

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 9 May 2018

ATTENDANCE

MEMBERS OF THE PANEL

P Bibby (Vice-Chairman), S B A F H Giles-Medhurst, S K Jarvis, J R Jones, 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

F Button

Upon consideration of the agenda for the Highways Cabinet Panel meeting on 9 May 2018 as circulated, copy annexed, conclusions were reached and are recorded below:

CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

- i. Illegal vehicle crossovers would be discussed at MAG on 21 May 2018 and a report on this circulated within the week to inform the debate;
- ii. An Information Note on test case illegal vehicle crossovers would be circulated within the week;
- iii. A report on illegal vehicle crossovers etc. would come to panel later in the year.

PART I ('OPEN') BUSINESS

1. MINUTES	ACTIONS
1.1 The Minutes of the Cabinet Panel meeting held on 7 March 2018 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman	
2. PUBLIC PETITIONS	
2.1 There were no public petitions	
3. HIGHWAY LOCALITY BUDGET DELIVERY 2017/18	

[Officer Contact: Richard Jones, Group Manager Mid Herts
(Tel: 01992 658374)]

- 3.1 The panel received a report in response to the following motion raised at full County Council on 27 March:
“This Council requests the Highways Cabinet Panel to review the delivery of 2017/18 Highway Locality Budget projects compared with their planned dates.”
- 3.2 Members noted the 2017/18 Highways Locality Budget (HLB) budget allocation of £7,249,669 to 1,189 highways schemes; the intention to complete the schemes within the financial year and for Members to receive progress updates via the monthly bulletins; breakdown by type and degree of funding involved; the four main delivery routes; a review and data based analysis of the status of the HLB and third-party funded programme of schemes as at 31 March 2018.
- 3.3 Officers emphasised that as Permanent Traffic Regulation Orders (PTROs) came into the Whole Client Service throughout the year they had to be reactively resourced. Consequently, for those that came in after 30 June there was often insufficient time remaining to both complete the statutory processes with due diligence and implement the scheme within the last quarter of the financial year, when resources were stretched and adverse weather likely. To improve this situation officers recommended that for TRO schemes requested after 30 June, planning and budgeting for development should occur within the financial year and, if necessary, implementation should occur within the first quarter of the second financial year. To aid Member understanding and expectations an additional recommendation was requested for provision of decision points for PTRO delivery timescales.
- 3.4 Following discussion of the delays often associated with ‘complex’ works, officers clarified that the introduction of formal monthly meetings between the relevant Assistant Highway Managers (AHMs) (who managed the designs) and the Ringway Nominated Designers (several of whom could be involved on one scheme due to various specialist work elements) would enable Members to approach their AHM for accurate information on design status.
- 3.5 Members heard that the limited notice of progress on HLB schemes they received via the monthly HLB bulletins from AHMs, stemmed from the fact that best value for money was obtained by allowing Ringway to insert these jobs into its schedule when most economic for it, however this allowed only limited forewarning. The panel highlighted in particular that for the larger schemes the

R Jones

**CHAIRMAN’S
INITIALS**

.....

Contractor must know at least in which quarter the work was being carried out. The Chairman, supported by appropriate officers, agreed to arrange to meet with Ringway to feedback the Panel's concerns and identify what improvements in the programme information being provided were possible. Following on from discussion the panel requested an additional recommendation that work be undertaken on achieving better Member visibility of Ringway HLB.

R Sangster
R Jones

- 3.6 During discussion of Speed Indicator Devices (SIDs) Members:
- Heard that as the SIDs purchased on their behalf used a simple Doppler system and were triggered 3 times by any approaching vehicle, and receding and turning vehicles in certain locations, the data was unsuitable for analysis and enforcement purposes;
 - Heard that speed and volume survey data was valid for 5 years; where such surveys had been undertaken by County Council staff or the constabulary, and where relevant to the proposed SID location, Members could use them to test the SID speed criteria
 - Heard that access to SID data was restricted to authorised trained personnel to avoid unintentional change to SID parameters and functionality, exposing the County Council to liability for potential accidents;
 - Heard that a structured process was being developed for SIDs; at present speed and volume surveys were undertaken for a week and the results were typically available within 4-5 weeks;
 - Observed that as the 200,000 passes recordable on SIDs was rapidly achieved on busy roads they would need resetting regularly for downloaded data to remain current.

- 3.7 Consequent to this, officers agreed to investigate accessing the data, the value of the data, how it could be used and the cost of recovering all the data from the totality of SIDs in Hertfordshire.

R Smith

Conclusions:

- 3.8 The panel:
- 1 Noted the contents of this report and that £6,548,935 (90% by value) of all projects, funded using both HLB and third-party funding, were completed by the end of the 2017/18 financial year.
 - 2 Noted the success derived from the existing HLB decision making milestones and endorsed their continued use; namely that Capital funding was determined prior to the start of the financial year, and that in-year all but £3,000

**CHAIRMAN'S
INITIALS**

.....

Revenue funding was ordered with suppliers by the end of September (including deciding all Permanent Traffic Regulation Orders (PTROs) for full delivery by 30 June) and the entire budget by mid-December.

