

PERTH AND KINROSS COUNCIL**Environment and Infrastructure Committee****21 March 2018****TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS
FLORENCE PLACE, PERTH
(WARD 12)****Report by Executive Director (Environment)**

This report outlines the problems experienced by Perth and Kinross Council due to the continued misuse of the automatic bollard at this location. This report contains feedback from consultation within the local area and asks Committee to decide which option to proceed with.

1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1 Florence Place currently has an island and automatic bollard arrangement located approximately half way along it to allow traffic along Florence Place in one direction only. If travelling in the opposite direction, the road becomes a cul-de-sack with no through road access. The bollard was initially installed to reduce through traffic on Florence Place and stop Florence Place being used as a route to bypass any congestion on Dunkeld Road.
- 1.2 The bollard is controlled by a number of detector loops in the road that detect any approaching vehicles. The system uses a red and a green light to indicate when the bollard is in the lowered position and safe to drive over.
- 1.3 There has been an ongoing issue due to the bollard and traffic management system being abused on a regular basis. Damage is caused to the bollard and during the intervening period between the bollard being put out of action and being repaired, traffic freely flows in both directions along Florence Place. There are also costs incurred for these regular repairs as most responsible parties are not identified.
- 1.4 A report was put forward at the Enterprise and Infrastructure Committee on 14 June 2017 (Report No. 17/215 refers). This stated that 'It is proposed that the bollard is removed and the road be completely blocked by a permanent obstruction across the full width of the road. This will prevent through traffic completely, turning Florence Place into two cul-de-sacs being blocked approximately half way along by this obstruction. This will provide a more maintainable and cost effective solution to the current problem.' This option is shown in Appendix 1.
- 1.5 From the Committee, it was agreed that a more widespread consultation be carried out as per this extract from the minutes –

- (i) The Director (Environment) be requested to carry out as broad a consultation as possible on the following options for combatting the problems caused to the Council by the continued misuse of the automatic bollard at Florence Place, Perth;
- (ii) Following the conclusion of the consultation, the Director (Environment) be requested to submit a report to the Committee outlining the responses and suggested options for further consultation.'

2. CONSULTATION FINDINGS

2.1 Consultation was firstly carried out within the localised area of Florence Place (South of Balhousie Street) where any changes would strongly affect each resident. A questionnaire was sent to each resident along with a freepost envelope to return them once completed. Further consultation was then carried out with local groups recommended by the Service Manager for Public Service Reform, Culture and Community Development. These are detailed in table 1 below along with results.

	Option 1 – Retain Automatic Bollard.	Option 2 – Block off road and create two cul-de-sacs.	Option 3 – remove the bollard and open the road up two-way.
Florence Place residents (South of Balhousie Street).	12	8	10
North Inch and Muirton Community Council.	0	9	62*
North Inch Community Campus.	1	0	0
North Muirton Community Council.	1	1	8
Riverside Church, North Muirton.	1**	0	0
TOTAL	15	18	80

Table 1 – Votes from each consultation.

*The Community Council wanted to make it clear that 'not all 62 are immediate residents' and were taken from Facebook comments.

**The respondent answered the consultation 'as a local resident and not in any work capacity' therefore does not represent a wide group.

3. CONCLUSION

3.1 From the consultation, it is evident that there is no majority for any option from the residents of Florence Place. Many of those that voted for Option 2 also commented that they were against Option 3. Also, many that did not vote for

Option 1 made it clear that this was due to the problems that have been encountered with the operation of the automatic bollard.

- 3.2 It is also evident that the majority of people outwith Florence Place (but within the local community) would rather make the road two-way.
- 3.3 It should be noted that the majority of these votes (from outwith Florence Place) are from people who will be less affected on a daily basis. The voting to make the road two-way would likely be due to convenience rather than an operational justification or consideration of any negative impacts on residents.
- 3.4 It is anticipated that Option 3 would lead to an increase in traffic on Balhousie Street and throughout Muirton to avoid congestion on Dunkeld Road. These are residential areas with nearby schools. It should be noted that North Inch Community Campus expressed road safety concerns for their pupils if option 3 was to be implemented
- 3.5 If Committee decides to retain the automatic bollard, Traffic & Network propose to meet with the maintenance contract provider to assess options for reducing the number of occasions that the bollard is out of order and to reduce the time periods that it is out of order for. This may be through reviewing the existing signage, and the configuration of the detector loops and the operation of the bollard.
- 3.6 It is recommended that Committee approve an option, based on the information contained within this report. Following that decision, more detailed work will be undertaken on design, if required.

Author

Name	Designation	Contact Details
Charles Haggart	Traffic & Network Manager	01738 475000 TESCommitteeReports@pkc.gov.uk

Approved

Name	Designation	Date
Barbara Renton	Executive Director (Environment)	12 March 2018

If you or someone you know would like a copy of this document in another language or format, (on occasion, only a summary of the document will be provided in translation), this can be arranged by contacting the Customer Service Centre on 01738 475000.

You can also send us a text message on 07824 498145.

All Council Services can offer a telephone translation facility.

