

Minutes



To: All Members of the Highways Cabinet Panel, Chief Executive, Chief Officers, All officers named for 'actions'

From: Legal, Democratic & Statutory Services
Ask for: Theresa Baker
Ext: 26545

HIGHWAYS CABINET PANEL 31 January 2018

ATTENDANCE

MEMBERS OF THE PANEL

P Bibby (Vice-Chairman), S B A F H Giles-Medhurst, S K Jarvis, J R Jones, J G L King, M B J Mills-Bishop, M D M Muir, R G Parker, R Sangster (Chairman), R H Smith, J A West, C B Woodward

OTHER MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE

A Stevenson, D Andrews

Upon consideration of the agenda for the Highways Cabinet Panel meeting on 31 January 2018 as circulated, copy annexed, conclusions were reached and are recorded below:

All Members who have a disclosable pecuniary interest arising from an allowance from the County Council, another local authority in Hertfordshire, or a body to whom they have been appointed by the County Council, have received a dispensation to allow them to participate in debate and vote on the Integrated Plan.

All Members have been granted a dispensation to participate in debate and vote in any business of the County Council relating to setting the council tax or precept when they would otherwise be prevented from doing so in consequence of having a beneficial interest in land which is within the administrative area of Hertfordshire or a licence (alone or jointly) to occupy such land.

Note: A conflict of interest was declared by a member of the Cabinet Panel in relation to the matters on which conclusions were reached at this meeting and are recorded at item 3.

CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

After consultation the panel agreed that item 4 would be taken before item 3 to accommodate officers' diary commitments.

PART I ('OPEN') BUSINESS

1. MINUTES

ACTIONS

- 1.1 The Minutes Part I & Part II of the Cabinet Panel meeting held on 16 November 2017 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman, subject to assurance that, in relation to 5.5 & 5.6 of the PART 1 minutes, members would be notified of the publication of the Integrated Works Programme (IWP) Forward Programme.

2. PUBLIC PETITIONS

The following petition was presented to the Cabinet Panel:

2A PETITION IN RELATION TO WARE ROAD TRAFFIC AND PARKING STUDY

[Officer Contact: Trevor Brennan, Strategy & Programme Manager, East Herts & Broxbourne (Tel: 01992 658406)]

- 2.1 Karen Johns presented the petition below:

"We the residents of Ware Road, Hertford and all roads in the surrounding area, request that East Herts District Local Planning Authority impose an immediate suspension on all planning decisions that involve parking provision, and call on Hertfordshire County Council Highways to complete their comprehensive traffic and parking study as soon as possible - to look in detail at the serious problems we are experiencing in relation to road safety, resulting from congestion, problem parking and speeding vehicles"

The petition attracted 349 signatories verified as living or working in Hertfordshire.

The petitioner addressed the Panel on the subject of the petition, the text of which can be viewed at the link below:

[Highways Cabinet Panel- 31 January 2018 - Ware Road Traffic & Parking Study – Petitioner's Speech](#) .

The Chairman received the petition.

- 2.2 Members considered a report in relation to a petition received by East Herts District Council (EHDC) which requested suspension of planning decisions on development applications involving residential parking provision for Ware Road, Hertford in July 2017, until Hertfordshire County Council had completed a comprehensive traffic and parking study to investigate congestion,

**CHAIRMAN'S
INITIALS**

.....

speeding and problem parking in the area.

- 2.3 Members noted the background to the study. There were no trends arising from the Personal Injury Collision data, whilst measurement of the mean speed on Ware Road and Stanstead Road revealed that there was no current requirement to change the speed limit or provide further traffic calming measures, the Local Member was however funding the installation of two Speed Indicator Devices from his Highways Locality Budget (HLB). The parking occupancy video survey had revealed that the majority of inconsiderate parking was attributable to residents in the area overnight and not to commuter or school traffic in the mornings.
- 2.4 On the basis of data analysis eight potential options were outlined to deal with the measured parking situation, the officer recommendation being option two 'Junction Protection 'i.e. double yellow lines at junctions and turning heads to improve driver visibility coming out of the junctions. This would have limited impact on on-street parking but would require public compliance and likely parking enforcement by the District Council.
- 2.5 The local member for Hertford All Saints thanked officers for producing the study and supported option two. He observed that the issue had arisen because the consequences on the highway of developing 150 homes at Liberty Rise and had not been considered; further to this congestion would increase with two further potential developments in the area.
- 2.6 Members variously :
- Suggested that funding for speeding issues could be sought from the Police and Crime Commissioner's Drive Safe Scheme to supplement the yellow lines;
 - Observed that the Highways Development Team should be proactive in securing funding for highways safety measures from developers of major sites;
 - Noted that in terms of responsibility the district councils were both the initiators and enforcers of parking schemes whilst the County Council was responsible for safety measures;
 - Observed that the District and Borough Councils should have greater concern for parking issues arising from developments and seek to recoup the associated costs from the developers.
- 2.7 Prior to reaching a conclusion the panel's attention was drawn to the standard recommendations to petitions which can be viewed at: [Highways Cabinet Panel- 31 January 2018 – Item 2A – Standard Recommendations for Petitions](#)

