

# NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM AGENDA



Friday 9<sup>th</sup> December, 2005

at 1.00 p.m.

in Committee Room B

MEMBERS: NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM:

Councillors Cambridge, Cook, Cranney, Fenwick, Flintoff, Hall, Lauderdale, J Marshall, Richardson, Rogan and Tumilty.

Resident Representatives: Steve Gibbon, Alan Lloyd and Linda Shields

**1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

**2. TO RECEIVE ANY DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST BY MEMBERS**

**3. MINUTES**

- 3.1 To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 28th November 2005 (*to follow*).

**4. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION**

**Scrutiny Investigation into the Local Bus Service Provision:-**

4.1 Evidence from Hartlepool's Member of Parliament:

- (a) Covering Report (*Scrutiny Manager / Research Assistant*); and
- (b) Verbal evidence from Iain Wright, MP for Hartlepool

4.2 Evidence from Hartlepool's Elected Mayor:

- (a) Covering Report (*Scrutiny Manager / Research Assistant*); and
- (b) Verbal evidence from Stuart Drummond, Elected Mayor for Hartlepool

**Scrutiny Inquiry into 20mph Speed Limit Zones Outside of Schools in Hartlepool:-**

- 4.3 Written Evidence from Cleveland Casualty Reduction Group  
(*Scrutiny Manager / Research Assistant*)

**5. ANY OTHER ITEMS WHICH THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS ARE URGENT**

**ITEM FOR INFORMATION**

**Date of Next Meeting – 12<sup>th</sup> December 2005, commencing at 1 p.m. in Committee Room B.**

# NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM MINUTES

28<sup>th</sup> November 2005

**Present:**

Councillor Kevin Cranney (In the Chair)

Councillors: John Cambridge, Rob Cook, Gerard Hall, Carl Richardson and Victor Tumilty

Resident Representatives:

Allan Lloyd, Linda Shields and Steve Gibbon

Officers:

Peter Frost, Traffic Team Leader  
Charlotte Burnham, Scrutiny Manager  
Rebecca Redman, Temporary Research Assistant (Scrutiny)  
Joan Wilkins, Principal Democratic Services Officer

Also Present: Councillor Robbie Payne (Culture, Housing and Transportation)

## **24. Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Sandra Fenwick.

## **25. Declarations of interest by Members**

None.

## **26. Minutes of the meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> November 2005.**

Confirmed.

## **27. 20 MPH Zones Outside of Schools Enquiry: Evidence from the Culture, Housing and Transportation Portfolio Holder (Scrutiny Manager/Research Assistant )**

The Scrutiny Manager reported that, further to minute no.23 of the meeting held on the 11<sup>th</sup> November 2005, the Culture, Housing and Transportation Portfolio Holder had accepted the Forums invitation to provide evidence in relation to the appropriateness of the enforcement of 20mph speed limit zones outside schools in Hartlepool.

The Chairman welcomed the Portfolio Holder and sought his views on the following questions:-

- a) As the Portfolio Holder for Culture, Housing and Transportation, what are your roles and responsibilities in relation to road safety?

The Portfolio Holder indicated that his role/responsibility was to reduce the number of injuries and traffic accidents in Hartlepool.

- b) What over and above the introduction of 20mph limits do you think also needs to be done to reduce injuries and traffic accidents around Hartlepool schools?

The Portfolio Holder agreed that additional measures were needed and drew attention to the problems created by parking around schools. Particular attention was drawn to problems at St Hilds and Members suggested that the school be added to the list of sites for the introduction of a 20mph zone and traffic calming measures. The Traffic Team Leader indicated that the addition of the school onto the list would be looked into and a copy of the list circulated to the Forum. It was, however, recognised that the introduction of traffic calming measures would not be practical around all schools and as such with 20mph zones required to be self enforcing, in most cases through traffic calming measures, not all roads outside schools would be suitable for 20mph zones. The availability of other measures such as lollypop ladies was, however, noted and attention drawn to a recent request for the provision of a lollypop lady at Throston Grange Primary School. The Portfolio Holder indicated that he had supported this application.

