



Powys County Council

Highways Maintenance Manual
(HMM)

2019

Version Control

Version	Action	Who	Date
1.0	Cabinet Approval	Cabinet	
1.0	Scrutiny		
1.0	Issue for Approval	Highway Asset Management Strategy Group (HAMSG)	June 2019

1. Capital Programme - Summary of Income and Allocation
2. Capital Programme - Proposed Scheme Allocation
3. General Works Programme Ranking Scheme
– Factors, Weightings and Scorings – Guidance Notes
4. Schemes for Prioritisation in General Works Programme
5. Surfacing materials Life Expectancy
6. SCHEME RANKING STRUCTURES (CAPITAL)
7. SCHEME RANKING STRUCTURES (CAPITAL) – Guidance Notes
8. Structure Ranking Scheme List
9. Structure Ranking Scheme List
10. SCHEME RANKING SMALL & SAFETY SCHEMES (CAPITAL)
11. SCHEME RANKING SMALL & SAFETY SCHEMES (CAPITAL)
– Guidance Notes
12. SCHEME RANKING TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT
13. SCHEME RANKING TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT – GUIDANCE NOTES
14. SCHEME RANKING 20 MPH ZONES (CAPITAL)
15. SCHEME RANKING 20 MPH ZONES (CAPITAL) - GUIDANCE NOTES

This page is intentionally blank

16. **Introduction**

- 16.1. The Highways Maintenance Manual (HMM) is a living document that contains guidance, advice and information on the practical implementation of the Highways Asset Management Plan (HAMP).
- 16.2. The HMM is developed through the Highways Asset Management Strategy Group (HAMSG) and approved by the Head of Service.

Environment Directorate
Highways, Transport and Recycling
Highway Infrastructure Capital Programme 2019 - 2024
Summary of Income and Proposed Expenditure

Capital Programme - Highways Infrastructure		Proposed	Proposed	Proposed	Proposed	Proposed	
Expenditure		2019/2020	2020/2021	2021/2022	2022/2023	2023/2024	Notes
		£	£	£	£	£	
951001	Major Strategic	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	Current moratorium on schemes unless they unlock significant inward investment
951002	Integrated Transport	£250,000	£200,000	£200,000	£200,000	£200,000	Car Park resurfacing and Traffic Signals renewals
951003	Street Lighting (Environmental and Highway)	£100,000	£250,000	£250,000	£250,000	£250,000	Specific allocation from prudential borrowing
951004	Major Remedial Earthworks	£262,000	£50,000	£50,000	£50,000	£50,000	
951005	Structural Drainage Improvements	£235,000	£50,000	£50,000	£50,000	£50,000	Allocations from a combination of Council funding (core, specific or prudential borrowing), grant or income
	Vehicle Containment at Hazards	£0	£100,000	£100,000	£100,000	£100,000	
951006	Highway Strengthening (Resurfacing)	£3,000,000	£2,475,000	£2,475,000	£2,475,000	£2,475,000	
951007	Structural Repair of Town Centre Footways	£170,000	£50,000	£50,000	£50,000	£50,000	Priorities based on ranking schemes and deliverability
951009	Structures Strengthening and Renewals	£1,020,000	£1,000,000	£1,000,000	£1,000,000	£1,000,000	
951010	Structural Maintenance - Roads	£1,586,000	£1,500,000	£1,500,000	£1,500,000	£1,500,000	
951011	Surface Dressing	£1,800,000	£1,800,000	£1,800,000	£1,800,000	£1,800,000	
951012	Estates Enhancement	£100,000	£100,000	£100,000	£100,000	£100,000	Continuation of schemes delivering community benefits
951013	Road Safety & Traffic Management	£75,000	£75,000	£75,000	£75,000	£75,000	Schemes specifically approved through Portfolio Holder for Highways based on ranked priority
951015	Flood Alleviation	£50,000	£50,000	£50,000	£50,000	£50,000	Flood drainage infrastructure schemes
951018	Local Transport Fund	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	Welsh Government Grant
951019	Safe Routes in Communities	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	Welsh Government Grant
951020	Active Travel Fund	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	Welsh Government Grant
Total Highways Infrastructure Expenditure		£8,648,000	£7,700,000	£7,700,000	£7,700,000	£7,700,000	
Income		Approved	Approved	Approved	Approved	Approved	Cabinet approval 12/02/2019
		2019/2020	2020/2021	2021/2022	2022/2023	2023/2024	
		£	£	£	£	£	
	Supported Borrowing and General Capital Grant (Core Allocation - All Areas)	£1,500,000	£1,500,000	£1,500,000	£1,500,000	£1,500,000	2019/2020 to 2023/2024 Core allocation
	2018/2019 Roll Forwards						
	Additional funding through Specific Bids						
951003	Street Lighting	£250,000	£250,000	£250,000	£250,000	£100,000	Financed from Capital Receipts
951009	Bridge Renewal/Strengthening	£500,000	£500,000	£500,000	£500,000	£500,000	
951010	Structural Maintenance - Roads	£1,120,000	£1,500,000	£1,500,000	£1,500,000	£1,500,000	Financed from Capital Receipts and Prudential Borrowing
	Highways (HAMP)	£1,750,000	£3,500,000	£4,800,000	£4,800,000	£4,900,000	Financed from Borrowing
951010	Highways Capitalised Revenue	£466,000	£0	£0	£0	£0	Finance from 2017/2018 not realised in 2018/2019 budgets.
	Roads Refurbishment Grant Displacement	£1,579,411	£0	£0	£0	£0	Displaced County Capital due to WG grant in 2018/2019
	Welsh Government Grants						
	Public Highways Refurbishment	£1,574,623	£1,574,623	£0	£0	£0	Welsh Government Grant - indicative figure for 2020/20201
951010	Storm Callum	£120,000	£0	£0	£0	£0	Welsh Government Grant
Total Highways Infrastructure Income		£8,860,034	£8,824,623	£8,550,000	£8,550,000	£8,500,000	
Difference		£212,034	£1,124,623	£850,000	£850,000	£800,000	

Environment Directorate
Highways, Transport and Recycling
Highway Infrastructure Capital Programme 2019 / 2020
Proposed Schemes

