



Buckinghamshire County Council Select Committee

Transport, Environment and Communities Select Committee

Report to the Transport, Environment and Communities Select Committee

Title:	Highways Development Management: Review and Improvement Report
Committee date:	23 rd June 2015
Author:	Martin Dickman – Director for Environment Services
Contact officer:	Christine Urry – Acting Head of Highways Development Management (01494) 475355
Cabinet Member sign-off:	Mark Shaw – Cabinet Member for Transport

Purpose of Agenda Item

The County Council, in its role as statutory local highway authority, is responsible for management of the highway network in Buckinghamshire. With significant growth taking place across the county there are a number of larger highway improvement schemes that are being delivered on the county's network by developers in response to the implementation of their proposals.

While the majority of these schemes progress with 'normal' levels of disruption being caused, there have been instances over the last 12 months where ongoing issues with developer-delivered schemes have caused significant delay and disruption to the network. This disruption has been felt by Buckinghamshire's residents and businesses, who inevitably turn to BCC with their concerns about the speediness and efficacy of roadworks.

With the scale of future growth currently being discussed at District level, it is likely that larger-scale highway improvements to the network will be a feature of the landscape going forward, and as such it was felt that undertaking a review of the way in which the County Council manages the highway development process, would provide valuable input to ensuring that current issues are addressed and improvement could be targeted in the most effective way.



In addition, the Council's Future Shape business model has seen the Highways Development Management service move from 'Planning & Compliance' to sit within 'Environment Services' under a new Service Director. Therefore any improvement plan is timely in order to reset our current approach and define our improvement needs in this context.

The purpose of this paper is to inform Members of the recommendations and actions emanating from the review and seek their views on the appropriate progression of activity within the service.

Background

Following concerns raised by the previous Chairman of the Select Committee, it was agreed that the service would commission an independent review of Highways Development Management. The review was undertaken between March and May 2015 and the subsequent report has been appended.

WSP Parsons Brinkerhoff (hereafter referred to as PB) was commissioned to review Highway Development Management's processes and provide external advice on the levels of assurance that are currently in place in terms of policies, procedures and practices to conduct effective highways development management.

The review process included an examination of existing procedural documents, interviews with officers and Members, as well as an assessment of a case study. The review also benchmarked with other authorities to compare with and define what 'best practice' looks like across the sector. It should be noted that it was explicitly not intended for the review to be an audit or inquiry into any one specific scheme.

Summary

The report provides a summary of the current processes and procedures, which are compared to best practice and relevant guidance, including a comparison with other local authorities including Northamptonshire and Oxfordshire County Councils.

A traffic light system has been used to recognise areas of good practice observed and to help categorise the importance of recommendations made. Green highlights areas of good practice, amber shows where action is required, whilst red highlights areas to be addressed promptly to ensure effective highways development management

Many of the recommendations that form part of the PB report focus around four key areas; documentation, resource, engagement and Transport for Buckinghamshire. These are summarised below, but the decisions now to be taken are around how to react to these

recommendations, what to take forward as a matter of priority, and how to resource this (if appropriate).

By bringing this report to the Select Committee, we are proactively seeking the views of the committee in determining/agreeing the areas of most immediate concern, and providing opportunity to advise the Cabinet Member ahead of any decision on resource allocation.

1. Documentation:

Make more documentation publicly available to developers in a more organised way:

External developer guidance documentation			
Document	Present	Quality	Priority
Sustainable Communities Strategy	●	●	
Local Transport Plan	●	●	
Development Management Policies	●	●	✓
Infrastructure Contributions guidance (S106/CIL)	●	●	
Information on Section 38/278 Highway Works	●	●	✓
Commuted Sums Protocol	●		✓
Pre-application process information	●		
Design Guide	●		✓
Materials Guide	●		✓
Development Construction Manual	●		
Parking Standards	●	●	✓
Rural Diversification	●		
Travel Plan Guidance	●	●	
Sustainability Appraisal	●	●	
Equality Analysis	●		
Biodiversity Action Plan	●	●	
Standard Drawings	●		✓
Internal development management documentation			
Document	Present	Quality	Priority
Standard Conditions	●		✓
Acceptance and refusal templates	●		
S38/278/106 agreement templates	●	●	
S38/278/106 instructions	●	●	
S38/278/106 process flow charts	●		✓
S38/278/106 central tracking databases	●		✓
S38/278 bond calculation sheets	●		✓
Criteria for abridged S278/S184	●		
Fee structure information (inc. commuted sums)	●		✓
S106 developer contributions spending & negotiation tracker	●		
Infrastructure needs identified for S106	●		

