

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 AND ENVIRONMENT CABINET PANEL 14 September 2018

ATTENDANCE

MEMBERS OF THE PANEL

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

OTHER MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE

H K Crofton, D Andrews

Upon consideration of the agenda for the Highways and Environment Cabinet Panel meeting on 14 September 2018 as circulated, copy annexed, conclusions were reached and are recorded below:

PART I ('OPEN') BUSINESS

- | | ACTIONS |
|--|----------------|
| 1. MINUTES | |
| 1.1 The Minutes of the Cabinet Panel meeting held on 12 July 2018 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman, subject to the date of the minutes being corrected to 12 July 2018. | T. Baker |
| 2. PUBLIC PETITIONS | |
| 2.1 There were no public petitions | |
| 3. PETITION RELATING TO TRAFFIC CONGESTION AT THE RUSH GREEN ROUNDABOUT | |

[Officer Contact:
Trevor Brennan, Strategy & Programme Manager, East Herts &

Broxbourne (Tel: 01992 658406);
Chris Allen-Smith, Group Manager, Highways Operations and
Strategy Eastern Herts (Tel: 01992 658167)]

- 3.1 The Panel received a report which provided the response and background to a petition presented to Full County Council on 17 July 2018 and which was then referred to the Highways and Environment Cabinet Panel. The petition requested that the County Council *“Work closely with Hertfordshire Police and McDonalds/BP to find and implement a safe solution to the major congestion caused by the vehicles queuing to enter the site and to alleviate the potential for a serious accident.”*
- 3.2 Most recently a meeting had taken place between representatives of the site owners (BP OIL UK LIMITED and McDonald’s RESTAURANTS LIMITED), the franchisee, Hertfordshire Constabulary, Hertfordshire County Council officers and the Local Member; four new access and egress arrangements were presented by the site owners for consideration by the Council’s Highways Development Management team and were under review for viability, funding for the works and land ownership. It was minuted that there was general agreement that all parties involved would jointly explore the most effective solution to the current situation, however there was no legally binding paperwork.
- 3.3 Officers clarified that BP had not been represented at the meeting with McDonald’s and that it had been minuted that BP would bear the costs, however there was to date nothing legally binding.
- 3.4 The early conclusions from the County Council’s review of the schemes were expected in the coming months. If the proposals were deliverable further work to fully cost the schemes would be undertaken including the funding required from the site owners; the solution(s) would be presented to a later panel.
- 3.5 Officers clarified that :
- Since the situation was a consequence of customers visiting McDonald’s the Council had no intention of funding any of the highways works, however officer time would be provided.
 - In terms of legal enforcement of the agreement, Hertfordshire Constabulary had served a ‘Community Protection Notice Warning’ (CPW) (Pursuant to s43 of the ASB Crime and Policing Act 2014) on the owners requesting that they come back within 28 days with solutions; once provided the warning had been withdrawn.
 - If further discussions were not positive the police would serve a further enforcement warning.

T Brennan
C Allen-Smith

**CHAIRMAN’S
INITIALS**

.....

Conclusions:

3.6 The Panel noted the content of the report.

4. LED STREET LIGHTING ILLUMINATION STRATEGY

[Officer Contact: Peter Simpson, Senior Asset Manager & Team Leader (Operations), (Tel: 01992 658170)]

4.1 The Panel received a report which updated them on Phase 4 of the Light-Emitting Diode (LED) and Central Management System (CMS) lighting project and the pilot projects which had identified the opportunities and constraints in extending dimming beyond current levels. The report sought endorsement of the proposed LED street lighting illumination strategy (dimming and trimming) to extend the lighting hours within the Part Night Lighting (PNL) Regime without increasing costs.

4.2 Members supported the proposed extension of PNL lighting hours from the existing regime which operated between midnight and 06.00 to between 01.00 and 05.00 and, noting the positive feedback from those who did attend the night time site trials, observed that greater Member attendance at the trials would have proved helpful.

4.3 The Panel commented that there was little difference in perception at 50% and 30% lighting; that the eye accommodated to the lower level of light within 20 minutes after which perception improved yet further even at the lowest lighting level and, as LED provided a more even distribution of light than sodium lighting blackspots were not an issue.