- c) At what times would 20mph limits be in place?

Members were advised that 20mph limits were to be in place 24 hours a day, 7 days a week and that Department of Transport legislation did not allow 20mph limits to be brought in for specific times during the day. Zones were also to be imposed only on sections of road's around/outside schools and not along full stretches of road.

- d) In your role as the Portfolio Holder for Culture, Housing and Transportation, how are you working towards the key aims and objectives of the Hartlepool Road Safety Strategy?

The Portfolio Holder emphasised the importance of working towards the aims and objectives of the Hartlepool Road Safety Strategy and drew attention to his activities in support for the provision of traffic calming and other measures, including the provision of lollypop ladies. Attention was also drawn to:

- The introduction of Vehicle Activated Signs on Mowbray Road, outside the Fens School, and hopes for a positive impact on the number of injuries.
- Road safety consultations ongoing with parents, etc. regarding the Road Safety Strategy.

- The way in which the Road Safety Strategy fits into the Local Transport Plan.

Members also:

- i) Queried if the Road Safety Strategy included the provision of road crossings and in relation to those with facilities for the disabled/deaf and sight impaired drew attention to the number of the across the town.

In relation to road crossings it was highlighted that the clearance time for traffic changes meant that disabled facilities could only be put in place at certain junctions. Whilst Members noted this response it was felt that this was an issue which should be brought to the attention of the Minister of Transport and that it should be compulsory for all crossings to have disabled facilities i.e. noise or flashing lights, etc. The Traffic Team Leader took on board the Forums comments and indicated that the provision of these facilities across the town would be looked into further.

- ii) Drew attention to the need to be aware of the displacement of traffic created with drivers taking alternative routes to avoid 20mph zones and the need to look further afield in terms of the provision of traffic measures and routes. Attention was also drawn to:

- Concerns regarding certain traffic systems across the town, i.e. along York Road, Park Road, Osbourne Road and at the Mail Office junction.
- Whether there had been scrutiny involvement in the design of road/junction layouts across the town.
- The length of time the pedestrian crossing sequence took at the Mail Office junction and details sought of any possible increases in pedestrian accidents at the site.

The Forum was advised that there had so far been no scrutiny involvement in the design of road systems, however, a study was to be undertaken to look at road systems across the whole of the town centre. Members requested that the findings of the study be brought back to this Forum and were advised that the issue identified above relating to the pedestrian crossing sequence at the Mail Office junction, and any possible increase in pedestrian accidents, would be looked into.

- iii) Drew attention to school sites around the town where it was felt that 20mph zones should be created i.e. High School. Whilst the Portfolio Holder confirmed that there were no plans for the creation of a 20mph zone outside High Tunstall School at this time Members highlighted the role scrutiny could play as part of this review in identifying sites suitable for zones, including the area around High Tunstall School.

- e) What is the Authority's current procedure of determining the appropriateness of enforcing 20mph Speed Limit Zones outside of schools?

The Portfolio Holder indicated that the need for safety schemes was assessed on the basis of accident numbers/casualty figures and in relation to getting High Tunstall on the list of sites Members were advised that people needed to bring sites to the attention of Members and officers. The Traffic Team Leader confirmed that at the present time there was no specific policy/criteria for the identification of possible zones and that each school was looked at on its own merits. The Portfolio Holder was, however, emphasised that he would be keen to see increased public and member involvement in the identification of sites and schemes and the development of proactive, rather than reactive policies.

- f) How does the Local Transport Plan 2006-2011 contribute to the achievement of the 50% reduction in fatal or serious child casualty's target to be realised by 2010?

This question had already been addressed during the course of discussions.