Conclusions:

**CHAIRMAN'S
INITIALS**

.....

2.8 The Panel unanimously endorsed Option 2 (Junction protection measures) as set out in the Ware Road – Feasibility Study Stage 1 (December 2017).

3. NEW RIVER BRIDGE (ESSEX ROAD, HODDESDON)

[Officer Contact: David Burt, Project Sponsor, Major Projects Group, (Tel: 01992 X658177)]

M B J Mills-Bishop declared a declarable interest in relation to item 3 of the agenda in view of the discussions between the County Council and Broxbourne Borough Council, as he is both the Leader of and a cabinet member of Broxbourne Borough Council. He left the room and did not participate in the discussion or vote.

3.1 The panel received a report which sought Members’ support for the proposal to seek Cabinet authorisation to proceed with all necessary statutory processes, including applying for Planning Permission, Side Road Orders and Compulsory Purchase Orders to enable delivery of the new river Bridge project at Essex Road, Hoddesdon. To incorporate such scheme alterations resulting from the pre-planning consultation process as deemed necessary.

3.2 Members heard that the Essex Road, including the bridge over the New River, was the main route providing access to the principal road network from the Hoddesdon Business Park, the latter having a Gross Value Added economic value of £0.8-£1.5m per day to Hertfordshire.

3.3 The physical issues of the bridge and consequences which would result from its closure, due to HGV breakdown on or collision with the bridge, were highlighted along with the development of the proposed scheme.

3.4 The panel heard that the Offline Option, i.e. a new access road over Woolens Brook and the New River to the south of the existing Essex Road was the preferred choice and, amongst other benefits, would be less disruptive to the users of Essex Road. They were also made aware of the recent pre planning consultation and proposed amendments to the scheme.

3.5 A successful funding bid had been made to the Hertfordshire LEP who had allocated £6.4m funding for the delivery of this scheme within their 2016-2021 Growth Deal to support their Strategic Economic Plan. This funding was supported by National Productivity Investment Funding (NPIF) and existing S106 funding

**CHAIRMAN’S
INITIALS**

.....

in the scheme locality.

3.6 There were no questions from the members of the panel.

Conclusions:

3.7 The Panel unanimously recommend to Cabinet that, at its meeting on 19 February, Cabinet authorise:-

- (i) the Chief Executive and Director of Environment, in consultation with the Executive Member for Highways, to proceed with all necessary statutory processes and to take all necessary steps, including the seeking of planning permission and Side Roads Orders to enable the delivery of the New River Bridge (Essex Road, Hoddesdon); and
- (ii) the Director of Resources , in consultation with the Executive Member for Resources, Property & the Economy, to acquire the land interests necessary for delivery of the New River Bridge (Essex Road, Hoddesdon) and to make compulsory purchase orders should they be necessary.

M Mills-Bishop returned to the room.

4. HIGHWAYS PERFORMANCE MONITOR

[Officer Contact: Steve Johnson, Head of Highways Contracts and Network Management (Tel: 01992 658126)]

4.1 The Panel received a report to enable review of the Highways service performance for the second quarter of the year (July-September 2017).

4.2 Members heard that this was the first presentation of the complete new style performance report to the panel. It now comprised 59 individual measures (contractual and non-contractual) grouped under 10 themes to demonstrate performance across the entire service, as opposed to measuring only contractor performance against performance indicators.

4.3 The panel welcomed the new style of report. The chairman observed that it focussed on areas of concern and gave greater transparency and detail; new measures could be added and those no longer appropriate removed as required.

4.4 Officers acknowledged the retroactive nature of the current process for dealing with dropped kerbs installed without approval of the Highway Authority. After being made aware of the issue,

**CHAIRMAN'S
INITIALS**

.....

the majority of offending residents applied for a dropped kerb. To assist in developing a proactive approach to this issue evidence was now being gathered on member and public reports of illegal dropped kerbs, actions taken and the outcomes achieved.