4.4 Members heard that the measured two stage approach to reducing the lighting level allowed for accommodation and complied with the safe and operational policy. Officers clarified that the percentages of dimming calculated were from the base level of 100%, where the lighting is at its normal operating level, which is then dimmed via the 'two stage' approach, based on a reduction of 50% at 21.00, and a further 30% at 23.00, resulting in an overall reduction of 80%. Officers clarified that the baseline level of lighting was approximate in terms of Lux due to locational variance and ambient light levels, and so any conversion of data from percentage to illuminance levels (Lux) was purely indicative and an estimate. Officers agreed to express dimming levels in reports in terms of Lux and to email Members a comparison table of Lux at the different stages of dimming.

P Simpson

4.5 Officers agreed that where there was a greater prevalence of the

**CHAIRMAN'S
INITIALS**

.....

dark patches which arose from the LED lighting on some footways, exacerbated in some cases where the footway was not directly adjacent to the road (i.e. separated by the presence of the roadside verge); this could be resolved by removing the shields at the back of LED lanterns that had been installed on a wholesale basis.

- 4.6 During further discussion, to draw all Council members' attention to the option of having the LED lantern shields removed or the angle of tilt adjusted an additional recommendation was proposed:

'Removal of the shields and, or adjustment of the angle of tilt of the lanterns would be addressed as appropriate upon request from Members and also the public via their Local Member'.

The amendment was unanimously agreed.

- 4.7 Officers clarified that LED arrays came in groups of 24 and were split as required. The number used on each of the 70,000 light units, located mainly in residential areas, was determined by the individual parameters in each area and if necessary, to meet public perception of uniformity, could be altered by exception in response to Member feedback.

- 4.8 Members heard that the strategy was to apply new technology to existing columns whilst maintaining the principle of no worse on the ground than before. However, to remedy situations where the original position of the column now resulted in large areas of shadow being cast by the LED light, by exception the position of a column could be moved in response to Member feedback.

- 4.9 Members observed that a more flexible approach to PNL at 30% was required as late night commuter trains in urban areas ran until 02.00 and there was also a late night economy. Further to this, potential funding of this suggested extension to PNL at 30% from 23.00 to 02.00 could be achieved by dimming the full night lighting between 05.00 and 06.00 by 50%. In view of the above discussion the following amendment was proposed: that bullet point 4 of the recommendations i.e. *'Dim a further 30% from 23.00 until 01.00'* be amended to *'Dim a further 30% from 23.00 until 02.00'*, and that bullet point 5 of the recommendations i.e. *'Switch off until 05.00'* be amended to *'Switch off until 05.00 and 50% dim until 06.00'*.

The amendment was voted upon and LOST (For 5 : Against 7). The opposition requested it be minuted that they had voted for the amendment.

**CHAIRMAN'S
INITIALS**

.....

- 4.10 Members were reminded that in terms of the lighting policy one size did not fit all and to achieve a balanced approach a number of parameters had to be considered i.e. financial savings, costs avoided, public safety, public perception of safety, the social aspects of an area and the street scene (e.g. width of the road; obstruction of light by parked cars). In view of the fact that the public had become accustomed to their property being lit by highway lighting, which also caused light pollution, Members were reminded that the principle objective of highway lighting was to light the extent of the highway boundary and not areas of private property and that this would be achieved by rebalancing the lighting to achieve the right feel on the ground.
- 4.11 Members heard that due to energy price increases all powered lit assets were being converted to LED in order of energy usage via an annual refurbishment/replacement programme, the most numerous being residential street lights (70,000), their initial conversion having saved the Council ca £1m p.a. The programme for the other lit assets was ongoing via the annual capital programme, which included belisha beacons (already completed), traffic signals ; illuminated signs, high masts, cycle ways, subways and school crossing Wig Wag signs. As the cost of converting each subway was ca £10,000 a limited number only could be undertaken annually; Members were advised that they could use their HLB to expedite subway and Wig Wag sign conversion.
- 4.12 Officers clarified that conversion of heritage / conservation area lights required bespoke lanterns and as such were not part of the main refurbishment / replacement programme. A number of bespoke lanterns were currently being trialled in Welwyn Garden City to replicate the heritage aesthetics whilst still meeting the 'no worse than before' requirement. Following officer and member review of the trialled lanterns, feedback would be presented to the Highways Liaison Meeting in October 2018 with the relevant members of the County Council, Welwyn Hatfield District Council and the Welwyn Garden City Society
- 4.13 During discussion it was clarified that:
- The LED dimming proposal applied to all residential roads;
 - All new roads would have LED lighting from the start and to provide best value for money were being reviewed with the objective of standardisation to reduce maintenance liability and energy needs;
 - Consultation with Hertfordshire's ten Chief Police officers had not revealed any negative implications from the existing PNL regime in terms of crime or fear of crime.
 - Where there was evidence of criminal activity or when required for police activities, by exception over a short