- g) Where it has been determined as inappropriate to enforce 20 mph Speed Limit Zones outside particular schools within Hartlepool what alternative traffic calming/road safety measures may be enforced?

This question had already been addressed during the course of discussions.

- h) Is the current funding received from the Local Transport Plan ring fenced to safety schemes such as 20mph Speed Limit Zones?

Members were advised that Local Transport Plan funding was utilised for the provision of a variety of schemes and that the amount allocated for safety schemes this year was approximately £200,000. It was estimated that of this about £25,000 was available for road safety schemes around schools with other sources of funding also tapped into. Whilst Members expressed a view that it would be beneficial to have more accurate figures for consideration as part of the Forums enquiry it was acknowledged that such figures were difficult to obtain as schemes were being carried out all the time.

The Chair of the North Neighbourhood Consultative Forum indicated that his Forum used whatever funding it could to address road safety issues and that he worked closely with the Traffic Team Leaders' Department to identify any other possible sources of funding. The Chair of the Consultative Forum took the opportunity to commend the department on its work and thanked the Traffic Team Manager for his help. It was also suggested that a rolling programme for the introduction of new 20mph zones should be introduced and that the need for the identification of resources to provide these zones across the town should be identified as a budget pressure.

- i) In your opinion, which schools in Hartlepool warrant 20mph Speed Limit Zones?

The Portfolio Holder indicated that he would like to see where appropriate every school provided with traffic calming measures and clarified that out of

the 36 schools in the town 25/26 would warrant 20mph schools.

Following consideration of the information provided by the Portfolio Holder the Chairman expressed the Forums thanks for his attendance. The Portfolio Holder took the opportunity to thank the Forum for the opportunity to participate and indicated that he would be more than willing to come back at any time.

### **Decision**

- i) The report was noted and the Portfolio Holder thanked for his attendance.
- ii) That the inclusion of High Tunstall School and St Hilds school in the list of sites for the introduction of a 20mph zones and traffic calming measures be looked into further.

## **28. Setting the Scene – '20 mph Speed Limit Zones Outside Schools' Scrutiny Enquiry** *(Traffic Team Leader and Scrutiny Manager)*

The Traffic Team Lead and Scrutiny Manager submitted a joint report outlining Department of Transport guidelines for the introduction of 20mph limit's, work currently being undertaken and examples of good practice from neighbouring local authorities. Details were also provided of the negative impacts of 20mph zones, progress in Hartlepool, the financial implications of their introduction and number of casualties outside schools within Hartlepool.

Following consideration of the report the following issues were raised:-

- i) Members queried how much it would cost to provide road safety measures outside all suitable schools and were advised that the cost of an average scheme was in the region of £15,000, with 25/26 possibly suitable sites.
- ii) Members queried if any back tracking was done to assess the effectiveness of schemes once they were put in place, i.e. talking to parents, with a view to assisting in the provision of future schemes. Particular attention was drawn to the Kingsley School scheme already completed and Members advised that officers had no figures at this time relating to its effectiveness. It was, however, confirmed that a process was in place to assess the effectiveness of schemes and that the lessons learnt were fed back into future schemes. In response to a query as to how this was carried out it was agreed that when completed details of the Rift House scheme and its effectiveness would be fed back to the Portfolio Holder and this Forum.
- iii) Concern was expressed regarding the congestion created by cars waiting to get into the car wash on Catcote Road and the problems this created for children attending the nearby school. Attention was also drawn to the problem of 6<sup>th</sup> Form students parking on Catcote Road. Members felt that both of these issues needed to be looked at further.

- iv) Attention was drawn to the damaging affect on drivers involved in collisions with pedestrians.
- v) Members were reminded of the format of the meeting to be held on the 12<sup>th</sup> December 2005 and Forums wish to seek views from the public at the meeting. The Scrutiny Manager was asked to bring this to the attention of the three Town Care Managers with a view to seeking the involvement of the Neighbourhood Consultative Forums.