1. IMPLICATIONS, ASSESSMENTS, CONSULTATION AND COMMUNICATION

Strategic Implications	Yes/No
Community Plan / Single Outcome Agreement	Yes
Corporate Plan	Yes
Resource Implications	
Financial	YES
Workforce	YES
Asset Management (land, property, IST)	YES
Assessments	
Equality Impact Assessment	Yes
Strategic Environmental Assessment	Yes
Sustainability (community, economic, environmental)	Yes
Legal and Governance	Yes
Risk	None
Consultation	
Internal	Yes
External	Yes
Communication	
Communications Plan	Yes

1. Strategic Implications

Community Plan / Single Outcome Agreement

- 1.1 The Perth and Kinross Community Planning Partnership (CPP) brings together organisations to plan and deliver services for the people of Perth and Kinross. Together the CPP has developed the Perth and Kinross Community Plan which outlines the key things we think are important for Perth and Kinross.

- i) Giving every child the best start in life
- ii) Developing educated, responsible and informed citizens
- iii) Promoting a prosperous, inclusive and sustainable economy
- iv) Supporting people to lead independent, healthy and active lives
- v) Creating a safe and sustainable place for future generations

- 1.2 It is considered that the actions contained within this report contribute to all of the above objectives.

Corporate Plan

- 1.3 The Council's Corporate Plan 2013-2018 outlines the same five objectives as those detailed above in the Community Plan. These objectives provide a clear strategic direction, inform decisions at a corporate and service level and shape resource allocation. It is considered that the actions contained in the

report contribute to the objectives as outlined in paragraph 1.2 above. These objectives are met by implementing schemes which promote road safety.

2. Resource Implications

Financial

Capital

- 2.1 There are the following cost implications depending on which Option Committee decides upon:
- Option 1 - to retain the bollard has no immediate Capital cost implications, however, approximately £2,500 may be required to amend signage and detector loops depending on the outcome of discussions with the maintenance contract provider.
 - Option 2 would cost approximately £7,500 to implement
 - Option 3 would cost approximately £25,000 which would include removal of the bollard and traffic calming works.

Revenue

- 2.2 There will be no direct costs from the recommendation within this report. Although there may be revenue spend on future measures to improve compliance such as signs and cutting of loops.
- 2.3 It is estimated from previous three year's spend on bollard repairs there will be an annual cost of approximately £4000 to maintain the bollard. This is already included in the UTC revenue budget.

Workforce

- 2.4 Staff will spend time investigating and implementing measures which may improve compliance or the operation of the system if Option 1 is chosen. For Options 2 and 3, staff will spend time furthering designs and implementing the construction works required.

Asset Management (land, property, IT)

- 2.5 There are no land and property, or information technology implications arising from the contents of this report.

3. Assessments

Equality Impact Assessment

- 3.1 Under the Equality Act 2010, the Council is required to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity, and foster good relations

between equality groups. Carrying out Equality Impact Assessments for plans and policies allows the Council to demonstrate that it is meeting these duties.

- 3.2 This section should reflect that the proposals have been considered under the Corporate Equalities Impact Assessment process (EqIA) with the following outcome:

(i) Assessed as **not relevant** for the purposes of EqIA.

Strategic Environmental Assessment

- 3.3 Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) is a legal requirement under the Environmental Assessment (Scotland) Act 2005 that applies to all qualifying plans, programmes and strategies, including policies (PPS). The proposals have been considered under the Act and no further action is required as it does not qualify as a PPS as defined by the Act and is therefore exempt.

Sustainability

- 3.4 Under the provisions of the Local Government in Scotland Act 2003 the Council has to discharge its duties in a way which contributes to the achievement of sustainable development. In terms of the Climate Change Act, the Council has a general duty to demonstrate its commitment to sustainability and the community, environmental and economic impacts of its actions.
- 3.5 The proposals contained within the report are assessed to have a positive impact on sustainability, particularly with regard to encouraging sustainable modes of travel.

Legal and Governance

- 3.6 The Order will be promoted in accordance with The Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (Scotland) Regulations 1999.

Risk

- 3.7 There are no significant risks associated with the implementation of this project.

4. Consultation

- 4.1 The Head of Legal and Governance, the Head of Democratic Services and the Head of Finance have been consulted in the preparation of this report.
- 4.2 This report details the results of the consultation with local residents and local community groups to allow the Elected Members to decide how to progress. If any changes to the layout are to be made then consultation will be undertaken with Police Scotland and other emergency services.

5. Communication

- 5.1 Should Committee decide to progress with Option 2 or Option 3, this will allow a start to be made to the formal procedure to vary the Traffic Regulation Order. This procedure will involve statutory consultation, preparation of a draft TRO and advertising in the press. This will provide an opportunity for additional comments to be made or objections to be raised. Should objections be raised, these will be reported back to Committee, with appropriate recommendations.

6. Background Papers

- 6.1 Enterprise and Infrastructure Committee on 14 June 2017 (Report No. 17/215)

7. Appendices

- 7.1 Appendix 1 shows the Option 2 proposal