duration and at the request of a Chief Police Officer, PNL could now easily be converted to full lighting.

- Alleyway lighting operating on a PNL regime would be dimmed in line with the recommendations.
- Historic maintenance issues such as power cables with intermittent power were frequently the reason for only partial conversion of some streets to LED lighting. In such circumstances the street would be returned to full operation following completion of the planned street by street conversions.

4.14 Officers agreed to provide Members with:

P Simpson

- the additional cost of keeping the night lighting on at 30% between 01.00 and 05.00;
- the overall cost of converting 1 sodium light to LED;
- the savings accrued by dimming 1 LED light from 11.00-01.00 and 11.00-02.00.

4.15 In terms of further refinements which officers could trial Members made the following suggestions:

- Provide the option of dimming by 30% from 23.00 to 02.00 as required;
- Cost neutral dimming of lighting between 05.00-06.00 to fund dimmed lighting throughout the period of switch off;
- Cost neutral further extension of lighting times from 01.00 to 02.00 by dimming the lighting by 50% between 05.00 and 06.00;
- Where a fully lit road met a road in partial lighting, potential public criticism of the sudden change in light level could be avoided by either leaving the first two lights of the part night lighting lit road at full lighting level or dimming the last two lights of the fully lit road.

4.16 To reflect the views expressed in paragraph 4.6 and discussion the panel voted on the recommendation to approve the proposed LED street lighting illumination strategy for PNL, viz.

- Switch on at dusk
- No worse lighting than current strategy from dusk until 21.00
- Dim by 50% (i.e. to approximately 4 Lux) until 23.00
- Dim a further 30% (i.e. to approximately 2 Lux) from 23.00 until 01.00
- Switch off until 05.00
- No worse lighting than current strategy from 05.00 until dawn
- Removal of the shields and, or adjustment of the angle of tilt of the lanterns would be addressed as appropriate upon request from Members and also the public via their Local Member

**CHAIRMAN'S
INITIALS**

.....

The recommendation was voted on and AGREED:For 7:Against 5
The Liberal Democrat Group requested it be noted that they voted against the recommendation.

Conclusions:

4.17 The Panel

- i Recommended to Cabinet that Cabinet approve the proposed LED street lighting illumination strategy for Part Night Lighting (PNL), viz.
 - Switch on at dusk
 - No worse lighting than current strategy from dusk until 21.00
 - Dim by 50% (i.e. to approximately 4 Lux) until 23.00
 - Dim a further 30% (i.e. to approximately 2 Lux) from 23.00 until 01.00
 - Switch off until 05.00
 - No worse lighting than current strategy from 05.00 until dawn
 - Removal of the shields and, or adjustment of the angle of tilt of the lanterns would be addressed as appropriate upon request from Members and also the public via their Local Member

ii Noted the Smart Cities Trial

5. A507 HERTFORDSHIRE HEAVY GOODS VEHICLES (HGV) PROJECT PLAN

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

5.1 The Panel received a report which presented the key outcomes following completion of the A507 Hertfordshire HGV Study.