- 4.5 A member observed that some District Councils had offered free hard standings and dropped kerbs to council / housing association tenants and that expansion of such schemes could reduce construction of illegal dropped kerbs at such properties. Members who were both County and District Councillors were asked to find out which councils offered such schemes. Members
- 4.6 The panel heard that a number of test prosecution cases for illegal dropped kerb installation were being worked on with the legal team to identify those most likely to result in a successful prosecution. Officers agreed to bring a progress report on the issue to the next panel. S Johnson
- 4.7 Members observed potential ambiguity in the graph title 'VXO applications processed in 6 Weeks' (i.e. officer processing the initial application to determine if a resident could have a dropped kerb, as opposed to the actual construction of the dropped kerb which was on graph 7 in Appendix 2); low performance in both processing of applications and actual construction led to public discontent in those who paid in advance for their dropped kerb. Officers reported that a recent change in subcontractor should improve overall delivery reliability.
- 4.8 Officers agreed in future to include the relevant numbers under the percentages in the Quarter 3 report (e.g. Appendix 6-Locality: 1. 'Response to member enquiries (within 5 working days)). S Johnson
- 4.9 Members heard that both County Council and Borough councillors were included in the 'Member attendance at Highways Liaison Meetings' figures. The attendance figures for Q2 were based on only one meeting and this measure would in future cover all such meetings. A member suggested identification of those Boroughs with the weakest attendance.
- 4.10 To concerns around the discrepancy between public / member perception of the number of blocked gullies and the 99.58% achieved in the 'Gully cleaning programme conformance' measure, officer clarified that this related to whether Ringway had tried to attend to clean a particular gully as planned. This did not mean it had been cleaned since the gully may have been blocked or access prevented by parked cars. Measures were under development for how many gullies were cleaned, how many blocked and how many programmed for dig out and, when

**CHAIRMAN'S
INITIALS**

.....

available, would be included in future reports.

- | | | |
|------|--|-----------|
| 4.11 | Officers clarified that the number of gullies audited was dependent on the number reported as having been cleaned and officers agreed to check that the 10% audit sample was being achieved. | S Johnson |
| 4.12 | Members highlighted the seasonal nature of some performance data and the benefit of viewing long term trends. To enable inclusion of such data in the report officers requested that members establish what trends they were interested in. | Members |
| 4.13 | In line with this, officers agreed to provide the total figures for the previous 3 years for 'rejected insurance claims' in the next performance report. | S Johnson |
| 4.14 | Officers agreed to provide data on the response time to defective street lights on unclassified roads including how far outside the agreed response time the defect was. Members heard that reporting of these defects was via the fault reporting system with a target of 98% of these street lighting outages to be rectified within 20 working days. The contractor was being incentivised to deal with the remaining 2% within 40 working days but this could be hampered by 3 rd party faults e.g. UKPN power supply problems. | S Johnson |
| 4.15 | In relation to 'Stage 1 & 2 complaint investigations completed to agreed timescales (%)' officers commented that such complaints had to be dealt with within 10 working days, that the numbers of them had been reducing and agreed to provide the figures for the last 3 years. | S Johnson |
| 4.16 | Members heard that the Gazetteer detailed what roads the County maintained and that 'Gazetteer status' measured how up to date it was against the national standard, gold being the highest level. Members observed that it was no longer visible on the Members Information System (MIS). | S Johnson |
| 4.17 | Officers clarified that the reduction in the 'Network Management' performance measure, had resulted from a disproportionately large number of incidents in East Hertfordshire and Broxbourne where there was limited ITS apparatus (variable message signs, CCTV) to proactively manage these incidents. Redeployment of underutilised assets from other areas of the county to east and north Hertfordshire was being considered as a remedy. | |
| 4.18 | Members suggested a debate on investment in technology to remedy the general down turn in Network Management performance and limited ITS infrastructure across the county. | |

**CHAIRMAN'S
INITIALS**

.....