Example

Job Number	Proposed Work Category / Scheme Name	Proposed 2019/2020
	Major Strategic	£0
	Integrated Transport	£266,000
CIN00116	Gas Street Car Park, Newtown	£240,000
CIN00117	Gravel Car Park, Newtown	£100,000
	Priory Hill, Brecon - Pelican Crossing	
	Cwmtwrch - Pelican Crossing	
	Street Lighting (Environmental & Highway)	£100,000
	Major Remedial Earthworks	£262,000
CIN00076	B4518, Gabion Wall collapse & road subsidence	£160,000
CIN00118	B4580, Llansilin	£32,000
CIN00119	B4392 Laundry Lane Junction	£40,000
CIS00081	U1582 Beili Bog, Bwlchysarnau	£20,000
CIS00082	C0198 Coelbren adjacent to 27 Ddol Henryd	£20,000
CIS00083	U0134 Pot Lane Llanigon	£50,000
CIS00084	U0406 Caerlan	£10,000
	Structural Drainage Improvements	£235,000
CIN00120	B4518, U2305 Jct Maesgwion	£40,000
CIN00121	C2058, Cefn-y-Fastre	£36,000
CIN00122	B4568 Fox's Pitch	£12,000
CIN00123	C2006 Porth Llifior	£12,000
CIS00085	B4518 Pantydwr	£10,000
CIS00086	Hay Festival site	£48,000
CIS00087	Brecon Road Hay-on-Wye	£45,000
CIS00088	C0036 Pantgwyn	£12,000
CIS00089	C0151 Pontsticill Reservoir	£20,000
	Highway Strengthening (Resurfacing)	£3,000,000
CIG00001	EDS Fees	
CIN00127	U4225 Heol Vastre	£64,000
	C2219 Llanrhaeadr	£60,000
	C2002 Bwlch y ddar to Tyn y pistol	£100,000
CIN00113	B4393 Courthouse Lane to Hawthorn House, Four Crosses	£60,000
	U4412, Brookfield Road, Welshpool	£40,000
CIN00111	A490 Happy Valley to B4393 Jct	£170,000
	U2370, U2896 Jct to C2041	£102,000
CIN00112	U2161 Access to Min Gwern	£35,000
	A490 Shade Oak to Groesllwyd	£168,000
	C2200 Green Inn to Llansilin	£26,500
	U2250 Middle Heldre Lane Bridge to Crossroads	£42,000
	B4385, Berriew Village outside Butchers to Old Post Office (Finamac)	£13,000
	B4385, Mellinton to county boundary	£40,000
	C2006, Pentre Llifior to C2050 Jct, Llys Hendy to 130 mtrs past Blackwood bridge	£72,000
	B4568, Crescent Roundabout to beyond Brynwood Drive (Finamac)	£23,500
	U2417, Minafon	£31,500
	U4256, Crescent Street	£21,000
	B4569, Caersws 30MPH to A470T Caersws (Finamac)	£24,000
	U4233, Lon/Llys Afallen Trehafren (Finamac)	£6,000
	U4234, Lon Gwern Trehafren (Finamac)	£8,500
	U4235, Lon Derw Trehafren (Finamac)	£5,500
	C2023, A470(T) Jct to passed Slaughter House Jct	£42,000
	C2006, C2014 Gareg-Lwyd to C2010 Finger Post Jct	£120,000

Environment Directorate
Highways, Transport and Recycling
Highway Infrastructure Capital Programme 2019 / 2020
Proposed Schemes

Example

Job Number	Proposed Work Category / Scheme Name	Proposed 2019/2020
	C2020, Penygreen Road, Llanidloes (Finamac & Resurface)	£84,000
	U2612, C2006 to C2010 (Cabin Wood, Gregynog Hall School)	£28,000
	U1488 Smatcher, New Radnor	£27,000
	C1362 Gore quarry entrance	£35,000
	C1222 Pendre Crossgates to jct A483	£77,000
	U1321 to the Dernol	£30,000
	U1481 Llawrllan housing estate, Rhayader (Finamac)	£10,000
	B4594 from western 30mph to C1371 Jct	£57,000
	C1217, Crossways Crossgates to Rock House	£27,000
	C1217, Rock House to Sunnysbank Farm House, Llanddewi	£28,000
	U1551 Graig Goch Dam	£25,000
	U1555 Elan Vally Visitor Centre	£19,000
	U1307 Jct C1336 to Jct C1338	£20,000
	U1306 Jct C1338 to Brynthomas farm	£15,000
	C1203 from A483 Jct to Bwchysarnau	£25,000
	U1756, Laurels Meadows, Knighton (Finamac)	£7,000
	B4355 Felindre Valley	£30,000
	C1339 Rugby Club to Cefn Morfa & Gorse Farm Jct (Finamac)	£21,000
	C0028 between Dolmenyn Crossroads and Builth Wells	£17,000
	U1700 Bowling Green from A488 to resurfacing joint	TBC
	C1351 Franksbridge to A481 Jct	£60,000
	B4362 Jct B4355 to Greenfield roundabout (Finamac)	£20,500
	C1085 Llandegley to Cilmanowyd, Dolau	£59,000
	U1133 from junction A483 to end Cefnbronllys	£53,000
	U0059 Newry Road, Builth Wells	£15,000
	U0046 Tyn-y-Graig	£60,000
	U0047 Maesmynis	£25,000
	U0805, Groesfordd Estate (Finamac)	£7,000
	U0803, Groesfordd Park (Finamac)	£7,000
	Richmond Park, Ystradgynlais (Finamac)	£8,500
	C0200 from Cwm Giedd lights to Commercial Street	£20,000
	A438 / A4079 Jct to past Old Barn Three Cocks	£40,000
	U0148 Penbont Road, Talgarth	£45,000
	U0390 Club Lane, Ystradgynlais (from barrier at club entrance to A4067 Jct)	£10,000
	A4221 Jct at C0198 Coelbren to CB with NPT	£31,500
	U1416 Clyro	£18,000
	Bronllys village	£10,000
	Cerrigochan Lane, Brecon	£24,000
	C0136, Llangattock to Canal Bridge	£17,500
	U0410 from bus stop at Abercrave Inn to Jct of A4067	£27,000
	A4079 Pipton Bridge	£22,500
	C0223 Speed limit, Elstons to traffic lights inc Cotswolds	£26,500
	B4560 Llangynidr to Beaufort	£27,000
	U0080 Crickadarn	£50,000
	U0412 Cae Hopkin from C0198 to Cycle Track	£24,000
	C0198 from A4067 over River Tawe Bridge to Jct U0410	£21,000
	B4350 Brecon Road, Hay-on-Wye	£24,000
	U0569 Cae Porth/Groesfordd, Llangynidr (Finamac)	£18,111
	U1440 Llanstephan	£22,500
	U1395 Fferm	£22,500
	U0779 Lion Street, Hay-on-Wye	£21,500
	C0182 from County Boundary to Hepste Bridge	£22,500

Environment Directorate **Example**
Highways, Transport and Recycling
Highway Infrastructure Capital Programme 2019 / 2020
Proposed Schemes