5.2 The Panel heard that that following on from previous Highways Cabinet Panels, the issue of 'A Safer A507' most recently had been considered on 7 March 2018 where Members had noted the previous endorsement of the intention to introduce a weight restriction on the most appropriate routes, avoiding the A507 between Baldock and Buntingford. Officers directed Members to the AECOM A507 (Hertfordshire) HGV study subsequently undertaken to analyse all potential consequences to identify, without prejudice, what was achievable. Members welcomed the volume of work undertaken by residents, officers and members on this issue.

5.3 Officers highlighted that any solution reached on the issue of

CHAIRMAN'S INITIALS

.....

inappropriate HGV access to the A507 between Baldock and Buntingford could potentially result in a fundamental reconsideration of the treatment of 'A' roads in Hertfordshire.

5.4 In relation to weights restriction the panel considered options A, B & C from the AECOM study and noted that option C, involving restriction from Cumberlow Green to Kingswood Bury Farm was the AECOM recommended choice. Members heard that the suggested option was based on balancing the likelihood of enforcement of any restriction.

5.5 During debate Members comments included:

- The lack of protection the 3 options afforded to Baldock, in particular the low bridge on Station Road which suffered damage by HGV strike and gridlock resulting from the turning around of HGVs unable to pass beneath it;
- The need to include a weights restriction for HGVs over 7.5T from the Radwell Lane roundabout to Baldock traffic lights to protect the bridge and prevent gridlock;
- The need to extend the HGV restriction from Baldock Services via the A507 to Buntingford;
- The need to include Baldock Road, Buntingford in the weight restriction to deter HGVs approaching from Royston;
- Likely HGV diversion down Royston Road (a residential road in Baldock) and Ashwell as a consequence of option C;
- Ongoing damage by HGVs to the crossroads area of White Horse Street, Baldock despite investment in protective measures to the railway bridge;
- The need to assess significant night time HGV activity;
- Option B being the resolution to the issues in Cottered;
- Greater likelihood of public enforcement of weight restriction contraventions (i.e. recording of HGV names and number plates) in more residential areas e.g. Cottered;
- The unrealistic nature of a shuttle signal-controlled system;
- The difficulty in turning around a HGV which arrived at a short length weight restriction;
- Protection of those non A roads and the associated hamlets, e.g. Ashwell, Walkern, Cromer, Lattimore which were potential diversions for HGVs avoiding any weight restriction(s);
- Absence of a HGV ban from the Baldock Services/Radwell Lane in option C;
- An improvement to the situation could be achieved but not all the issues would necessarily be resolved.

5.6 Members emphasised the futility of relying on police enforcement of HGV weights restrictions who had advised they lacked the necessary resources, however, officers highlighted that enforcement was more likely over a shorter length of restriction

**CHAIRMAN'S
INITIALS**

.....

where a single policeman could view its entirety. It was noted that policing priorities meetings could be used to suggest a periodic focus on Weights Restriction enforcement.

5.7 During discussion of electronic tachometers, the type of data they recorded and use of them to separate 7.5t HGVs on the A507 (the majority of which were making local deliveries) from those using it inappropriately, Members observed that as and when legislation was agreed by the DfT to allow enforcement by technology of weights restrictions officers should bring a report to Members seeking funding for equipment, management and administration. T Brennan

5.8 Officers clarified that:

- Any weight restriction signage would be visible well before the A507/A10 roundabout, beginning on the strategic network and reducing in size as the restriction approached;
- Any TROs potentially impacted by Weights Restriction would be evaluated to ensure they were compatible and legally enforceable, including Baldock Road which could be affected by 'rat running';
- Weights restrictions were stored in the national TRO database and consequently were identified in HGV specific satnavs, however this was not the case for car satnavs which some HGV drivers used;
- Use of Automatic Number Plate Recognition technology would identify the vehicle but not its weight.

