

Transport for Buckinghamshire Task & Finish review

2nd November evidence session - Background information for Members

This document presents summary background information on the following:

1. Background information on complaints and handling of complaints at BCC
2. Summary of data gathered through BCC transport surveys
3. Summary of data from BCC Contact Centre on call topics about TfB services
4. Selection of TfB discussions / comments raised at Local Area Forums

1. Background information on complaints and handling complaints

The following is a summary. For more detailed information, please see the attached BCC Feedback and Complaints document. Members can ask officers for further definitions and examples at the evidence session on the 2nd November.

The Local Government Ombudsman (LGO) provides the following advice on defining complaints:

'We suggest that councils have a definition and that it includes the following: an expression of dissatisfaction about a council service (whether that service is provided directly by the council or by a contractor or partner) that requires a response. There is no difference between a 'formal' and an 'informal' complaint. Both are expressions of dissatisfaction that require a response'.

A complaint can be broadly defined as any expression of dissatisfaction. Recognising a complaint is not always obvious but if the person raising the issue says it is a complaint, then it is a complaint even if the complaint is unlikely to be upheld or is not the responsibility of BCC. Complaints are closely related to customer expectations which can vary from person to person. In resolving complaints, it is important for BCC to identify any organisational learning that could be developed.

Feedback and Complaints Procedure

The Feedback and Complaints Procedure has 3 stages:

- Stage 1 (Initial complaint) – customer tells the people who provide the service what the problem is and what needs to be done
- Stage 2 (Senior management) – customer tells the person who manages the service that they were not happy with the outcome of Stage 1 and refers it to senior management
- Stage 3 (Council Monitoring Officer) – customer asks the Council's Monitoring Officer to look at the complaint if they are not happy with the outcome of Stage 2

Stages can be flexible (e.g. can move from 1 to 3 or start at Stage 3).

For each of these stages, the following timescales apply:

- **In 10 days or less** - BCC will let you know that we have received your complaint and who is going to deal with it.
- **In 28 days or less** - BCC will send you our response to your complaint. If we are not able to do this we will let you know, explain why and give you a new reply date.

2. Summary of data gathered through BCC transport surveys

Annual Transportation Survey – Net satisfaction ratings (2006-2010)

The figures below are within range of -100 to 100 (with 100 representing total satisfaction, -100 meaning total dissatisfaction, and 0 meaning either that views were balanced, or that respondents were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied).

Aspect of highways	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
The overall standard of roads and pavements	-31.4	-38.8	0.4	-9.7	-4.3
The quality of salting, gritting, and/or snow clearance on roads	-19.7	8.9	38.0	18.1	29.4
The condition and maintenance of pavements	-4.1	10.9	-	-	-
The quality of salting, gritting and/or snow clearance on pavements	-	-21.9	14.2	6.1	7.7
The standard and maintenance of road markings (e.g. white lines)	43.8	54.9	67.4	57.0	71.0
The condition and maintenance of traffic signs	46.1	65.0	57.8	55.8	53.0
The maintenance of grass verges	22.0	37.2	28.7	37.8	-
The condition and maintenance of street lighting	35.0	43.7	46.1	56.4	-
BCC's overall approach to managing road congestion	-14.1	14.9	-4.2	-8.1	-6.9
BCC's overall approach to road safety	21.1	33.1	38.6	26.8	32.0

TfB Highway Maintenance Survey 2009

From 1027 interviews carried out across the County, the following data was extrapolated.

About the respondents:

- 47% were male and 53% were female
- 12% were 24 or under; 16% were 25 - 34; 14% were 35 - 45; 18% were 45 – 54; 17% were 55 – 64 and 23% were 65 or older
- Only 7% did not normally have a car available for use while 29% had one, 47% had two and 16% had three or more
- Just 6% considered themselves to be disabled, 61% of whom have a mobility impairment, 14% have a sensory impairment, 8% have diabetes and 3% have heart problems
- 91% were white British, 3% white other, 2% Asian, 1% mixed and 3% refused to disclose their ethnicity.

