

- The general public perceives road humps, point closures, wider footways, speed enforcement cameras and improved crossing facilities as a good safety feature, a score here of (+2) may be appropriate
- Features such as mini-roundabouts, junction improvements, improved road markings, improved signs and red light enforcement cameras may have a lesser perception, a score of (+1) may be appropriate
- Schemes that remove existing facilities without providing an alternative (-1)

D, Reduction in vehicle speeds

- Meets or is below the speed standards outlined in RMBC Speed Management Strategy (+2) - **Note - would require speed measurement**
- Expected speed reduction will be typically 5mph or greater - (+2)
- Expected speed reduction will be typically below 5mph - (+1)
- Where no speed reduction is expected a neutral score is given
- Where speeds are expected to increase to the detriment on road users, an increase of up to 5mph will score (-1) and an increase of above 5mph will score (-2)

E, Safety for Pedestrians and Cyclists

- Schemes that provide off highway routes, including highway crossing points on that route (+2)
- Controlled crossing points or traffic calming (+2)
- Schemes providing a degree of segregation from vehicular traffic (+1)

- Schemes that increase the number of crossings along a route, reduce the width of footway (including verge) to below 1.8m, or increase walking distance by 50m or cycling distance by 150m (-1)
- Schemes that remove existing facilities without providing an alternative (-2)

6, Maintaining Infrastructure

A, Improves condition of Infrastructure

- Scheme replaces 25% or more of existing road pavement to sub-base level or replaces 50% or more of existing road surfacing or removes 10% or more of heavy traffic >7.5t without displacing to other "similar" roads (+2)
- Scheme removes 50% or more of light traffic <7.5t without displacing to other "similar" roads (+1)
- Scheme increases light traffic (within the scheme) without maintenance to existing pavement <7.5t (-1)
- Scheme increases heavy traffic (within the scheme) without maintenance to existing pavement >7.5t (-2)

B, Specific linkage to QBC

- Where major maintenance has been included, such as pavement renewal or multiple inspection chamber replacement (+2)
- Where minor maintenance has been included, such as road marking renewal or a single inspection chamber replacement (+1)
- Where no maintenance in the short term is expected a neutral score is given
- Where minor maintenance has been excluded (-1)
- Where major maintenance has been excluded (-2)

C, Linkage to other projects and initiatives - Regeneration schemes, Groundwork Dearne Valley, Objective 1, Safe Routes to Schools, etc.

- Linkage to multiple other initiatives, giving benefits to all vulnerable users in an area, such as an area calming scheme or pedestrian access improvements to local facilities (+2)
- Linkage to another initiative, giving benefits to some users, such as an individual crossing scheme (+1)
- A potential conflict with other known initiatives (-1)
- A direct and clear conflict with another known initiatives (-2)