Job Number	Proposed Work Category / Scheme Name	Proposed 2019/2020
	Structural Repair of Town Centre Footways	£170,000
CIN00124	UF0085 Working mens club to red bank 120 x 1.5 plus side support	£10,000
CIN00125	UF0054 Trehafren, Newtown	£24,000
CIN00126	Kerry village footways	£33,000
CIS00090	U1723 Rockes Meadow, Knighton	£15,000
CIS00091	U0869 Oaklands Crescent, Builth Wells	£5,000
CIS00092	C0002 Deanway, Llanwrtyd Wells (inc. Berthlwyd)	£5,000
CIS00094	Cerrigochan Hill	£36,000
CIS00095	C0250 Brecon Town Centre and Watton	£40,000
CIS00096	C0200 Commercial Street to Cwmgiedd Lights	£16,000
CIS00097	Footpath Heol Twrch to Swyn-y-Nant	£10,000
	Structures Strengthening and Renewals	£1,190,000
	<i>B4398, New Bridge, Vyrnwy (CB02328) - Strengthening</i>	£170,000
CIS00098	C0036 Cwmcynog (CB00101) - Replacement	£110,000
CIS00099	C0166 Trep Philip (CB00314) - Redecking	£30,000
CIS00100	A488 Teme (CB01051) - Abutment strengthening	£35,000
CIS00101	Lamb and Flag (CB04007) - Replacement	£260,000
CIS00102	U0586 Wenllan (CB00726) - Redecking	£35,000
CIS00103	C1343 Cwmddu (CB01390) - Redecking	£50,000
CIS00071	B4350, Hay Bridge (CB00262) - Parapet Upgrade	£0
CIS00078	Gwtws Path Retaining Wall (CB07187) - New retaining wall	£200,000
CIS00041	Planned Maintenance (South)	£200,000
CIN00066	Planned Maintenance (North)	£200,000
	Structural Maintenance - Roads	£1,586,000
CIS00007	Structural Maintenance - Roads	£1,586,000
	Surface Dressing	£1,800,000
CIS00042	Surface Dressing (South)	£900,000
CIN00067	Surface Dressing (North)	£900,000
	Estates Enhancement	£172,000
CIS00046	Estates Enhancement	£100,000
	Road Safety & Traffic Management	£75,000
CIN00105	A490 Redbank Junction, Welshpool	
CIN00106	C2200 Green Inn Junction, Llangedwyn (part funded 18/19)	
CIS00076	A4067/B4599 Trawsffordd, Ystradgynlais - Junction Improvement	£12,500
CIS00077	A4068 Bethel Road to Heol Twrch, Lower Cwmtwrch - Mini Roundabout	£10,000
CIN00114	B4518 Llangurig Road, Llanidloes - Footway	£35,000
	Flood Alleviation	£50,000
CIX00014	Arlais Brook Telemetry	£9,000
CIX00015	Dolfor Brook Telemetry	£7,000
CIX00016	Pantyyffynon Road Flood Relief Scheme - Design and Development	£10,000
CIX00017	Pregge Lane Drainage Improvements - Construction	£35,000
CIX00018	Castlefield Close Rhosgoch - Design and Development	£7,500
CIX00019	Llowes FAS - OBC	£15,000
CIX00020	Cwmbach Village FAS - OBC	£15,000
CIX00021	Woodlands Avenue & Brynderwen FAS - OBC	£15,000
CIX00022	Pontfaen FAS - FBC	£30,000
CIX00023	Lledan Brook FAS (Phase 3) - Construction	£130,000
		£8,906,000

General Works Programme Ranking Scheme – Factors, Weightings and Scorings – Guidance Notes

Allocations are prioritised based on six weighted factors with a Priority Score being calculated for individual schemes where:

$$\text{Priority Score} = \text{Total of } \left[\text{Score} \times \text{Weighting} \right] \text{ For each Factor}$$

Schemes are included in the priority list on the basis of their Priority Score.

Factors such as deliverability can affect where a scheme will feature in the delivery programme.

Factor	Sub-category	Weighting	Score = 1	Score = 2	Score = 3	Score = 4	Score = 5	Unique Factor
Hierarchy	Carriageway	20	CH5	CH4	CH3	CH2	CHSR CH1	Only used in exceptional circumstances where normal scoring criteria does not give sufficient weight to the severity.
	Footway	30	FH5	FH4	FH3	FH2	FHVHU FH1	
Safety/Risk	Accident	30	Low Likelihood Low Severity	Medium Likelihood Low Severity	Medium Likelihood Medium Severity	Medium Likelihood High Severity	High Likelihood High Severity	
Engineering	Condition	10	Low Will last over 5 Years	Low Within 3 to 5 Years	Medium Within 2 to 3 Years	Medium Within 1 to 2 Years	High Next Years Programme	
Democratic	Elected Member	10	Low Priority		Medium Priority		High Priority	
Local	Community Council and/or Public complaint	None	Low Priority		Medium Priority		High Priority	

Highways Asset Management Plan (HAMP) 2019

Surfacing materials Life Expectancy.

Predicting the life expectancy for surfacing materials is an important consideration in capital funding and works programming.

In May 2011 the Association of Directors of Environment, Economy, Planning and Transport (ADEPT) together with the Road Surface Treatments Association (RSTA) published a joint report titled "Service Life of Surface Treatments" www.rsta-uk.org/downloads/RSTA-ADEPT-Service-Life-document.pdf which considered average life expectancy having regard to requirements for asset management best practice.

Using the ADEPT/RSTA document as a baseline and having regard to the nature of routes across Powys the following indicative life expectancies are considered appropriate for the region:

Road Class	Urban/Rural	Resurfacing	Micro Surfacing	Surface Dressing
		Interval (years)	Interval (years)	Interval (years)
Class 1	Urban	30	10	10
	Rural	30	10	10
Class 2	Urban	40	12	12
	Rural	60	15	15
Class 3	Urban	40	15	20
	Rural	60	25	20
Unclassified	Urban	40	15	25
	Rural	60	25	25

Table 1

LOCAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES SCHEME RANKING STRUCTURES (CAPITAL)

Scheme Information

Scheme Title	
Location	
Brief Details	
Brief History (Including impetus for the scheme) and Documents attached	
Ranked By	
Date of Ranking	
Ranking Stage	

Financial Implications

Element	Note	Ref	£ ,000
Total Scheme Cost	Including fees	A	
Previous expenditure	Land, advance purchase, NOT fees.	B	
	Remaining Cost (A - B)	C	
Impact on Revenue budgets (5 year costs, savings, income)	Enter savings/income as positive, costs/commitments as negative.	D	
Financial Impact on the Public (Delays are accounted elsewhere)	Journey Costs, etcetera. Assume for these purposes; Domestic vehicles cost 11p/mile, HGV's cost £1/mile.	E	
	Cost Factor (C - D - E)		

Availability of Alternatives

Factor should be within the range 1.0 to 1.5	Factor
See Guidance Notes	

Ranking Factor

$\frac{(\text{FACTORS SCORE}) \times 1000}{(\text{ALTERNATIVES FACTOR}) \times (\text{COST FACTOR})}$	=	$\frac{\quad}{\quad}$	
---	---	-----------------------	--