- 4.19 In terms of corporate risk to Highways, officers confirmed that if and when the Croxley Rail Link scheme was finally withdrawn a report on the financial, procedural and infrastructural impact on the County Council would be brought to the appropriate panels. Rob Smith
- 4.20 During discussion of obstruction to the highway by overhanging third party vegetation, officers clarified that data on letters delivered to offending property owners and follow up actions was being gathered and a measure to monitor this issue could be introduced. S Johnson
- 4.21 During discussion of Network Management and ‘Days occupation on the Highways’ officers observed that during the winter period there was typically an increase in emergency works by utility companies to repair damaged and leaking gas and water pipes, over which Highways had no control. In emergency situations the utilities attended as required, but only had to notify the County Council within two hours of starting works on site during normal business hours. Highways coordinated permits for planned works to help manage traffic flows, but one of the current challenges was extended works durations and sites with traffic management in place but no works happening. This was as a consequence of how repairs were now being carried out i.e. one team installing traffic management, a second team digging up the road and a third carrying out a repair.
- 4.22 With the agreement of the panel the chairman confirmed that a members working group would take place in the following months on future data and technology and how this could be used to deliver Network Management and then report back to the panel. R Sangster
S Johnson

Conclusions:

- 4.23 The Cabinet Panel noted the report and commented on the performance monitor for the Highways service for Q2 2017-18.

5. INTEGRATED PLAN 2018/19 - 2021/22

[Officer Contact Mike Collier, Assistant Director (Environment)
(Tel: 01992 555792)]

- 5.1 The Cabinet Panel received a report on the draft Integrated Plan (IP) in relation to the Highways Service, for comment and identification of any issues members felt that Cabinet should consider in finalising the Integrated Plan proposals.
- 5.2 Agenda Item 4(i) of the Cabinet Integrated Plan 2016/17 – 2019/20 was presented to Cabinet on 22 January 2018 and set

**CHAIRMAN’S
INITIALS**

.....

out the actions the County Council had taken to engage and consult primarily with the public, in particular raising awareness of the financial pressures faced by the County Council. The results of the consultations were summarised within the related report and appendices.

- 5.3 Members' attention was drawn to an error in Agenda Item 4(ii) of the Cabinet Integrated Plan 2018/19 – 2021/2022 where a reduction in Driver Training income (of £250k pa) had incorrectly been included in the Environment, Planning and Transport portfolio pages (p115, 116 and p122) instead of the Highways portfolio movement. Members were asked to include this item in their consideration of the IP proposals; amended versions of the incorrect pages, i.e. 129,130,138 and 139, for the Highways portfolio were tabled and can be viewed at [Highways Cabinet Panel - 31 January 2018 – Item 5: Appendix B-pages 129 -130 and Appendix C-pages 138-139](#).

The following issues were discussed in relation to the report to Cabinet of 22 January 2018, agenda item 4(ii): Integrated Plan 2018/19 -2021/22:

- 5.4 Re page 14 of 17, members highlighted the potentially misleading title of an item in Table v in relation to the Highways Locality Budget (HLB). It was agreed that the description would be adjusted.
- 5.5 Officers clarified that the £500,000 'Income' figure referred to in 'Analysis of Revenue Budget by Objective Areas', page 140; related to income from third parties as a result of accidents causing damage to the highway.
- 5.6 Re page 141, Members welcomed the New Capital Bid of £5m in 2018-19 and £8m in each of the following four years for carriage maintenance. It was clarified that in Hertfordshire's working model the percentage of A, B & C roads requiring improvement was 3-6%, and that the extra funding would be used to reduce, potentially by half, the 15-16% of unclassified roads currently requiring improvement. If approved, the funding would not be equally spread between divisions but would focus on those unclassified roads most in need of improvement as identified by technical analysis of the road system.
- 5.7 The new funding stream would be delivered by the Integrated Works Programme (IWP) and a separate schedule issued to identify which unclassified roads would be involved, enabling members to ensure their HLB commitments did not duplicate work covered by the programme. To aid with this Assistant Highway

R Smith

Assistant

**CHAIRMAN'S
INITIALS**

.....

Managers would check which roads were on the additional IWP and discuss with the Local Member.