**Decision**

- i) The report was noted.
- ii) That when complete details of the Rift House scheme and the assessment of its effectiveness be fed back to the Portfolio Holder and this Forum.
- iii) That the Scrutiny Manager make the Town Care Managers aware of the meeting on the 12<sup>th</sup> December 2005 with a view to seeking the involvement of the Neighbourhood Consultative Forums.

KEVIN CRANNEY

CHAIRMAN

**NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM**

9 December 2005



**Report of:** Scrutiny Manager/Research Assistant

**Subject:** Scrutiny Investigation into Hartlepool's Bus Service Provision – Evidence from MP Iain Wright

---

**1. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT**

To inform Members of the Forum that the town's Member of Parliament (MP) has been invited to attend this meeting to provide evidence in relation to this Forum's ongoing investigation into Hartlepool's Bus Service Provision.

**2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

- 2.1 Members will recall that at the meeting of this Forum on 19 August 2005, the Terms of Reference and Potential Areas of Inquiry/Sources of Evidence were approved by the Forum for this scrutiny investigation.
- 2.2 Consequently, Iain Wright, the town's Member of Parliament (MP) has agreed to attend this meeting to submit evidence of a local perspective to the Forum.
- 2.3 During this evidence gathering session with the town's Member of Parliament, it is suggested that responses should be sought to the following key questions:-
- a) Speaking on behalf of your constituents of Hartlepool, do you feel that the current bus service provision meets the needs of the community?
  - b) During recent surgeries with your constituents, what comments have been made regarding the current bus service routes, together with its infrastructure, within Hartlepool?

- c) What do you believe would allow us to meet a variety of needs in relation to: access to employment; education; health care; local shops and services; and leisure facilities?
- d) What comments have residents made concerning the availability of information relating to bus service provision in Hartlepool, especially in relation to the co-ordination of timetable changes?
- e) What barriers do disabled people and vulnerable groups face when using the bus service, and how do you see the Council contributing to overcoming these barriers?
- f) As the towns MP have residents expressed satisfaction with the cost of bus travel and the availability of (different) ticket types within Hartlepool to you?
- g) What key milestones do you believe we must we achieve for an improved transport network that would remedy the concerns of residents and visitors of Hartlepool?
- h) Throughout this inquiry it has been indicated that the settlement for concessionary bus fares will exceed the estimated costs of the scheme. With this in mind would you support these additional monies being utilised to improve Hartlepool's bus service provision?
- i) What other advice / information are you able to provide to this Forum, that would assist this scrutiny investigation?

### **3. RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 3.1 That Members of the Forum consider the views of the town's MP in relation to the questions outlined in section 2.3

**Contact Officers:** - Charlotte Burnham – Scrutiny Manager  
Rebecca Redman – Temp Research Assistant (Scrutiny)  
Chief Executive's Department - Corporate Strategy  
Hartlepool Borough Council  
Tel: 01429 523 087 / 523 647

Email: [charlotte.burnham@hartlepool.gov.uk](mailto:charlotte.burnham@hartlepool.gov.uk)  
[rebecca.redman@hartlepool.gov.uk](mailto:rebecca.redman@hartlepool.gov.uk)

**BACKGROUND PAPERS**

The following background paper was used in the preparation of this report:-

- (i) Joint Report of the Scrutiny Manager and Scrutiny Support Officer entitled 'Scrutiny Investigation into Hartlepool's Bus Service Provision – Scoping Report' presented to the Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum on 19 August 2005.

**NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM**

9 December 2005



**Report of:** Scrutiny Manager/Research Assistant

**Subject:** Scrutiny Investigation into Hartlepool's Bus Service Provision – Evidence from the Elected Mayor

---

**1. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT**

To inform Members of the Forum that the Elected Mayor has been invited to attend this meeting to provide evidence in relation to this Forum's ongoing investigation into Hartlepool's Bus Service Provision.