About road maintenance:

- 35% are very/quite satisfied with the overall condition of roads and pavements compared to 50% who are very/quite dissatisfied giving a net satisfaction rating of -14.7
- 32% are very/quite satisfied with the condition and maintenance of roads with 52% being very/quite dissatisfied giving a net satisfaction rating of -19.8
- 44% are very/quite satisfied with the quality of salting, gritting and/or snow clearance on roads with 32% feeling the opposite giving a net satisfaction rating of 11.5
- 43% are very/quite satisfied with the condition and maintenance of pavements with 38% being very/quite dissatisfied giving a net satisfaction rating of 5.5
- 30% are very/quite satisfied with the quality of salting, gritting and/or snow clearance on pavements with 40% feeling the opposite giving a net satisfaction rating of -10.1
- 65% are very/quite satisfied with the standard and maintenance of road markings (e.g. white lines) with 17% being very/quite dissatisfied giving a net satisfaction rating of 47.5
- Almost three quarters (73%) are very/quite satisfied with the condition and maintenance of traffic signs with just 13% being very/quite dissatisfied giving a net satisfaction rating of 59.7
- 62% are very/quite satisfied with the maintenance of grass verges while 19% is very/quite dissatisfied giving a net satisfaction rating of 43.2
- 58% are very/quite satisfied with the condition and maintenance of street lighting with 24% being very/quite dissatisfied giving a net satisfaction rating of 33.8
- 41% are very/quite satisfied with the overall maintenance of the highways while only slightly fewer (38%) are very/quite dissatisfied giving a net satisfaction rating of 2.7
- A huge number of stretches of road were mentioned as having the worst maintenance related problem in Buckinghamshire. The ones receiving ten or more mentions were the A4010 at Princes Risborough, the A413, the A41, the A40 and A4155 Marlow to Henley. As previously, by far the most common cause given was pot holes and cracks coming from 79%. 13% mentioned standing water, 9% gave verge erosion, 8% gave loose stones and a further 8% mentioned poor streetlight maintenance (e.g. broken lamps). Some 5% said the cause was verge obstruction (e.g. overgrown hedges) a further 5% gave blocked drains and gullies with another 5% feeling it was because of uneven surfaces and yet another 5% said it caused by a general lack of maintenance. Poor traffic sign maintenance (e.g. obstructed signs) was mentioned by 4%

Awareness of investment:

- Just 15% are aware that Buckinghamshire County Council has invested over £4m more on highway maintenance than they did two years ago while the large majority

(85%) were not. Interestingly awareness was at least twice as high among the 18 – 34 year old age group than either of the older groups.

About transport usage/preference:

- The overwhelming majority (89%) have a car at their disposal to meet their typical weekly travelling needs while 16% can use a bus, 14% can walk, another 10% have a bicycle at their disposal and 2% can use a motorcycle. Fewer 18 – 34 year olds have a car at their disposal (79%) than the two older groups with the 35 – 54 year olds having the highest at 97%.
- The large majority (81%) drive a car most often for their typical weekly travelling needs while 6% walk, 5% use a bus, 3% are car passengers, 2% go by bike and just 1% use a train. Walking is more common among the 18 – 34 year olds at 14% than any other group and bus usage is greater among the younger and older age groups with hardly anyone from the middle 35 – 54 age group using them.
- Half (50%) predominantly go with the type of transport used most often to work. This is followed by 31% who use it to go to the town centre then 12% go a place of leisure and 5% go to an education facility. Just 1% uses it to go to either the train station or health centre.

Other comments:

- 70% did not have any other comments to make but among those who did the more popular ones included too many pot holes coming from 5%, 4% suggested generally poor or lack of maintenance while a further 4% think the Council should improve the pavements. 2% suggest each of street lighting is lacking and higher standards of maintenance are needed.

3. Summary of data from BCC Contact Centre on call topics about TfB services

The following two tables show calls by topic to the BCC Contact Centre relevant to TfB services for the period June 2010 to May 2011. Calls about carriageways are consistently the most frequent call topic with, depending on the time of year, grass and trees (May-Aug), lighting/electrical (Dec-April) and winter maintenance (Dec) the other most frequent call topics.