Guidance/checklist for technical approval	●		✓
Planning and adoption checklist	●	●	
Email/post handling guidance	●		
Income processing guidance	●		✓

Key	Present	Quality
●	Present	No improvement needed
●		Some improvement needed
●	Not present	Significant improvement

2. Resource:

Ensure resourcing levels are adequate to fulfil Highways DM remit by recruiting extra staff.

Grade	Current no of staff	Suggested level of staff
Management	2 (1 vacant)	2
Senior & Lead Officer DM	3 (1 vacant)	4
Officer	1 (1 vacant)	2
Transport coordinators	2	2
Inspectors	2	4
Technicians	3	4
Total	13	18

Table 3: Current, and suggested staffing levels

3. Engagement:

Ensuring focus remains on core Highways DM activities, reducing the current high level of communication with the public.

4. Transport for Buckinghamshire:

Re-evaluating relationships with TfB putting KPI's in place to ensure the needs of the Highways Development management team are met by the contract and reassess the number of days assigned to TfB for Highways DM work.

Key issues

The report highlights evidence of the following 'good practice' within the Highways Development Management Team:

Good Practice

Detailed guide notes alongside application forms and template agreements for Section 278, S38, S184 and S106 agreements.

Excellent example of local level guidance 'Highway Protocol for Conservation Areas document'. This represents a formal agreement between BCC and Aylesbury Vale DC a model which could

be used again.

Template application forms and instructions relating to Section 278, 38, 184 and S106 agreements as well as a communication strategy, development control crib sheets, approval, adoption and pre-start meeting checklists and a Section 184 process flowchart.

BCC Highways Development Management officers are providing a very high level and volume of communications with BCC Councillors and the Public.

In particular it was noted that the level of communication with Members and the public is commendable, albeit an incredibly resource-intensive process.

The report however does outline a further 32 recommendations, of which 12 have been categorised as areas to be addressed promptly. The Highways Development Management team have already started implementing changes, predominantly focusing on those recommendations that would result in efficiency savings without any financial outlays.

The table in Appendix 1 lists the recommendations from the report and identifies them as either a short (0-4 months), medium (4-12 months) or long term (over 12 months) aspirations.

Next Steps

Implementing solutions to each of the areas of recommendation within the report will have both time and cost implications. Many of the recommendations stress the need to get standardised advice and protocols in place to both secure quality and streamline processes, a proportion of which can be bought in (albeit with a range of financial implications). However, of more critical concern is the ongoing staffing resource 'deficiency' when compared to levels at other authorities. The PB report states that the Highways Development Management team at Buckinghamshire County Council is small in comparison to other authorities. Other local authorities dealing with a similar number of applications have upwards of 20 staff, whilst the Highways Development Management Team only has 13 (with 3 vacant posts). This is unlikely to be sustainable going forward and the council's current response rates are commensurate with this level of resource.


The Service Director will be discussing the report, together with any observations from the committee, with the Cabinet Member to determine how future resourcing need can be addressed. This will therefore need to be considered in the context of future MTP discussions. The Head of Highways Development Management, when appointed, will be expected to action the recommendations set out in the review, taking into account both the prevailing limitations in resources and finance.