5.9 Consequent to discussion and acknowledging the strength of member feeling, the panel emphasised that a broader approach was required, that officers consider how best to protect the whole area from inappropriate HGV access and that this be reflected in the recommendation. Officers agreed to undertake comparative modelling, including various numbers of Weights Restrictions, and provide the panel with the outcomes in February. Officers also agreed to undertake further talks with the Police to clarify enforcement issues. T Brennan
T Brennan

Conclusions:

5.10 The Panel:

1. Noted the content of the report;
2. Requested that officers investigate the feasibility of weights restriction from Baldock Services / Radwell Lane roundabout to Buntingford and outlying villages and also compare these with weights restriction on a shorter stretch and discuss the outcomes of each, a report to be brought to the February 2019 Highways and Environment Cabinet Panel. T Brennan;
T Baker

**CHAIRMAN'S
INITIALS**

.....

6. SURFACE DRESSING IN URBAN AREAS

[Officer Contact: Chris Allen-Smith, Head of Profession, Asset Management & Maintenance (Tel: 01992 658167)]

- 6.1 Following a motion at Full Council on 17 July 2018 the panel received a report which reviewed the policy of using "surface dressing" (stone chips) in urban settings as opposed to other treatments on urban roads.
- 6.2 Members noted the nature of 'surface dressing' (SD) and the other like-for-like option 'micro asphalt' (micro surfacing) (MA), the situations in which each type of surfacing was most appropriate and the reasons why SD was sometimes used on a case-by-case basis on urban roads. Officers emphasised that technical expertise guided treatment selection based on the needs and circumstances of each road.
- 6.3 Members heard that the stone chippings locked together to form a surface matrix and that rolling and the passage of traffic enabled stronger interlocking, the 10% extra chippings used ensuring that any remaining gaps were filled. Initial bedding in of chippings generally took 2-3 weeks, process completion taking 6-12 months.
- 6.4 A Member raised an example and suggested that SD was unsuitable for cul-de-sacs which experienced little traffic. Officers highlighted that poor quality workmanship in that particular case caused the problems, not the treatment chosen, and the contractor had to rectify this at their own expense.
- 6.5 To aid Member identification of the treatment type to be used on each road officers agreed to look at and hoped to improve the information within the regular Members' Bulletins, including a more precise description of treatments and/or inclusion of the identifying technical codes. It was noted that Members also received a letter regarding road surface treatments in their division two weeks in advance of the start of the work. C Allen-Smith
- 6.6 In view of the discussion a member proposed and the panel agreed that paragraph 4.6 of the report be used for the recommendation with the addition of a fourth bullet point : *'Where surface dressing is used the Local Member will be advised in advance, i.e.:*
As a general rule, engineers will tend to specify SD in more rural locations and MA in more urban ones. However, there are exceptions, considered on a case-by-case basis, which can include:
 - Urban roads with a low number of parking or turning

CHAIRMAN'S INITIALS

.....

movements (some urban A roads and dual carriageways fall into this category);

- Urban roads where the shape of the road (e.g. a high existing camber or lack of existing kerb face) makes adding additional thickness to the road undesirable;
- Engineers will also take into account the defects that are present and need treating (for instance a road where there are no dips to remove but the surface is very polished might be a stronger candidate for surface dressing)
- Where surface dressing is used the Local Member will be advised in advance

Conclusions:

6.7 The panel agreed that:

As a general rule, engineers will tend to specify SD in more rural locations and MA in more urban ones. However, there are exceptions, considered on a case-by-case basis, which can include:

- Urban roads with a low number of parking or turning movements (some urban A roads and dual carriageways fall into this category);
- Urban roads where the shape of the road (e.g. a high existing camber or lack of existing kerb face) makes adding additional thickness to the road undesirable;
- Engineers will also take into account the defects that are present and need treating (for instance a road where there are no dips to remove but the surface is very polished might be a stronger candidate for surface dressing);
- Where surface dressing is used the Local Member will be advised in advance.

7. “ONE AND DONE” CONCEPT AND IMPLEMENTATION

[Officer Contact: Chris Allen-Smith, Head of Profession, Asset Management & Maintenance (Tel: 01992 658167)]

7.1 The Panel received a report on ‘On and Done’ following referral from Full Council on 17 July 2018 of the motion that *“Council considers that the practices of ‘one and done’ is embedded in the Integrated Works Programme for highways resurfacing / reconstruction and i2i projects to enable redundant crossovers to be raised, blocked gully grates to be cleared and, where possible, ponding at road junctions to be resolved with re-profiling or appropriate measures to ensure the long term benefits to the highway and footway network and thus reducing costs in the future”*.