- 3 Endorsed the principle that the existing HLB decision making milestones were the 'latest' dates and earlier decisions were preferable to provide the best opportunity to direct available resources to complete the HLB programme within year.
- 4 Noted that utilising the LRMT Framework delivery route offered the most effective route for delivering highway structural maintenance and consequently then also enabled full attention to be given in-year towards determining the Revenue funded programme.
- 5 Endorsed the introduction of a new protocol to manage the receipt and delivery of third-party funded projects, namely;
 - Any third-party contribution to either partially or fully fund a project needed to be received in time such that the ordering process can be completed by the end of December in the financial year of delivery.
- 6 Endorsed the introduction of a new protocol to manage schemes requested after the December ordering deadline, namely;
 - All projects requested after the December ordering deadline shall be treated as exceptions, with ordering only taking place once approval has been received from both WCS Head of Profession for Member & Community Engagement and Ringway's Operations Manager.
- 7 Endorsed the conclusions reached at paragraphs 9.4 and 9.5 (of the report) relating to WCS PTRO, traffic study and design schemes and that the default for PTRO schemes requested after 30 June will be to plan and budget for development in year 1 and implementation (if required) in year 2.
- 8 Noted that the installation of Speed Indicator Devices (SIDs) will be procured differently in 2018/19 and endorsed that a new 'compliance to programme' KPI be applied to this programme if it is comparable in terms of scale and scope to that of 2017/18.

- 9 Requested better Member visibility of Ringway HLB scheme delivery dates.
- 10 Requested a chronological time scale based on decision points for Member expectation of TRO delivery.

4. HIGHWAYS TOGETHER

Report of the Chief Executive

[Officer Contact: Richard Jones, Group Manager Mid Herts
(Tel: 01992 658374)]

- 4.1 The panel received a report in response to the following motion raised at full County Council on 27 March:
“Council believes that closer working with Town, Parish and Community Councils has the potential to improve standards of highway maintenance in parished areas at little or no cost to the County Council but notes that the current Highways Together programme has had a relatively limited take up.

It believes that the scheme should be enhanced along the lines of the those successfully introduced elsewhere which allow Parish, Town and Community Councils to perform a much wider range of highway maintenance tasks after receiving appropriate training. Such an enhanced scheme should then be actively promoted to all Parish, Town and Community Councils.”
- 4.2 A wide ranging discussion included brokering discussions with the P&TCs on how to make the scheme work, proactive relaunching of HT rather than waiting for the P&TCs to come forward, greater publicity for the scheme, establishing / encouraging existing volunteer groups to undertake this work in geographical areas lacking a P&TC and the possibility of making the scheme more embracing (e.g. to include insurance) to make it more attractive.
- 4.3 Officers clarified that the County Council could not devolve responsibility for removing A Boards to a third party, the HT scheme required 5 days’ notice of works to be given as Highways had a duty to coordinate road works and judicial guidance had been sought in regard of salting. Further to this, since the launch of the HT scheme some of the local issues and priorities P&TCs wished to address were now addressed through the HLB scheme or the service improvement initiatives.
- 4.4 Despite criticism of the County Council’s documentary process, as many of the panel felt that it would be advantageous to bring additional P&TCs into the HT process, the chairman proposed

**CHAIRMAN’S
INITIALS**

.....

that he, supported by appropriate officers, meet with HAPTC to see what improvements could be made to the current HT scheme to enable P&TCs to more productively engage in the process.

Conclusions:

4.5 The Panel:

- 1 Noted the contents of the report and the range of highway activities already 'enabled' under the existing HT scheme.
- 2 Noted that no further resource was devoted to generally developing the current HT scheme, but instead P&TCs were invited to make contact should they wish to take on more functions than currently enabled under the scheme, so individual formal agreements can be considered.
- 3 Agreed that the Chairman, along with officers meet with the HAPTC to see what improvements could be made to the current HT scheme to enable P&TCs to more productively engage in the process and report back to the panel later in the year.

R Jones

5. HS2 UPDATE INFORMATION REPORT

[Officer Contact: Rupert Thacker, Group Manager South West Herts (Tel: 01992658176)]

5.1 The Panel received a report to update it on the HS2 railway scheme, including a brief summary of potential impact on national and local services that were subject to ongoing discussion with the rail industry. The key points of the panel paper in respect of scheme development, local construction, accommodation work and funding, and the implications for south west Hertfordshire's highway network were presented.

5.2 Members' attention was drawn to the comprehensive presentation Align would be making to the Environment, Planning and Transport Cabinet Panel on 11 May 2018, viewable at: [Environment, Planning & Transport Cabinet Panel - 11 May 2018 - Align Presentation](#)

5.3 The Panel noted that three joint ventures had been appointed as main Works Civils Contractors route wide and that affected Local Authorities had begun to see construction plans with enabling works prior to main works being carried out in Hertfordshire e.g. on Chalfont Lane, Hornhill Road and the A412 Denham Way. The Local Member highlighted that he had monthly briefings on the project's progress, the implications of HS2's work and proposals

**CHAIRMAN'S
INITIALS**

.....

as they arose, and would exert his influence where possible on behalf of residents. When necessary the Local Member had brought concerns to the Local MP for communication to higher levels of government.

5.4 It was clarified that Three Rivers District Council officers were updated by County Council officers where relevant; it was then the responsibility of the District Council officers to brief the relevant District Council Members for the affected areas. In view of the infancy of the two schemes proposed for funding via the HS2 Road Safety Fund, County Council Officers agreed to provide a briefing note on the potential projects to Three Rivers District Council officers for communication to the relevant District Council Members. Similarly the HS2 representative for Community Engagement would be requested to update the relevant District Council Members directly.

R Thacker

J Foster

Conclusions:

5.5 The Panel noted the contents of the report.

OTHER PART I BUSINESS

There was no other business.

**KATHRYN PETTITT
CHIEF LEGAL OFFICER**

CHAIRMAN _____

**CHAIRMAN'S
INITIALS**

.....