Appendix 1 – Recommendations

Short Term	0 - 4 months
Medium Term	4 – 12 months
Long Term	Over 12 months

Ref	Description	Solution	Management Comments	Lead Officer	Implications	Completion date	Completed
02	There are clear gaps in the publicly available guidance on the BCC website, focussed around application and design guidance.	It is recommended that these documents plus the information pack are immediately made available publicly through the BCC website. This will lighten some workload from the DM team, whilst also bringing BCC into line with other local authorities in the region.	To be actioned when all external documents have been revised and/or produced in line with recommendations: 03/04/08	Head of Highways DM	Possible Efficiency Savings Financial Implications – to be considered by MTP.	Long Term	
05	Life-cycle tracking of planning applications and section 106/38/278/184 agreements was a common concern raised with the review team. This currently manifests itself as a lack of accountability for incoming developer fees on a scheme by scheme basis, and missed revenue from section 106 agreements	It is recommended that central spreadsheet databases (or similar) are introduced to track planning applications and section agreements from first contact through to archiving of plans. Ideally, these should be collaborative, including input from district councils as well as TfB, or provide links to other databases.	Highways Development Management already record planning applications through Uniform and Highway Agreements using excel. The two programmes are however not linked. The team will investigate options for tracking the life-cycle of planning applications, including archiving of documents. This may require development of a database. Additional administrative resource will be required in order to manage a database (please refer to recommendation 09).	Head of Highways DM	Finance implications – to be considered by MTP	Medium Term	


Appendix 1 – Recommendations

06	<i>To the review team's knowledge, TEE does not currently have standard drawings in place for common highway features.</i>	<i>It is recommended to produce standard drawings for common highway features. This process could align with the earlier recommendation to produce a county level design guide.</i>	<i>Standard Details will need to be created in consultation with Transport for Buckinghamshire.</i> <i>The development of Standard Details will need to be outsourced.</i> <i>In the meantime Highways DM are trying to gain access to British Standards through TfB.</i>	<i>Head of Highways DM and Head of Highways Client</i>	<i>Finance implications – to be considered by MTP</i>	<i>Long Term</i>	
14	<i>Some refusals are being written and sent out by junior staff. This puts BCC at serious risk, including the potential for awarding of costs against BCC.</i>	<i>It is imperative that all refusals are fully checked by a senior member of the DM team be sent out in their name.</i>	<i>All reasons for refusal are now signed off by a Senior Member of the Highways DM team and sent out in their name.</i> <i>Moving forward the scheme of delegation within Highways DM will need to be revised, which could be included in the internal documents that are required as a result of the report.</i>	<i>Head of Highways DM</i>		Completed	
15	<i>Various forms of DM triage have been tried within BCC, but none has been fully effective. The systems have always placed a significant burden on the DM team, as well as senior DM staff.</i>	<i>A dedicated DM administrative assistance should be provided to perform a significant amount of the triage tasks. They would also be able to input the information into Uniform and/or an application tracking spreadsheet / database.</i>	<i>Currently Highways DM does not have administrative support. This is to be considered alongside recommendation 09.</i> <i>Discussions are taking place with the Business Planning and Commercial Development team and Business Support to secure assistance.</i>	<i>Head of Highways DM</i>	<i>Finance implications – to be considered by MTP</i>	<i>Short Term</i>	
18	<i>Many of the consultations which the Development</i>	<i>Standardise text to save officers from having to rewrite the same or similar</i>	<i>Work has already been undertaken by Highways DM to develop a new</i>	<i>Head of Highways DM</i>	<i>Possible efficiency savings</i>	In progress	

Appendix 1 – Recommendations

	<p>Management team receive are for smaller schemes. However, written responses to planning applications for these schemes are still often long and therefore time-consuming.</p>	<p>responses. Standardised text should be reviewed and compared against other local authorities; it may be possible to include this within Uniform.</p>	<p>process in order to reduce the length of officer time spent on minor planning applications.</p> <p>This will need to be reviewed by the Cabinet Member for Transport prior to discussions with the Local Planning Authorities.</p>				
19	<p>A significant period of time may elapse between planning consent and commencement of a development. In this period it is possible that continuity between the planning stage and the implementation stage (S278 & S38).</p>	<p>It is recommended that a handover file is set up at consultation stage for every large application containing significant roadworks, or that a system is put in place which records all relevant information to an application for later retrieval.</p>	<p>Highways DM currently save all planning application responses and associated files on the N-Drive. A new process will be created for the handover of files – including a meeting with officers (as per recommendation 07/21).</p> <p>The handover should be assisted through the creation of a database to track the lifecycle from planning application to agreement (recommendation 05).</p>	<p>Head of Highways DM</p>	<p>Resource Implications – to be considered by MTP.</p>	<p>Short Term</p> <p>Medium Term</p>	
21	<p>While a checklist of requirements for a Section 278 agreement has evolved within the DM team, it is not used by every officer involved and there is no consistent protocol for the handling of requests or the guidance of promoters.</p>	<p>It is recommended that guidance in the form of a Section 278 Protocol is drawn together as soon as possible from best practice of other highway authorities, adapted to the requirements of BCC. It is recommended that adherence to consistent processes for Protocol (and Supervision – see below) then becomes mandatory in the DM team and applied consistently in all future</p>	<p>Model process flow charts for dealing with agreements are to be developed by Highways Development Management in consultation with the Business Planning and Commercial Development team (as per recommendation 07).</p>	<p>Head of Highways DM</p>	<p>Resource Implications – to be considered by MTP.</p>	<p>Short Term</p>	