**CHAIRMAN’S
INITIALS**

.....

7.2 Members heard that the One and Done concept involved trying to include ancillary works as part of larger schemes to deliver joined-up works that would better meet public expectations. They noted the detail of the concept, the types of ancillary works considered, also the cost, constraints and delivery issues considered in deciding if and when to include them in schemes.

7.3 The Panel supported the inclusion of all Integrated Works Programme (IWP) schemes, including carriageway maintenance schemes and those promoted under the i2i initiative in 'One and Done'; however officers highlighted that some of the current schemes had begun before the concept had been initiated which might limit the amount or type of 'one and done' activities that could be included.

7.4 Officers clarified that Highways had created the virtual operations hub and taken back in house from Ringway control of some parts of the service. This provided greater flexibility in guiding them on Cat 2 low priority issues but which the contractor would legitimately not have considered a high priority. In contrast Cat 6 Ringway work was directed by the Whole Client Service and addressed by campaigns to enable efficient delivery.

7.5 During discussion officers clarified that:

- Ponding in the road at a pedestrian crossing point (or anywhere else) could be considered and potentially resolved during routine resurfacing if it was caused by the road surface sinking;
- Completely flush dropped kerbs caused their own ponding;
- Coordination was undertaken with the utilities to avoid unnecessary damage to the Network however, in emergency situations the latter sometimes had to dig up fresh work.
- The main technical walk through for a scheme was typically undertaken around 6 months in advance of the work itself and it was during this window that issues to be dealt with by 'One and Done' were identified and budgeted for;
- Line marking after conventional resurfacing was usually undertaken prior to reopening the road, however on newly Surface Dressed roads it could only be undertaken following the 6-8 week bedding in period and sweeping away of loose chippings (typically after 3-4 weeks dependent on the road).

7.6 Officers agreed to communicate to contractors that the T-Bar did not need to be reinstated after a dropped kerb was removed.

C Allen-Smith

Conclusions:

7.7 The Panel considered and commented on the report.

**CHAIRMAN'S
INITIALS**

.....

8. 'PEDESTRIAN & CYCLING POLICIES'

[Officer Contact: Rupert Thacker, Group Manager, Head of Profession, Policy, Strategy and ITP (Tel: 01992 658176)]

- 8.1 The Panel received a report on the new LTP4 policies relevant to pedestrians and cyclists and their implementation following referral from Full Council on 17 July 2018 of the motion that *“The Executive Member for Highways and Environment is requested to review policies relating to pedestrians and cyclists to ensure that on all highways schemes the greater priority is given to those to encourage modal shift in line with Council’s aims and objectives and to bring the review to Highways and Environment Cabinet Panel.”*
- 8.2 Members heard that policies to encourage more walking and cycling were reviewed through the development of the Local Transport Plan 4 (LTP4) which provided direction on where to allocate limited highway resources and rebalanced the limited space within the highway boundary, however most of the recently implemented schemes had been developed before LTP4.
- 8.3 In terms of encouraging modal shift the panel’s endorsement was requested for investigation of the ‘Green Man ‘authority’ signalling technique which when used primarily in busy areas gave priority to pedestrians over vehicles.
- 8.4 In a similar vein Members noted that application of LTP4 philosophy to a previous feasibility study for junction improvement at Station Road, Borehamwood had resulted in the solution to the current mini roundabout being changed to a proposed ‘continental’ style roundabout with zebra crossings on each arm. This prioritised pedestrians and, as vehicles had to travel through it more slowly than a standard British design, it was also easier for cyclists to navigate the junction.
- 8.5 During discussion Members observed:
 - That carriageway edge defects of 40mm which did not affect cars adversely affected utility cyclists and maintenance of these was necessary to encourage cycling on roads;
 - To compliment LTP4 philosophy ongoing maintenance of existing cycle paths was necessary to ensure they remained safe and useable and reinstatement of those that were no longer showing;
 - A major challenge lay in persuading Local Planning Authorities to encourage developers both in line with LTP4 and to provide funding for cycle paths/ lanes;

**CHAIRMAN’S
INITIALS**

.....

