



**LEICESTERSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL HIGHWAYS AND
TRANSPORT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE –
THURSDAY 20 JANUARY 2022**

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED UNDER STANDING ORDER 7(3) and (5)

The following questions are to be put to the Chairman of the Highways and Transport Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

1. Question by Mr. Max Hunt CC:

Could the Chair confirm that whilst there is national guidance on the installation/management of assets, there is no local guidance as such.

Response from the Chairman:

Whilst there is national guidance on the installation/management of assets, there is no local guidance. There is, however, local criteria for the management of Leicestershire County Council (LCC) assets, which enables the Department to manage the asset base within the budget available.

The key policies and strategies that set these criteria are:

[ROAD CASUALTY REDUCTION IN LEICESTERSHIRE AND FUTURE APPROACH TO CASUALTY REDUCTION - 12 SEPTEMBER 2016](#)

[HIGHWAY ASSET MANAGEMENT POLICY AND HIGHWAY ASSET MANAGEMENT STRATEGY REVIEW - 23 JUNE 2017](#)

<https://resources.leicestershire.gov.uk/environment-and-planning/planning/leicestershire-highway-design-guide>

The criteria have been developed so that they prioritise safety, followed by the need to maintain the highway in the most cost-effective way.

2. Question by Mr. Max Hunt CC:

How are the installation of highway assets, including specifically VAS signs, Bus Shelters and Zebra Crossings, prioritised where the core budget is concerned (eg by records of incidents, petitions, complaints, collisions, or other local factors) and are these criteria published?

Response from the Chairman:

Vehicle Activated Signs and other Safety Measures

The prioritisation criteria for the installation of highway safety measures funded by Leicestershire County Council are contained within the [ROAD CASUALTY REDUCTION IN LEICESTERSHIRE AND FUTURE APPROACH TO CASUALTY REDUCTION - 12 SEPTEMBER 2016](#)

This document is available on the Leicestershire County Council website. The criteria identifies localities that should be prioritised for funding on the following basis:

- The site must be on the local road network;
- The site has experienced 7 or more accidents in 5 years;
- The site has not been investigated in recent years, or have treatment ongoing or where treatment is proposed;
- The site has been assessed to identify patterns of accidents or treatable accidents;
- The number of accidents at a site is higher than the national figure for comparable roads.

Zebra Crossings

Accepted national practice to assess the justification for a pedestrian crossing using a calculation involving both pedestrian and vehicle flows. This is known as 'PV²' and effectively evaluates the potential for conflict between vehicles and pedestrians. In 1995 the introduction of Local Transport Note (LTN) 1/95 – "Assessment of Pedestrian Crossings"

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/330269/ltn-1-95_Assessment-Crossings.pdf

replaced the previous Advice Note TA10/80 "Design Considerations for Pelican and Zebra Crossings."

Most Local Authorities, including LCC continued to use a modified version of PV² formula including additional enhanced criteria taking into consideration the types of pedestrians, the different types of vehicles, the vulnerability of pedestrians plus community links etc. as detailed in LTN 1/95 and the new guidance in the [Traffic Signs Manual Chapter 6.](#)

Bus Shelters

Experienced County Council officers make an assessment when a bus shelter request is received by using their knowledge of the network and by carefully considering each request based on frequency, usage and locality as well as reviewing daily passenger usage. As there is no specifically defined scoring criteria covering other factors to determine shelter requests, it is recognised that this

approach requires a review. The intention going forward is to work towards developing a clear policy for bus shelter requests which will include a scoring framework for a range of factors. This work will be progressed as part of the Bus Service Improvement Plan.

3. Question by Mr. Max Hunt CC:

How many installations/improvements under the Members' Highway Fund (MHF) have been approved which do not meet the existing local criteria for funding out of the core budget?

Response from the Chairman:

68 (everything that has been approved to date).

4. Question by Mr. Max Hunt CC:

How many installations/improvements under the MHF have been approved which do meet the existing local criteria for funding out of the core budget, and are those criteria published in detail for VAS, Zebras and Shelters?

Response from the Chairman:

0

No criteria exist other than whether they are allowable on the highway. The criteria for whether they are allowable on the highway is governed by the following national legislation and guidance:

[Traffic Signs Manual \(all chapters\)](#)
[The Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2016](#)

If a member has asked for something that should be paid for out of the core budget the application has been declined and been transferred to "business as usual"

5. Question by Mr Max Hunt CC:

If installations/improvements have been approved under MHF which meet the existing local criteria for funding out of the core budget, why would members opt to use the MHF?

Response from the Chairman:

Please see the answer to question 4 above.

6. Question by Mr. Max Hunt CC:

Is it possible that an MHF application could 'jump the queue' over other more worthy cases, based on cost or long standing records of performance?

Response from the Chairman:

Safety will always be the priority and the Department will address the most pressing issues with its core budget. The objective of the MHF is to be able to address local members concerns in their local communities and it is recognised that those concerns may not always align with the priority of our core highways works. It should be noted however that the funding for MHF works is in addition to our core highways budgets.

7. Question by Mr. Max Hunt CC:

Have there been a drop in installations/improvements from core budget since MHF was introduced and if so do we foresee this continuing?

Response from the Chairman:

No.

8. Question by Mr. Max Hunt CC:

Could you confirm that where an additional asset or improvement is agreed under MHF which would increase the authority's liabilities including maintenance, a third party capable of accepting that liability must do so under a legal licence; and that if a third party cannot be identified (for instance in a non-parished area where their local highway agency has been transferred to LCC) the liability will be accepted by LCC as it would under a core budget acquisition?

Response from the Chairman:

It should be noted that Parish Councils have no responsibility for the highway network and as such there is no transfer of responsibility to LCC.

The maintenance and public liability of additional assets or improvements to the network funded by the MHF should be accepted by a third party if appropriate (i.e. bollards, MVAS etc). If a third party cannot be identified, the public liability will be "taken on" by LCC.

It should be noted that as with all LCC assets, once end of life has been reached their retention will be challenged in line with our existing policies and it may be removed.