Appendix 1 – Recommendations

		<i>cases. Figure 4 provides a model for this protocol.</i>					
22	<i>It is crucial that all highway works are appropriate and have been fully agreed by BCC before construction begins. There is significant risk to BCC in allowing works to begin without all technical approvals being in place, all legal issues being dealt with and all monies being provided.</i>	<i>The review team strongly recommends that no highway works are allowed to begin until a full technical approval has been issued. This may be best achieved by coordinators/inspectors checking technical approval is in place at the point of road space booking.</i>	<i>This has been implemented. This will also be included in the protocol to be produced (as per recommendation 21).</i>	<i>Head of Highways DM</i>		Completed	
28	<i>The main issue encountered by the reviewers concerning technical approval is time taken for TfB to issue technical approval.</i>	<i>It is recommended that additional KPIs are added to the contract at the next available opportunity. These KPIs should be around a quick turn around of work.</i>	<i>Highways DM will liaise with Head of Highways Client to ensure that KPI's are included within the contract.</i>	<i>Head of Highways DM and Head of Highways Client</i>		<i>Medium Term</i>	
30	<i>It appears that there is no breakdown available for days spent by TfB on DM work. It is unclear whether days allocated in the budget have actually been used on DM work. The process certainly appears to require further</i>	<i>It is recommended that BCC conduct a review of the work undertaken by TfB on the highways DM work and ensure that the correct number of days has been utilised.</i>	<i>Highways DM will liaise with Transport for Buckinghamshire to review the number of support days required and ensure a process for monitoring time spent on Highways DM work throughout the year.</i>	<i>Head of Highways DM and Head of Highways Client</i>		<i>Short Term</i>	

Appendix 1 – Recommendations

	<i>investigation.</i>						
31	<i>It is not uncommon for other authorities that allow contractors to carry out S278 works to limit the selection of contractors to a list of companies who have further satisfied the authority in respect of a number of additional requirements.</i>	<i>It is recommended that S278 agreements require that contractors provide additional information about contractors.</i>	<i>Highways DM to produce a list of requirements for contractors working on the publicly maintained highway, considering best practice from other councils.</i>	<i>Highways DM Transport Coordinator</i>		<i>Short Term</i>	

Ref	Description	Solution	Management Comments	Lead Officer	Implications	Completion Date	Completed
01	<i>BCC's website contains the least publically available guidance of any of the surveyed authorities, and was difficult to use.</i>	<i>BCC would benefit from one, central page focussed entirely on information for developers. Perhaps this could be located under a new '_TEE' page, as opposed to the current position within transport and roads. This should become a central hub bringing together into one place all relevant documents, application forms, contacts and guidance notes.</i>	<i>To be actioned, with support from the Business Planning and Commercial Development team when all external documents have been revised and/or produced in line with recommendations: 03/04/08</i>	<i>Head of Highways DM and the Business Planning and Commercial Development team</i>	<i>Possible Efficiency Savings Financial Implications – to be considered by MTP.</i>	<i>Long Term</i>	
03	<i>On a strategic level, whilst the Buckinghamshire County Council Strategic Plan does include a planning and transportation portfolio</i>	<i>It is recommended BCC develop a strategic document outlining forward development management policy, as part of a network of</i>	<i>LTP4 is to include a 'Highways Development Management Policy'. This is being delivered by Growth and Strategy team within TEE.</i>	<i>Head of Transport Strategy</i>	<i>Being delivered by Growth and Strategy in consultation with Highways DM as part of LTP4</i>	<i>In progress</i>	