- White lines which showed the separation on segregated cycle/pedestrian routes encouraged pedestrians to be conscious of potential cycle presence.

8.6 Officers clarified that:

- To reflect the increasing number of cyclists the speed management strategy in town centres needed to be reviewed and advice was being sought from the government;
- In situations such as narrow roads there was difficulty in balancing the needs of the different users, e.g. a speed limit which reflected an appropriate limit for driver travel versus the needs of cyclists / horse riders;
- Developers were actively being encouraged to consider lower speed limits for planned new developments and creation of environments which encouraged modal shift;
- National studies had shown that white lining on segregated cycling and pedestrian routes had little effect on making the parties concerned adhere to their allocated side and positive engagement and education was required to encourage aggressive cyclists to moderate their behaviour.

Conclusions:

8.7 The Panel:

- noted and commented as above on the report;
- agreed that the Green Man Authority Signals should be investigated

9. FOOTWAY CLOSURES

[Officer Contact: Dave Barnett, Group Manager
(Tel: 01992 658118)]

9.1 Members received a report on Footway Closures following referral from Full Council on 17 July 2018 that the motion “*The Director of Environment and Infrastructure is requested to ensure that in any footway (or off road cycle way) closure that is required for development work those users be afforded greater priority and that:-1) Local Members be informed of such closures beforehand; and 2) On principal routes adequate and safe pedestrian crossing facilities are provided by the developer including traffic controls to so protect them.*”

9.2 The Panel noted that the County Council operated a permit scheme to coordinate works on the highway and that works promoters were required to comply with the requirements set out in the DfT ‘Safety at Street works and Roadworks’ publication (the ‘Red Book’). This directed that it is the works promoter’s

**CHAIRMAN’S
INITIALS**

.....

responsibility to ensure that pedestrians and other road users passing the works were safe by protecting them from works and passing traffic.

The Panel welcomed advance warning of the local County Councillor of planned footway closures on principal roads and requested that not only A but also B roads should be covered.

D Barnett

- 9.3 Members heard that under the 'Red Book', where works were going to obstruct the footway, the works promoter was required to provide a safe alternative, which could include portable pedestrian crossing signals. In relation to promoters protecting pedestrians, Members commented that the developer should provide signals to enable safe crossing particularly at sites where there were no other suitable signal controlled crossings in the vicinity.

D Barnett

Conclusions:

The Panel:

1. Noted the content of the report;
2. Supported the proposal that from 1 November 2018 Network Management will make the local County Councillor aware of planned footway closures on principal roads (A and B Roads – see definition APPENDIX A) in their division for works that Hertfordshire County Council are notified of in advance.

10. HIGHWAYS PERFORMANCE MONITOR

[Officer Contact: Jonathan Knapman, , Service Development & Efficiencies Manager (Tel: 01992 555381)]

- 10.1 The Panel received the Highways and Environment Service overall performance report for Q1 April-June 2018 comprising 67 individual measures grouped under 10 themes.

- 10.2 Members noted the instigation of: 4 new measures to reflect the new 'environment' element of the remit; the representational change to historic data which enabled self bench-marking to be viewed; the addition of a performance improvement tracker (appendix 13), and the year on year comparison of theme scores to more accurately account for seasonal fluctuations. In response to member requests Category 1 lit features completion rates, and Customer Service Centre abandonment rate and average wait time had been included this quarter.

- 10.3 There was no Member discussion.

Conclusions:

**CHAIRMAN'S
INITIALS**

.....

10.4 The Cabinet Panel noted the report on the performance monitor for the Highways service for Q1 2018-19.

11 OTHER PART I BUSINESS

11.1 There was no other business.

**KATHRYN PETTITT
CHIEF LEGAL OFFICER**

CHAIRMAN_____

**CHAIRMAN'S
INITIALS**

.....