Summary

NETWORK FACTORS	30	ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS	30
SAFETY IMPACT	42	DEMOCRATIC OBJECTIVES	24
COMMUNITY FACTORS	24	ECONOMIC FACTORS	24

**LOCAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES
SCHEME RANKING
STRUCTURES (CAPITAL) ASSESSMENT OF IMPACT**

Element	See G N Ref	Wtg	INFLUENCE / IMPACT / VALUE							Score Impact x Wtg	Reason (See note)
			Negative			None	Positive				
			H -5	M -3	L -1	0	L +1	M +3	H +5		
NETWORK FACTORS											
Strategic Impact or Value	N1	8									
User Volumes (Traffic)	N2	9									
Nature of Use	N3	9									
Impact on Journey times	N4	4									
Network Factors											
SAFETY FACTORS											
Fatalities	S1	10									
Serious	S2	10									
Slight	S3	8									
Controlled Facilities	S4	6									
Segregation of Users	S5	8									
Safety Impact Factors											
COMMUNITY FACTORS											
Lifestyle / Comfort	C1	4									
Severance	C2	8									
Access to Services / Facilities	C3	5									
Access for All (Disadvantaged)	C4	7									
Community Factors											
ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS											
Impact on Pollution (All forms)	E1	9									
Environmental Impact	E2	7									
Aesthetic Impact	E3	7									
Sustainability & Whole Life Costs	E4	7									
Environmental Factors											
DEMOCRATIC FACTORS											
Governmental Objectives	D1	4									
County Objectives	D2	5									
Departmental Objectives	D3	6									
Service Objectives	D4	7									
Statutory Duty	D5	2									
Objectives Factors											
ECONOMIC FACTORS											
Inward Investment	EC1	6									
Access to Grant Aid	EC2	5									
Economic Regeneration / Local Employment	EC3	7									
Tourism	EC4	6									
Economic Factors											
UNIQUE FACTORS											
(Describe)											
Unique Factors											
TOTAL IMPACT FACTORS SCORE										(Sum)	

**LOCAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES
SCHEME RANKING
STRUCTURES CAPITAL - GUIDANCE NOTES**

The Impact score is a measure of the net benefit that undertaking a scheme will provide over the 'do nothing' alternative. In the majority of cases impacts are beneficial (positive score), but disbenefits are common, for instance the provision of a Pelican crossing may delay through traffic, cause traffic noise and fumes, or affect parking.

GN Ref.	Element	Notes
NETWORK FACTORS		
N1	Strategic Impact or Value	Importance to National and County Network: e.g. Primary County Strategic Route = Positive High (+5) County Distributor = Positive Medium (+3) Local Distributor Route = Positive Low (+1) Local Access to 10 or less properties = None (0) Sole access route may warrant consideration under 'unique factors'
N2	User Volumes (Traffic)	How much traffic uses the route over the structure? The higher the traffic volumes then the more benefit derived from carrying out the scheme. 0 - 200 vehicles / day, None (0) 200 - 600 vpd, Positive Low (+1) 600 - 1500 vpd, Positive Medium (+3) 1500 vpd and above, Positive High (+5)
N3	Nature of Use	What type of traffic uses the structure? (is there a need to strengthen to full C&U) up to 3% HGV enter 0 3 - 6% HGV enter +1 6 - 10% HGV enter +3 over 10% HGV enter +5
N4	Impact on Journey Times/Delays (due to waiting at site because of traffic control, etc)	How significant would the scheme be in maintaining vehicle flows at near normal levels or avoiding delays arising from constraints? Up to 30 seconds per journey time saved score 0 30 seconds to 1 minutes score +1 1 to 2 minutes +3 over 2 minutes +5. Impacts relating to the time and length of a diversion route will normally be covered in the Financial assessment and the alternatives factor
SAFETY FACTORS		
S1	Accidents – Fatal	How many fatal accidents are predicted to be saved by the project each year? Up to 3 is +1 score 4 to 7 is +3 8 or more is +5. For prospective additional slight 1 additional is -1, 2 or 3 is -3, and 4 or more is -5.
S2	Accidents – Serious	How many serious accidents are predicted to be saved by the project each year? Up to 3 is +1 score 4 to 7 is +3

		8 or more is +5. For prospective additional slight 1 additional is -1, 2 or 3 is -3, and 4 or more is -5.
S3	Accidents – Slight	How many slight accidents are predicted to be saved by the project each year? Up to 3 is +1 score 4 to 7 is +3 8 or more is +5. For prospective additional slight 1 additional is -1, 2 or 3 is -3, and 4 or more is -5.
S4	Controlled Facilities	Provision of dedicated controlled facilities +5, provision of pedestrian phase within Traffic lights, +3, centre island or other benefits, +1, and etc.
S5	Segregation of Users	Is a separate footway/cycle way for pedestrians/cyclists to be provided? segregation by lining and signing, score +1, providing adjacent full standard facility score +3, providing separate facility score +5
COMMUNITY FACTORS		
C1	Lifestyle / Comfort	Does the proposal improve the lifestyle/comfort for the people using the route. Removal of a weight limit, which severely restricts the movement of traffic, will score highly. Removal of traffic control may improve the situation for neighbouring properties, i.e. reduction in noise and air pollution from waiting vehicles.
C2	Severance	Is this the only route out of a community?, if so consider extent of severance (delay, weight limits, etc). Absolute Severance of the only access to an area may justify a 'unique factor' entry, of up to 10 times the number of domestic properties served
C3	Access to Services / Facilities	Does the proposal improve access to facilities such as schools, shops, libraries, leisure centres, etc.
C4	Access for all (Disadvantaged)	Does the proposal improve facilities that will be of specific help to the mobility of those with difficulties or the vulnerable, that is the Disadvantaged, School Children, the Elderly, the visually impaired, the infirm, those with prams, those in wheelchairs or with walking aids, those that rely on walking/cycling/public transport and any other 'disadvantaged' groups
ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS		
E1	Impact on Pollution (All forms)	Will the end project impact on pollution of watercourses or will there be an impact on vehicle derived pollution (noise or emissions) or is there an impact on any other pollution form. Improvements are positive (+) whilst increased pollution scores negative (-)
E2	Environmental Impact	Does the scheme affect areas of vegetation, are water or other habitats affected, is there an impact on SSSI's or other special sites.
E3	Aesthetic Impact	Does the scheme improve or detract from the visual amenity in an area of outstanding natural beauty or a conservation area, is the structure 'listed',
E4	Sustainability & Whole Life Costs	Is the proposal sustainable and does it offer the 'best' whole life option.
DEMOCRATIC FACTORS		
D1	Governmental Objectives	Raising the weight limit by 3 classes counts +5, by 2 classes counts +3, and by 1 class counts +1. The proposal may also impact on other Governmental Objectives such as safe routes to school, Road Traffic Reduction, etc
D2	County Objectives	The Authority is developing Corporate Objectives through the 'Corporate Plan', these will include measures to address Social Inclusion, Anti Poverty and Environmental issues. Additionally the Department's Performance Plan (BV) and the previous Service Delivery Plan and other Departmental
D3	Departmental Objectives	Consider the contents of the published Objectives. These include for instance the removal of Constraints to movement.
D4	Service Objectives	The above documents contain Service Objectives, which are/will be reviewed.