Appendix 1 – Recommendations

	<i>plan, its focus is not on development management</i>	<i>cross referenced publically available guidance. This document should undergo an appraisal process similar to the LTP, or could even be included as part of the next LTP for Buckinghamshire, due for release in March 2016.</i>					
04	<i>Developers are referred to national guidance such as the Manual for Streets regarding design and construction.</i>	<i>It is recommended BCC produce supplementary or standalone design, construction and/or materials guides for development work in the county.</i>	<i>The development of design, construction and/or material guides would need to be outsourced.</i>	<i>Head of Highways DM and Head of Highways Client</i>	<i>Financial implications – to be considered by MTP.</i>	<i>Long Term</i>	
07	<i>Current processes for processing incoming applications and requests are functional but not clearly defined. This has seen procedures not robustly enforced and meant important groups (sometimes TEE themselves) are left out of the loop during correspondence</i>	<i>It is recommended that Figures 3-6 should be used to form the basis of a clearly defined process outlining how BCC will conduct development management.</i>	<i>Model process flow charts for dealing with planning applications and agreements are to be developed by Highways DM in consultation with the Business Planning and Commercial Development team.</i>	<i>Head of Highways DM and the Business Planning and Commercial Development team</i>	<i>Possible Efficiency Savings</i>	<i>Short Term</i>	
08	<i>The review highlighted several documents which could provide efficiency, consistency and transparency across the development management process.</i>	<i>It is recommended that BCC review the current portfolio of internal documents, and strongly consider the benefits of implementing some or all of those additional documents highlighted in figure 2 in leading a consistent, clearly</i>	<i>Table 2 of the report highlights the current availability of internal and external Highways DM.</i> <i>The development of internal and external documents would need to be outsourced or additional resources provided within the team to undertake this</i>	<i>Head of Highways DM</i>	<i>Resource and financial implications - to be considered by MTP</i>	<i>Medium/ Long Term</i>	

Appendix 1 – Recommendations

		<i>defined and streamlined process.</i>	<i>work.</i>				
09	<i>The BCC DM team is small in comparison to similar authorities, even considering the increase in posts brought about by the TEE process. The DM team also pick up extra work relating to statutory highway functions of BCC</i>	<i>Additional staff resources (Highways Development Management Lead Officer and Highways Development Management Officer) should help, however the review team feel that the number of DM officers is still not enough and recommends that the DM team be increased. Suggested areas for increase are shown in table 3.</i>	<i>The report highlights a need for an increase in staff numbers at every level considering the new TEE structure. It was noted that other local authorities dealing with a similar number of applications have upwards of 20 Highways DM staff. In order to implement the recommendations within the report, additional resources will be required. In the short term ensuring current vacancies are filled will be prioritised.</i>	<i>Head of Highways DM</i>	<i>Financial implications – to be considered by MTP</i>	<i>Medium Term</i>	
10	<i>BCC DM officers provide a high quality of communication with BCC Councillors and the public. Whilst commendable, this resource intensive process is preventing DM officers from completing their core work. It has also tended to raise the level of expectation amongst the public as to the level of communication they expect to receive.</i>	<i>It is recommended that the DM team take a step back from the significant levels of communications they undertake. Particularly with the public, the level of expectation needs to be reset at a more manageable level. Developers should be required to keep the public and Councillors informed and engaged in the process. The LPA also have a consultation role.</i>	<i>Procedure for dealing with correspondence from residents and councillors to be developed by Highways Development Management in consultation with the cabinet member.</i>	<i>Highways DM Team Leader</i>	<i>Possible efficiency savings</i>	<i>Short Term</i>	
11	<i>Despite a move towards regionalisation of roles, some BCC staff including transport co-</i>	<i>It is recommended that BCC consider assigning regions to inspectors. This will</i>	<i>Assigning regions to inspectors will only be possible if additional resources are secured</i>	<i>Head of Highways DM and Transport Co-ordinators</i>	<i>Resource Implications – to be considered by MTP</i>	<i>Long Term</i>	