**2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

2.1 Members will recall that at the meeting of this Forum on 19 August 2005, the Terms of Reference and Potential Areas of Inquiry/Sources of Evidence were approved by the Forum for this scrutiny investigation. Consequently, arrangements have been finalised for the Elected Mayor to be in attendance at this meeting to submit evidence of a local perspective to the Forum.

2.3 During this evidence gathering session with the Elected Mayor, it is suggested that responses should be sought to the following key questions:-

- a) As the town's Elected Mayor, what are your roles and responsibilities in relation to bus service provision?
- b) In your role as the town's Elected Mayor, how are you working towards the key aims and objectives of the 2001-2006 Local Transport Plan?
- c) In what ways are you able to ensure that the current bus infrastructure meets the needs of the community?
- d) How do you feel the Local Transport Plan 2006-2011 will improve the current bus service routes within Hartlepool to ensure it continues to meet a variety of needs in relation to: access to employment; education; health care; local shops and services; and leisure facilities?

- e) What are your views on the availability of information relating to bus service provision in Hartlepool, especially in relation to the co-ordination of timetable changes?
- f) What do you consider to be the barriers of using buses for disabled people and vulnerable groups, and how do you see the Council contributing to overcoming these barriers?
- g) What do you believe are the key milestones for achieving this Council's vision for an improved transport network that would contribute to our longer-term vision within the Community Strategy?
- h) Throughout this inquiry it has been indicated that our settlement for concessionary bus fares will exceed the estimated costs of the scheme. In light of other pressures and priorities facing the Council would you utilise this additional money to improve Hartlepool's bus service provision?
- i) What other advice / information are you able to provide to this Forum, that would assist this scrutiny investigation?

### **3. RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 3.1 That Members of the Forum consider the views of the Elected Mayor in relation to the questions outlined in section 2.3

**Contact Officers:** - Charlotte Burnham – Scrutiny Manager  
Rebecca Redman – Temp Research Assistant (Scrutiny)  
Chief Executive's Department - Corporate Strategy  
Hartlepool Borough Council  
Tel: 01429 523 087 / 523 647

Email: [charlotte.burnham@hartlepool.gov.uk](mailto:charlotte.burnham@hartlepool.gov.uk)  
[rebecca.redman@hartlepool.gov.uk](mailto:rebecca.redman@hartlepool.gov.uk)

### **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

The following background paper was used in the preparation of this report:-

- (i) Joint Report of the Scrutiny Manager and Scrutiny Support Officer entitled 'Scrutiny Investigation into Hartlepool's Bus Service Provision – Scoping Report' presented to the Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum on 19 August 2005.

**NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM**

**9 December 2005**



**Report of:** Scrutiny Manager / Research Assistant

**Subject:** Scrutiny Inquiry into 20 MPH Speed Limit Zones Outside Schools- Written Evidence from Cleveland Casualty Reduction Group

---

**1. PURPOSE OF REPORT**

- 1.1 To consider the written evidence submitted by the Cleveland Casualty Reduction Group, in relation this Forum's ongoing inquiry into 20 mph Speed Limit Zones Outside of Schools in Hartlepool.

**2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

- 2.1 Members will recall that at the meeting of this Forum on 11 November 2005, the Terms of Reference and Potential Areas of Inquiry/Sources of Evidence were approved by the Forum for this scrutiny investigation.
- 2.2 Consequently, written evidence has been sought from the Chair of the Cleveland Casualty Reduction Group, which is attached as **Appendix A** for consideration by Members of the Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum.

**3. RECOMMENDATION**

- 3.1 That Members of the Forum consider the written evidence submitted by the Cleveland Casualty Reduction Group (Appendix A refers).