		The current Objective for the Bridge maintenance service as stated as 'Maintaining the Quality of the Road National Assembly Highways Directorate Foot Bridges in Powys'.
D5	Statutory Duty	Consider the consequences of failing to deliver a duty, Avoidance of Prosecution would score +5 or +3, avoidance of a legal rebuke would score +1, or perhaps failing to deliver a duty may have no consequence, score 0. Conversely, if the proposal is likely to engender a prosecution or rebuke, then a negative score is appropriate
ECONOMIC FACTORS		
EC1	Inward Investment	Is the project likely to engender or facilitate investment in Powys Better than £2 investment for each £1 spent, score +5, 75p to £2 score +3, 10p to 75p score +1, and conversely if the proposal may prejudice inward investment score a negative
EC2	Access to Grant Aid	Is the project supported by grants or match funding from other sources such as WDA, CCW, etc (score same as above)
EC3	Economic Regeneration / Local Employment	Could the scheme encourage businesses to develop or enable existing businesses to continue. In contrast to the short term investments considered in EC1 above this relates to the longer term economic or commercial impacts, and as above can be a positive score for benefit or a negative score for disbenefits.
EC4	Tourism	Will the scheme encourage, enable, or sustain tourism in the area. Consider implications arising from parking facilities, constraints to movement (domestic vehicles and Coaches), aesthetic impacts, etc.
UNIQUE FACTORS		
		Any unique factors not covered elsewhere.
	(describe)	This should only be used in exceptional circumstances.

Availability of Alternatives

Where an acceptable alternative route is available then it is clearly not as important to upgrade a substandard structure to full capacity. The degree of acceptability should be determined using the following guideline.

Alternatives Factor	1.5	1.4	1.3	1.2	1.1	1.0	0.5
Additional Journey Distance	up to 1 mile	1 to 2 miles	2 to 3 miles	3 to 5 miles	5 to 7 miles	over 7 miles	Severance

Note: The suggested ranges for these factors should not be taken too rigidly, the condition, impact, and suitability of the alternative must also be taken into account.

Structure Ranking Scheme

Sample

Structure Number		2270	3007	1513	1469	2389	1199	2271
Shire Area		M	M	R	R	M	R	M
LE Area								
Road Number		B4393	U2308	U1507	C1337	U2343	U1400	B4393
Structure Name		Llandrinio	Crincoed	Fron-las	Cloggau	Aber Nodwydd	Llowes Mill	Schoolbrook
Budget		£230,824	£120,780	£113,400	£21,788	£41,847	£30,690	£55,440
Local Member			Bob Morgan					
Community Council			Llanbrynmair			Banwy	Glasbury	Llandrinio
Assessment Value		7.5 tonnes	3 tonnes	C&U	0 tonnes	3 tonnes	7.5 tonnes	7.5 tonnes
Current Constraint		7.5 tonnes	C&U	C&U	Closed	C&U	C&U	C&U
Span		37.85	12.20	6.00	1.25	3.70	3.30	2.00
Deck Width		4.62	3.30	4.50	4.15	3.77	3.10	6.60
Total Area		174.87	40.26	27.00	5.19	13.95	10.23	13.20
Scheme Factor		1	2	3	3	2	2	3
Scheme Type			Replacement	Replacement	Replacement	Redecking	Redecking	Replacement
Cost of Scheme		£230,824	£120,780	£113,400	£21,788	£41,847	£30,690	£55,440
Alternative Route Mileage	1000	36.0	0.0	0.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	2.5
No. of Commercial Properties affected	12	1	1	0	0	0	0	
No. of Farms affected	10		1	1	1	1	0	
No. of Domestic Properties affected	8	0	0	0	0	0	6	
No. of HGV's per day		12	11	10	10	10	0	0
HGV Cost per day	£1.00	£432.00	£0.00	£0.00	£60.00	£1,000.00	£1,000.00	£0.00
No. of Cars per day		0	0	0	0	0	48	0
Car Cost per day	£0.11	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£1,000.00	£1,000.00	£0.00
Total Cost per day		£432.00	£1,000.00	£1,000.00	£60.00	£2,000.00	£2,000.00	£0.00
Ranked By		RAR	RAR	RAR	RAR	RAR	RAR	RAR
Date of Ranking		Jan-16	Jan-16	Jan-15	Feb-14	Jan-13	Jan-13	Jan-13
Nature of Assessment		c	c	c	c	c	c	c
N1	8	5	0	0	1	0	0	5
N2	9	3	0	0	1	0	0	3
N3	9	5	5	0	5	5	3	3
N4	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
NF	Total	116	45	0	62	45	27	94
S1	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
S2	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
S3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
S4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
S5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SF	Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
C1	4	5	5	3	3	5	3	3
C2	8	3	5	3	3	5	1	3
C3	5	0	0	0	3	3	3	3
C4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CF	Total	44	60	36	51	75	35	51
E1	9	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
E2	7	0	0	-1	0	0	0	0
E3	7	1	0	1	1	1	1	1
E4	7	3	1	3	5	3	3	3
EF	Total	37	7	30	42	28	28	28
D1	4	5	5	1	5	5	5	5
D2	5	5	5	1	5	5	5	5
D3	6	5	5	1	5	5	5	5
D4	7	5	5	1	5	5	5	5
D5	2	5	5	0	5	1	0	0
DF	Total	120	120	22	120	112	110	110
EC1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
EC2	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0
EC3	7	3	5	0	1	3	0	0
EC4	6	0	5	0	0	0	0	0
ECF	Total	46	65	0	7	21	0	0
Unique Factor		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Impact Factors	Score	363	297	88	282	281	200	283
Fin. C funding required		£230,824	£120,780	£113,400	£21,788	£41,847	£30,690	£55,440
Fin. D Revenue 5 year save	1,825	£0	£0	-£5,400	£0	£0	£0	£0
Fin. E Public 5 year save	1,825	£788	£1,825	£1,825	£110	£3,650	£3,650	£0
Total Cost Factor		230036	118955	116975	21678	38197	27040	55440
Alt Fact.		1.0	0.5	0.5	1.1	0.5	0.5	1.3
Rank Fact		1578	4993	1505	11826	14713	14793	3927
Valid Ranking	Y/N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N
	Reason	Repaired 2016/2017	Replaced 2016/2017	Consistant flooding issue, new bridge required to replace existing culvert	Redecked 2014/2015	Apply a permanent weight restriction (3t MGW)	Permanent 18t MGW to be applied	Strengthened 2015/2016

LOCAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES SCHEME RANKING SMALL & SAFETY SCHEMES (CAPITAL)

Scheme Information

Scheme Title	
Location	
Brief Details	
Brief History (including impetus for the scheme) and Documents attached	

Financial Implications

Element	Note	Ref	£ ,000
Total Scheme Cost	(including Fees)	A	
Previous expenditure & external support	(Land, Advance purchase, external funding)	B	
Remaining Cost to PCC	(A - B)	C	
Impact on Revenue budgets (5 year costs, savings, income)	(enter savings/income as positive, costs/commitments as negative)	D	
Financial Impact on the Public	Delays, Journey Costs, etcetera	E	
	Cost Factor (C - D - E)		

Availability of Alternatives

Factor should be within the range 1.0 to 1.5 see Guidance notes	Factor

Ranking Factor

$\frac{(\text{FACTORS SCORE}) \times 1000}{(\text{ALTERNATIVES FACTOR}) \times (\text{COST FACTOR})}$	=	_____	
---	---	-------	--

Summary

GENERAL	20	ASSISTANCE TO THE VULNERABLE	30
HIGHWAY TRAFFIC FLOW	25	COMMITMENT	10
SAFETY IMPACT	40	DEMOCRATIC OBJECTIVES	30

LOCAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES SCHEME RANKING SMALL & SAFETY SCHEMES (CAPITAL) ASSESSMENT OF IMPACT

Element	see G N ref	Wtg	INFLUENCE / IMPACT / VALUE							Score Impact x Wtg	Reason see note
			Negative			None	Positive				
			H -5	M -3	L -1	0	L +1	M +3	H +5		
GENERAL											
Encourage local employment	G1	3									
Amenity	G2	3									
Council Policy	G3	5									
Disruption and delays	G4	3									
Access to grant aid	G5	2									
Impact on others	G6	4									
General factors											
TRAFFIC FACTORS											
Journey times	T1	6									
Community severance	T2	9									
Traffic Congestion	T3	6									
Layout improvement	T4	4									
Traffic factors											
SAFETY FACTORS											
Safety Improvement	S1	10									
Accident Reduction	S2	12									
Speed Management	S3	8									
Pedestrian Safety	S4	10									
Safety factors											
ASSISTANCE TO THE VULNERABLE											
Pedestrian Facilities	V1	8									
Disadvantaged Facilities	V2	10									
Controlled Pedestrian Crossing	V3	6									
Access to Services/Facilities	V4	6									
Assistance factors											
COMMITMENT											
Contractual Commitment	C1	5									
Completion of Phased Scheme	C2	5									
Commitment factors											
DEMOCRATIC OBJECTIVES											
Tourism	D1	3									
Crime	D2	1									
Cycling / Walking	D3	2									
Traffic Reduction	D4	2									
Public Transport	D5	2									
Social Regeneration	D6	1									
Social Inclusion	D7	1									
Sustainable Transport	D8	3									
Environmental Effects	D9	8									
Pollution	D10	7									
Objectives factor											
TOTAL IMPACT FACTORS SCORE										(sum)	

LOCAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES SCHEME RANKING SMALL & SAFETY SCHEMES (CAPITAL) GUIDANCE NOTES

The sum total Influence/Impact/Value Factor score is the net benefit/disbenefit that undertaking a scheme or project, will provide over the 'do nothing' alternative. In the majority of cases individual impacts may be beneficial (positive score), but disbenefits are common. For instance the provision of a Pelican crossing may have disbenefits to through traffic, to residents close to the facility (traffic noise, fumes, the lights etcetera) to traders (loss of parking) and due to the visual impact.

Additionally you are reminded that in some cases negative 'influence/impact/value' scores will not be appropriate, certain elements measure the value of the facility to the Council (the Public) and are absolute. Most elements however measure the impact (value) of the scheme/work to be done compared to the 'do nothing' scenario.

GN Ref.	Element	Notes
GENERAL		
G1	Encourage Local Employment	Is there going to be an effect on commerce in the area eg. Isolation of shops from delivery / customers, does scheme 'open up' opportunity for industrial development or improve safe access to works
G2	Amenity	
G3	Council Policy	
G4	Disruption and Delay	Does the scheme reduce disruption and delay to travellers and the public
G5	Access to Grant Aid	Does the scheme enable or engender short term investment in other projects (if this is built will other projects be built by other bodies) +5 for £100,000 or more investment, +3 for £30,000 to £99,999, and +1 for any lower investment
G6	Impact on others	Travellers, traders, consider any influences on 'third parties'
TRAFFIC FACTORS		
T1	Journey Times	Are journey times increased or reduced due to proposals
T2	Community Severance	Are pedestrian links between facilities affected? Eg. Pedestrian crossing facilities linking school to sports facilities (+5). Increased traffic flow along shopping street (-3). Also consider number of pedestrians affected
T3	Traffic Congestion	Are proposals likely to create (negative impact) or relieve (positive impact) traffic congestion.
T4	Layout improvement	
SAFETY FACTORS		
S1	Safety Improvement	
S2	Accident Reduction	Is there predicted to be a reduction in the number and severity of recorded injury accidents due to the scheme? Reduction of any fatality or 3 or more serious, high (+5), 1 or 2 serious or 5 or more slight, medium (+3), and 1 to 4 slight, low (+1). If the scheme is predicted to INCREASE the accident rate, then score high negative (-5) for any fatal or serious, medium negative (-3) for any slight, and low negative (-1) for the public perception of a worse situation
S3	Speed Management	Are speeds going to be more appropriate for the location. Eg. Reduced speeds through populated areas, or enabling increased average speeds on unencumbered through routes
S4	Pedestrian Safety	Are pedestrian facilities improved? Eg. Widened Footway (+1), Provision of full width footway where none exists (+5), Pedestrian Crossing (+5), Controlled crossing within traffic lights controlled

		junction (+3), additional signs (obstacles) in footway are a disbenefit (negative score) but consider the residual width available to pedestrians.
ASSISTANCE to the VULNERABLE		
V1	Pedestrian Facilities	
V2	Disadvantaged Facilities	
V3	Controlled Pedestrian Crossings	
V4	Access to Services and facilities	
COMMITMENT		
C1	Contractual Commitment	
C2	Completion of Phased Scheme	
DEMOCRATIC OBJECTIVES		Does it contribute to or meet any Government or Council Directives The greater number of the Authority's policies that a scheme contributes to the higher the positive score. Similarly greater number of policies that a scheme conflicts with the higher the negative score
D1	Tourism	Will the scheme boost or detract from the tourism potential of the area, Are the proposals likely to improve the appearance of the area or create an eyesore for residents tourists or commuters
D2	Crime	Will there be a nett effect on the crime potential. Eg. Does Street Lighting have a crime prevention possibility
D3	Cycling / Walking	Could the scheme encourage people into walking or cycling as an alternative to using motor vehicles
D4	Traffic Reduction	
D5	Public Transport	Is there an effect, is bus access to be improved or worsened
D6	Social Regeneration	
D7	Social Inclusion	
D8	Sustainable Transport	
D9	Environmental Effects	Does the scheme have an impact on the Natural Environment. Are wildlife areas created or impinged on, are there any benefits or risks to watercourses or environments arising from such as drainage improvements
D10	Pollution	Is there likely to be an increase in air and noise pollution. Examples might include increased noise from speed humps, fumes from waiting vehicles, noise from vehicles stopping and starting

LOCAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES SCHEME RANKING TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT

Scheme Information

Scheme Title	
Location	
Brief Details	
Brief History (including impetus for the scheme) and Documents attached	

Financial Implications

Element	Note	Ref	£ ,000
Total Scheme Cost	(including Fees)	A	
Impact on Revenue budgets (3 year costs, savings, income)	(enter savings/income as positive, costs/commitments as negative)	B	
	Cost Factor (A - B)		

Ranking Factor

$\frac{\text{TOTAL IMPACT SCORE} \times 1000}{\text{(COST FACTOR)}}$	=	
--	---	--

Summary

SAFETY	35
TRAFFIC	25
ENVIRONMENT & COMMUNITY	20
INVESTMENT IMPLICATIONS	10
DEMOCRATIC OBJECTIVES	10

LOCAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES SCHEME RANKING TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT GUIDANCE NOTES

The sum total Influence/Impact/Value Factor score is the net benefit/disbenefit that undertaking a scheme or project, will provide over the 'do nothing' alternative. In the majority of cases individual impacts may be beneficial (positive score), but disbenefits are common. For instance the provision of a Pelican crossing may have disbenefits to through traffic, to residents close to the facility (traffic noise, fumes, the lights etcetera) to traders (loss of parking) and due to the visual impact.

Additionally you are reminded that in some cases negative 'influence/impact/value' scores will not be appropriate, certain elements measure the value of the facility to the Council (the Public) and are absolute. Most elements however measure the impact (value) of the scheme/work to be done compared to the 'do nothing' scenario.

GN Ref.	Element	Notes
SAFETY FACTORS		
S1	Pedestrian Accident Reduction	Is there predicted to be a reduction in the number and severity of recorded injury accidents to pedestrians due to the scheme? Reduction of any fatality or 3 or more serious, high (+5), 1 or 2 serious or 5 or more slight, medium (+3), and 1 to 4 slight, low (+1). If the scheme is predicted to INCREASE the accident rate, then score high negative (-5) for any fatal or serious, medium negative (-3) for any slight, and low negative (-1) for the public perception of a worse situation
S2	Pedestrian Improved Facilities -	Are pedestrian facilities improved? Eg. Widened Footway (+1), Pedestrian Crossing (+5), Controlled crossing within traffic lights controlled junction (+3), additional signs (obstacles) in footway are a disbenefit (negative score) but consider the residual width available to pedestrians.
S3	Pedestrian Severance	Are pedestrian links between facilities affected. Eg. Pedestrian crossing facilities linking school to sports facilities (+5). Increased traffic flow along shopping street (-3). Also consider number of pedestrians affected
S4	Motor Vehicle Accident Reduction	Is there likely to be an impact on the number and severity of recorded injury accidents to vehicle occupants due to the scheme? (score as above)
S5	Other Road Users Accident Reduction	Is there likely to be a reduction in the number and severity of recorded injury accidents to other road users, such as cyclists and equestrians, due to the scheme? (score as above)
S6	Severance	Do works create hazards or benefit other road users. Eg Do narrowed carriageways make cyclists more vulnerable (negative score), are cycle lanes provided (positive score)
TRAFFIC FACTORS		
T1	Traffic Congestion	Are proposals likely to create (negative impact) or relieve (positive impact) traffic congestion.
T2	Speed Management	Are speeds going to be more appropriate for the location. Eg. Reduced speeds through populated areas, or enabling increased average speeds on unencumbered through routes
T3	Journey Times	Are journey times increased or reduced due to proposals
T4	Road Hierarchy	Is the road priority maintained or improved. Eg. Is priority given to major

		routes over minor routes at junctions. Also consider importance of route to county network
ENVIRONMENT and COMMUNITY		
E1	Environment / Quality of Life	Is there an overall effect on Quality of Life. Eg. Removing traffic from residential areas and Town Centres, or traffic calming effects (+3 for 20% reduction), pushing traffic onto unsuitable routes(-3 for 20% increase).
E2	Economic Benefits	Is there going to be an effect on commerce in the area eg. Isolation of shops from delivery / customers
E3	Tourism	Will the scheme boost or detract from the tourism potential of the area
E4	Visual Intrusion	Are the proposals likely to improve the appearance of the area or create an eyesore for residents tourists or commuters
E5	Public Transport	Is there an affect, is bus access to be improved or worsened.
E6	Cycling / Walking	Could the scheme encourage people into walking or cycling as an alternative to using motor vehicles
E7	Crime Prevention	Will there be a net effect on the crime potential. Eg. Does Street Lighting have a crime prevention possibility
E8	Pollution	Is there likely to be an increase in air and noise pollution. Eg. Do speed humps increase noise, are fumes increased by waiting vehicles
E9	Natural Environment	Does the scheme have an impact on the Natural Environment. Are wildlife areas created or impinged on.
E10	Public/Community Support	does evidence show that the local Community Council and/or the public support or oppose the proposal (+5 for <u>strong</u> Community and Public support, =3 for support from the Community Council and/or 75% support from the public based on available evidence, +1 for majority 60% support from the Public, and similar negatives for opposition)
ECONOMIC FACTORS		
EC1	Finance, Grant Aid	Does the scheme attract grant aid, and if so what proportion. Eg. 80% or more Grant Aid (+5), match funding (+3), 10% Grant Aid (+1).
EC2	Short term investment	Does the scheme enable or engender short term investment in other projects (if this is built will other projects be built by other bodies) +5 for £100,000 or more investment, +3 for £30,000 to £99,999, and +1 for any lower investment
DEMOCRATIC FACTORS		
D1	Statutory Requirements	Does it contribute to or meet any Government Directives
D2	County Council Objectives	Does it contribute to or meet any County Council Objectives.

LOCAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES SCHEME RANKING 20 MPH ZONES (CAPITAL) GUIDANCE NOTES

The sum total Influence/Impact/Value Factor score is the net benefit/disbenefit that undertaking a scheme or project, will provide over the 'do nothing' alternative. In the majority of cases individual impacts may be beneficial (positive score), but disbenefits are common. For instance the provision of a Pelican crossing may have disbenefits to through traffic, to residents close to the facility (traffic noise, fumes, the lights, etcetera) to traders (loss of parking) and due to the visual impact.