Appendix 1 – Recommendations

	<i>ordinators and inspectors must cover work across the entire county</i>	<i>require recruitment of extra inspectors to provide adequate coverage, as shown in table 3</i>	<i>(please refer to recommendation 09)</i>				
12	<i>The DM team are responsible for providing advice to the LPA when they are producing their Local Development Plans (LDPs). DM officers have not had the time required to give serious thought to the impact of local plan developments and this may be limiting future applications.</i>	<i>More time and resource needs to be spent on communication with the district councils regarding their LDPs, so that they do not become a limitation to proceedings. The quality of the DM response to the LDP process should be reviewed and a lessons learned note created.</i>	<i>Highways DM would not be able to offer this level of service based on staffing levels in the current structure (please refer to recommendation 09).</i>	<i>Head of Highways DM</i>	<i>Resource implications- to be considered by MTP</i>	<i>Long Term</i>	
13	<i>Reasons for refusal may not be properly justified in transport terms. These can lead to appeals which lead to diversion of effort to respond and may lead to costs against the authority for unreasonableness.</i>	<i>Ensure that adequate training is provided to staff and that knowledge is continuously maintained. (As an example, in Suffolk, all new staff above technician level attend the 4 day IHE course on Development Management).</i>	<i>Four members of the team are currently undertaking a HNC in Engineering. Learning and Development Plans are to be created for all members of the team. TEE has an identified training budget to support this.</i>	<i>Head of Highways DM and Team Leader of Highways DM</i>		<i>In progress</i>	
16	<i>It was noted that some Local Planning Authorities can be slow to forward applications and can fail to forward on to BCC other people's consultation responses, which are relevant to transport.</i>	<i>BCC should make a commitment to improve the working relationships with the planners - Spend more time with the planners and consider more frequent visits to the LPA</i>	<i>Where feasible, Highways DM have agreed to work from District offices once a month to improve relations with planners. Due to current pressures and limited resources, officers are unable to be</i>	<i>Head of Highways DM</i>	<i>Resource implications – to be considered by MTP.</i>	<i>In progress</i>	

Appendix 1 – Recommendations

	<i>This may be as a result of relatively poor relationships between the DM team and the LPA.</i>	<i>offices. - Be available and willing to discuss larger applications throughout the process, rather than simply sending a final response.</i>	<i>available to discuss large applications throughout the process (please refer to recommendation 09).</i>				
17	<i>BCC are consulted on applications from four Local Planning Authorities. BCC's standard conditions for each one of these districts is different. This makes it hard for DM officers to respond quickly and efficiently and may lead to future mistakes.</i>	<i>It is recommended that a single set of standard conditions should be created and agreed across all of the LPAs. A review against other Local Authorities should be carried out to ensure that wording of each condition is correct and that all appropriate standard conditions are included.</i>	<i>Highways DM are in the process of producing standardised conditions and reasons for refusal which can be used across all four districts.</i>	<i>Senior Highways DM Officer</i>	<i>Possible efficiency savings</i>	In progress	
20	<i>S184 permits are being used for smaller scale road works. This section of the act does not provide the same level of protection to BCC and may leave BCC open to paying to deal with issues arising from the works.</i>	<i>The review team recommends that S184 permits are retained for minor access alterations and additions. Works of the value of £15-25,000 should be carried out under a shortened or abridged S278 agreement.</i>	<i>This will be taken forward with legal services. The existing guidance notes will need to be revised by Highways DM.</i>	<i>Highways DM Transport Co-Ordinators</i>	<i>Financial Implications – to be considered by MTP</i>	<i>Medium Term</i>	
23	<i>S278 guidance documents will help to reduce the burden on DM officers when dealing with S278 works.</i>	<i>It is recommended that a set of documents are produced or revised and made available to developers. A shorter version of guidance should be developed for abridged S278</i>	<i>Guidance notes and Fee schedules to updated and revised by Highways DM.</i>	<i>Head of Highways DM</i>	<i>Resource implications - to be considered by MTP</i>	<i>Medium Term</i>	