**Contact Officers:** Charlotte Burnham - Scrutiny Manager  
Rebecca Redman – Temp Research Assistant (Scrutiny)  
Chief Executive's Department – Corporate Strategy  
Hartlepool Borough Council  
Tel: 01429 523087  
Email: charlotte.burnham@hartlepool.gov.uk  
Email: rebecca.redman@hartlepool.gov.uk

**BACKGROUND PAPERS**

No background Papers were used in the preparation of this report

APPENDIX A

**\*\*SENT VIA EMAIL\*\***

11<sup>th</sup> November 2005

Dear Rebecca

**20 mile per hour limits and zones**

In response to your query, the following advice is contained in Traffic Advisory Leaflet 9/99 '20mph speed limits and zones' issued by the Dept for Transport:

*There are two different means of implementing 20 mph speed limits. Broadly, these are:*

- *use of speed limits, indicated by terminal and repeater signs alone;*
- *a zonal approach using terminal signs together with suitable traffic calming measures to provide a self enforcing element*

*Equally important is that the form of speed limit chosen does not require unreasonable levels of enforcement.*

*20 mph speed limits by signs alone would be most appropriate where 85th percentile speeds are already low and further traffic calming measures are not needed.*

*20 mph zones should be used where excessive speeds occur, and where traffic calming measures would be needed to ensure speeds are at or below 20 mph. 20 mph zones would be particularly appropriate where there is an existing record of accidents to children occurring over an area, or where concentrations of pedestrians and/or cyclists exist or are anticipated. They can help to protect children walking and cycling to and from school, and may encourage other children to walk or cycle.*

**Design Advice**

*20 mph speed limits without self-enforcing features have the attraction of being relatively inexpensive to implement. However, regard must be given to the 'before' speeds, because the higher they are the less likely speeds will be reduced to 20 mph.*

*It will be important that the local police are consulted at the outset, to obtain an understanding of the level of enforcement that could be applied and how effective that might be in ensuring a significant reduction in speed. There will be some areas where speeds are relatively low already and the provision of a 20 mph speed limit indicated by terminal and repeater signs alone, without extensive police enforcement, will be sufficient to bring speeds down to 20 mph.*

*Circular Roads 1/93 advises that if the observed 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed is within 7 mph or 20% of the proposed limit, the new limit may be introduced. For 20 mph speed limits it is recommended that the 20% figure is applied. If observed 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speeds are above 24 mph, then it is unlikely a 20 mph speed limit would be appropriate, unless traffic calming measures can be provided.*

*When considering the appropriateness of a 20 mph speed limit, the area or length of road involved will also have some bearing. It is generally recommended that 20 mph speed limits (including 20 mph zones) should be imposed over an area consisting of several roads and not just an individual road.*

*There may be exceptions to this but it is doubtful that a single road 20 mph speed limit would have any significant effect on speeds or accidents unless it was at least 500m in length. Accidents in areas where 20 mph speed limits would be most successful seldom occur in particular locations, but are scattered throughout an area.*

*It is of doubtful benefit to have a short length of either a 20 mph speed limit or a 20 mph zone outside a school. Apart from the uncertainty of whether drivers will observe the limit, they may subsequently speed up significantly in an area where children, in relatively large numbers, will be approaching or leaving the school.*

Emphasis must be placed on the self-enforcing aspect of any 20mph limit or zone. Cleveland police would not support a scheme that could rely on enforcement to succeed. Should surveys identify 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speeds in excess of the 20% explained in the leaflet, then appropriate traffic calming features must be introduced to prevent drivers travelling over the applied limit.

I hope this information and advice is useful, all Traffic Advisory Leaflets are published on the Dept. for Transport's web site – at [DfT.gov.uk](http://DfT.gov.uk).

Should you require any further assistance, please do not hesitate to get in touch. I would suggest you also approach Paul Watson, Road Safety Officer, Hartlepool Borough Council (tel 01429 523590) and Peter Frost, Traffic Management engineer, also Hartlepool Borough Council (tel 01429 523200),

Yours sincerely

Chris Cole

Ms C Cole  
Road Policing Unit