Additionally you are reminded that in some cases negative 'influence/impact/value' scores will not be appropriate, certain elements measure the value of the facility to the Council (the Public) and are absolute. Most elements however measure the impact (value) of the scheme/work to be done compared to the 'do nothing' scenario.

GN Ref.	Element	Notes
SAFETY FACTORS		
S1	Pedestrian Accident Reduction	Is there predicted to be a reduction in the number and severity of recorded injury accidents to pedestrians due to the scheme? Reduction of any fatality or 3 or more serious, high (+5), 1 or 2 serious or 5 or more slight, medium (+3), and 1 to 4 slight, low (+1). If the scheme is predicted to INCREASE the accident rate, then score high negative (-5) for any fatal or serious, medium negative (-3) for any slight, and low negative (-1) for the public perception of a worse situation
S2	Pedestrian Improved Facilities	Are pedestrian facilities improved? Eg. Widened Footway (+1), Pedestrian Crossing (+5), Controlled crossing within traffic lights controlled junction (+3), additional signs (obstacles) in footway are a disbenefit (negative score) but consider the residual width available to pedestrians.
S3	Motor Vehicle Accident Reduction	Is there likely to be an impact on the number and severity of recorded injury accidents to vehicle occupants due to the scheme? (score as above)
S4	Other Road Users Accident Reduction	Is there likely to be a reduction in the number and severity of recorded injury accidents to other road users, such as cyclists and equestrians, due to the scheme? (score as above)
S5	Severance and other impacts	Do works create hazards or benefit other road users. Eg Do narrowed carriageways make cyclists and pedestrians more vulnerable (negative score), are cycle lanes provided (positive score) Also consider the effect of 20 mph zones for emergency vehicles.
TRAFFIC FACTORS		
T1	Traffic Congestion	Are proposals likely to create (negative impact) or relieve (positive impact) traffic congestion.
T2	Speed Reduction Potential	When speeds are reduced to 20 mph how much would the 85 th percentile speed be reduced by. Reduction of speed 0 - 10 mph score (+1) 10 - 20mph reduction score (+3) 20 - 30 mph reduction score (+5)
T3	Journey Times	Due to the nature of 20mph zones journey times will always be increased and the score will, therefore, always be negative.
ENVIRONMENT and COMMUNITY FACTORS		
E1	Community Impact	Is there an overall effect on the Community. Eg. Removing traffic from residential areas or would the 20 mph zone encourage motorists to use unsuitable routes. Is there going to be an effect on commerce in the area eg. Isolation of shops from delivery / customers, loss of parking by shop, etcetera
E3	Intrusion	Are the proposals likely to improve the appearance of the area or

		<p>create an eyesore for residents, tourists or commuters For instance, 20 mph zones should have in place speed reducing features of a significant number and appropriate design to be able to reduce traffic speeds to 20 mph or less.</p> <p>If major signing is required score (-5) If some signing is required score (-3) and if only minor measures are required score (-1). No net change (unlikely) scores zero and reduced signing scores positive</p> <p>Is there likely to be an impact in air and noise pollution. Eg. Do speed humps increase noise, are fumes increased by slower vehicles, In considering these aspects it may be appropriate to amend the score above</p>
E4	Public Transport	Would any traffic calming measures associated with 20 mph zones have a detrimental effect to public transport. If the zone is on a bus route appropriate traffic calming measure need to be considered
E5	School Transport	Is facilities for school transport i.e school buses and parents delivering pupils, going to be improved (+) or worsened (-).
E6	Cycling / Walking	Could the scheme encourage children into walking or cycling to school as an alternative to using motor vehicles, or would the scheme be detrimental to Cycling or walking.
E7	Integration with other initiatives	Would the introduction of a 20 mph zone support any proposals for a Safer Routes to School scheme, or does it have any other integrated benefits.
E9	Street Lighting	20 mph zones are best suited to areas that have an adequate system of street lighting. If the area has an entirely suitable street lighting system score (+5) if the area has no street lighting score (-5), with scores in-between as appropriate
E10	Public/Community Support	Does evidence show that the local Community Council and/or the public, support or oppose the proposal (+5 for <u>strong</u> Community and Public support, +3 for support from the Community Council and/or 75% support from the public based on available evidence, +1 for majority 60% support from the Public, and similar negatives for opposition) NB This issue should be given careful consideration.
E11	Governing Body Support	Does evidence show that the Governing Body, support or oppose the proposal (+5 for <u>strong</u> support, +3 or +1 for qualified support, and similar negatives for opposition) NB This issue should be given careful consideration.

LOCAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES SCHEME RANKING 20 MPH ZONES (CAPITAL)

Scheme Information

Scheme Title	
Location	
Brief Details	
Brief History (including impetus for the scheme) and Documents attached	

Financial Implications

Element	Note	Ref	£ ,000
Total Scheme Cost	(including Fees)	A	
Grant aid and funding from other sources		B	
Scheme cost to the Council	(A - B)	C	
Impact on Revenue budgets (3 year costs, savings, income)	(enter savings/income as positive, costs/commitments as negative)	D	
	Cost Factor (C - D)		

Ranking Factor

$\frac{\text{TOTAL IMPACT SCORE} \times 1000}{\text{(COST FACTOR)}}$	=	
--	---	--

Summary

SAFETY	42
TRAFFIC	27
ENVIRONMENT & COMMUNITY	36

LOCAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES SCHEME RANKING 20 MPH ZONES (CAPITAL) ASSESSMENT OF IMPACT

Element	see G N ref	Wtg	INFLUENCE / IMPACT / VALUE							Score Impact x Wtg	Reason see note
			Negative			None 0	Positive				
			H -5	M -3	L -1		L +1	M +3	H +5		
SAFETY FACTORS											
Pedestrian Accident Reduction	S1	12									
Pedestrian Improved Facilities	S2	8									
Vehicle Accident Reduction	S3	8									
Other Accident Reduction	S4	8									
Severance and other impacts	S5	6									
Safety Factors											
TRAFFIC FACTORS											
Traffic Congestion	T1	6									
Speed Reduction Potential	T2	17									
Journey Times	T3	4									
Traffic Factors											
ENVIRONMENT & COMMUNITY											
Community Impact	E1	3									
Intrusion (Visual Noise Air etc)	E3	2									
Public Transport	E4	3									
School Transport	E5	5									
Cycling, Walking	E6	6									
Integration with "Safe Routes to School" and other initiatives	E7	5									
Street Lighting	E9	2									
Governor's Support	E11	5									
Public/community Support	E10	5									
Community and Environmental Factors											
TOTAL IMPACT FACTORS SCORE										(sum)	