Appendix 1 – Recommendations

		<i>works and access alterations under S184.</i>					
24	<i>Some processes and checklists have been created by the team to help during the inspection process. The review team feel that there are potential benefits from ensuring consistency across the board.</i>	<i>It is recommended that these documents are used as the back bone to a set of guidance documents, checklists and sign off sheets for use within the inspection process. These should be made publically available to allow developers to be aware up front of their requirements.</i>	<i>Check lists and sign off sheets to be created for use within the inspection process, building on the work already undertaken by the Highways DM team.</i>	<i>Highways DM Transport Inspectors</i>	<i>Resource implications – to be considered by MTP</i>	<i>Medium Term</i>	
25	<i>BCC should protect itself from future over-running schemes and poorly performing contractors.</i>	<i>The S278 agreements should be amended to include a window of works and a description of the reapplication process (including additional fee) in order to provide BCC with greater control over the process.</i>	<i>This will be taken forward with legal services. There is a need to review our standard legal agreements.</i>	<i>Head of Highways DM</i>	<i>Financial implications – legal fees</i>	<i>Short Term Medium Term</i>	
26	<i>The risk of inconvenience to road users caused by a poorly performing contractor can be further mitigated by means of governance agreed with the promoter.</i>	<i>It is recommended that the S278 agreement for very large schemes should include a requirement for the promoter and contractor to participate in a project board and co-operate to the authority's satisfaction.</i>	<i>In order to offer this level of service additional resources will be required (please refer to recommendation 09).</i>	<i>Head of Highways DM</i>	<i>Resource Implications- to be considered by MTP</i>	<i>Long Term</i>	

Appendix 1 – Recommendations

27	<i>Assurance would form part of the project board structure, and would ensure pro-active involvement in issues on buildability and minimising risk of disruption to road users</i>	<i>In order to avoid yet more pressure on inspection resources and to augment skills available for assurance, it is recommended that assurance is supplemented with suitably experienced inputs from external sources during works of a potentially disruptive nature.</i>	<i>In order to offer this level of service additional resources will be required (please refer to recommendation 09).</i>	<i>Head of Highways DM</i>	<i>Resource Implications – to be considered by MTP.</i>	<i>Long Term</i>	
29	<i>The main issue encountered by the reviewers concerning technical approval is time taken for TfB to issue technical approval.</i>	<i>It is also recommended that the number of man days required to support the highways DM team is reviewed. If it is considered that there is a need for greater time, then this should be agreed with TfB. This will enable them to recruit the specialisms in house. Given that the cost of bringing in expertise above the fixed number of days agreed up front is so much more expensive, and given the need for the work to be carried out quickly, this might be a solution which is relatively cost neutral.</i>	<i>Highways DM will liaise with Transport for Buckinghamshire to review the number of support days required and ensure a process for monitoring time spent on Highways DM work throughout the year.</i>	<i>Head of Highways DM/ Head of Highways Client.</i>		<i>Short Term</i>	
32	<i>BCC does not currently have standard details</i>	<i>Standard details for items such as</i>	<i>Standard Details will need to be created in</i>	<i>Head of Highways DM/</i>	<i>Finance Implications – to be</i>	<i>Long Term</i>	

Appendix 1 – Recommendations

	<p>for construction of typical highway features. While details are provided in individual sets of S278 plans, a standard set is desirable in the interest of standardising items for future maintenance.</p>	<p>illuminated bollards, street lighting, traffic signals, accesses, pavement construction and special paving should be provided.</p>	<p>consultation with Transport for Buckinghamshire.</p> <p>The development of Standard Details will need to be outsourced.</p> <p>In the meantime Highways DM are trying to gain access to British Standards through TfB.</p>	<p>Head of Highways Client.</p>	<p>considered by MTP.</p>		
33	<p>Innovative or non-standard design outside the scope of DMRB (for instance special paving required for aesthetic reasons, non-compliant crossings and textured paving) has led to design liability and penalties under Health and Safety legislation elsewhere on public and private roads.</p>	<p>It is recommended that any non-standard design is accompanied by a sufficient risk assessment and competent approval. They will need to be agreed by the TfB Asset Management team.</p>	<p>Highways DM to create a process of assessing non-standard designs in consultation with TfB Asset Management.</p>	<p>Highways DM Transport Co-ordinator</p>		Short Term	
34	<p>BCC should protect itself from future works unduly affecting the operation of the road network.</p>	<p>When S278 works are on traffic sensitive areas, it is recommended that a simple assessment of traffic delays during stages of construction and, where possible, options to minimise delays should be provided. The assessment may show the relative impact on construction cost and traffic delays of alternative options.</p>	<p>Highways DM to create a process for assessing traffic management on sensitive roads in consultation with TfB Street works team.</p>	<p>Highways DM Transport Co-ordinator</p>		Short Term	