Highways
Managers

- 5.8 In relation to Revised Capital Bids – Annual Programmes (page 142) it was clarified that ‘traffic signals replacement’ also covered pedestrian crossings. Further to this, as there was already a programme of traffic signal refurbishment the additional funding would be directed to junctions.
- 5.9 Officers clarified that the revenue element of HLB not specifically mentioned in the ‘Analysis of Budget by Objective Areas’ on page 140 was included in the Traffic Management & Safety line.
- 5.10 In relation to Key Budget movements ‘Reduced Street Lighting Scouting Frequency’ (page 139), officers clarified that conversion of street lights to LED and in particular the introduction of a Central Management System (CMS) meant that scouting was unnecessary after conversion. However funds remained for this purpose and some scouting would continue for bollards and signage. It was highlighted that some street lights remained out after scouting due to UK Power Networks (UKPN) issues and were out of the control of the Council. Officers clarified that approximately £100,000 per year was spent on scouting of illuminated assets.
- 5.11 During discussion of the impact of the growth agenda on the highways, officers highlighted that the agenda to encourage modal shift already existed and, although the Local Transport Plan (LTP4) gave it greater emphasis, the approach to growth was changing and could result in greater pressure on the highways. The impact would be discussed with members as it was modelled.
- 5.12 During debate on the need to improve the Council’s funding response to medium sized development applications, members who served as both county council and district/borough councillors were encouraged to become involved with the campaign of the Executive Member for Environment, Planning and Transport (EPT) to ensure that the uplift in land values generated suitable levels of funding for Councils, as the consequence of development had impacts beyond the sites being developed. Emphasis was placed on highlighting to the District and Borough Councils that they were recovering insufficient funds to meet the costs of delivering the required infrastructure.
- 5.13 Furthermore, to enable the Council to bid for infrastructure funding via government funding streams for infrastructure issued at random and at short notice, the Executive Members for EPT and

**CHAIRMAN’S
INITIALS**

.....

Highways had required the preparation of impact assessments for varying sizes of development. This would also provide the District and Borough Councils with the information on how much they needed to raise from planning consents to support infrastructure.

- 5.14 Emphasis was placed on ensuring that the Council's Development and Management Team put the right information on planning applications and that the District and Borough Councils incorporated this in the planning conditions or as an informative.
- 5.15 In relation to the projected reduction of £250,000 in Driver Training income in 2018/19 officers clarified that the surplus income from Speed Awareness Courses for drivers in lieu of points and fines was applied to road safety. Data suggested that the decrease in the number of individuals attending the course and concomitant decrease in this income stream would continue into the next year. Some counties were observing a similar decline in the throughput whilst others were not and the police were assisting in understanding the reasons behind this.
- 5.16 Members heard that recent press reports on the number of unfilled potholes in Hertfordshire were likely not informed by the same database as the County Council's and as a result at variance. Strategic proactivity on potholes centred on the Asset Management approach to maintain the roads in best condition and stop them from deteriorating within the funding available and, as part of this, the proposed additional funding for unclassified roads would significantly reduce the number of potholes. The performance indicator of 'Carriageway Defects Reported by the Public and Attended Within the Prescribed Response Time', showed a 100% achieved rate in September 2017 which, alongside the Council's high repudiation rate for insurance claims relating to highway defects, further substantiated the service's high levels of performance in dealing with potholes within the intervention criteria. It was clarified that highway faults below the intervention criteria were not classified as potholes. Further to this, members' intervention in bringing the increased size of potholes previously categorised as below intervention level to the Highways Service's attention was constructive in getting them filled. On the need to ensure the quality of pothole repairs, comment was passed that in some cases, those now being undertaken appeared to last longer than the surrounding road.
- 5.17 During discussion of the need to widen the A1M between Welwyn and Stevenage to deal with the fact that it did not function appropriately between junctions 6 and 8 for large parts of the working day, officers highlighted that it was not appropriate for the County Council to fund works on another agencies' networks.

**CHAIRMAN'S
INITIALS**

.....

However, Hertfordshire had lobbied Highways England (HE), via the Managed Motorways Scheme, to widen this stretch of road and had been advised that work would start in the 2019/20 calendar year.

- 5.18 Following concerns around the need for additional funding from HE for improvements to affected junctions to assist local traffic flows, members heard that the Strategy Document under development included A1M junctions 3 and 4. It would also establish the ability of the Highways Service to develop schemes to take advantage of any government funding and Local Enterprise Partnership monies that became available. To member observations that in the past feeder junctions had been funded by HE, officers commented that HE had recently taken a more enlightened approach to highway improvements and were taking complimentary measures to support associated junctions.

Conclusions:

- 5.19 1.The panel commented as above to Cabinet on the proposals in the Integrated Plan in respect of Highways;
2. The panel identified issues as above that it felt Cabinet should consider in finalising the Integrated Plan proposals.

6. OTHER PART I BUSINESS

- 6.1 There was no other business.

**KATHRYN PETTITT
CHIEF LEGAL OFFICER**

CHAIRMAN _____

**CHAIRMAN'S
INITIALS**

.....