Customer Service Advisors are targeted with 7min 30sec average call time for TfB issues - *times in red (or underlined if b/w copy) are calls over the Contact Centre target time of 7mins 30secs for each call.*

Table 1 - Calls by topic to Contact Centre: June 2010 to November 2010

CALL TOPIC	Jun-10			Jul-10			Aug-10			Sep-10			Oct-10			Nov-10		
	Av Call Handl e Time	No of calls	% of calls	Av Call Handl e Time	No of calls	% of calls	Av Call Handl e Time	No of calls	% of calls	Av Call Handl e Time	No of calls	% of calls	Av Call Handl e Time	No of calls	% of calls	No of calls	% of calls	
Bridges	<u>13:06</u>	4	0.1%	03:39	1	0.04%	00:00	0	0.00%	<u>10:31</u>	7	0.28%	06:18	4	0.18%	07:03	5	0.18%
			37.5			35.26			29.37			33.31			34.81			29.59
Carriageway	<u>09:09</u>	1082	%	<u>08:33</u>	951	%	<u>08:29</u>	794	%	<u>08:40</u>	834	%	<u>08:59</u>	762	%	<u>10:17</u>	807	%
Casualty Reduction	<u>09:17</u>	19	0.7%	06:33	16	0.59%	05:44	11	0.41%	05:51	21	0.84%	05:04	13	0.59%	<u>08:55</u>	12	0.44%
Complaints	<u>16:55</u>	4	0.1%	03:44	4	0.15%	03:23	2	0.07%	<u>19:04</u>	3	0.12%	<u>14:16</u>	6	0.27%	<u>17:46</u>	16	0.59%
Compliments	05:12	8	0.3%	04:53	7	0.26%	04:58	3	0.11%	04:59	2	0.08%	06:17	7	0.32%	06:17	10	0.37%
Cycling	05:28	28	1.0%	<u>09:41</u>	10	0.37%	07:20	14	0.52%	<u>09:01</u>	13	0.52%	07:19	7	0.32%	<u>08:17</u>	17	0.62%
Development Control	04:23	6	0.2%	07:19	1	0.04%	02:16	2	0.07%	03:55	3	0.12%	06:46	3	0.14%	<u>11:08</u>	2	0.07%
Footway	<u>10:42</u>	128	4.4%	<u>10:30</u>	121	4.49%	<u>09:35</u>	69	2.55%	<u>10:41</u>	96	3.83%	<u>09:16</u>	80	3.65%	<u>11:13</u>	37	1.36%
			12.7			14.76			13.13			13.54			13.75			13.79
General	<u>08:59</u>	366	%	<u>08:06</u>	398	%	<u>07:50</u>	355	%	<u>07:50</u>	339	%	<u>07:49</u>	301	%	<u>08:39</u>	376	%
									10.17									
General TfB	<u>08:45</u>	32	1.1%	06:36	25	0.93%	04:35	275	%	05:26	20	0.80%	05:49	12	0.55%	<u>07:56</u>	19	0.70%
			20.0			18.84			17.94			13.62			10.74			
Grass & Trees	<u>08:52</u>	578	%	<u>08:34</u>	508	%	<u>08:05</u>	485	%	<u>08:41</u>	341	%	<u>08:55</u>	235	%	<u>09:58</u>	186	6.82%
Extents/land Charges	04:44	55	1.9%	04:46	70	2.60%	04:02	76	2.81%	04:42	63	2.52%	06:50	44	2.01%	05:38	55	2.02%
Licenses	06:47	181	6.3%	05:59	163	6.04%	05:43	123	4.55%	06:39	139	5.55%	06:24	86	3.93%	<u>07:38</u>	82	3.01%
						10.86			13.28			18.49			20.47			24.02
Lighting/Electrical	<u>08:30</u>	241	8.4%	<u>07:36</u>	293	%	<u>07:56</u>	359	%	<u>08:01</u>	463	%	<u>08:12</u>	448	%	<u>09:16</u>	655	%
Parking	<u>08:25</u>	81	2.8%	<u>07:50</u>	79	2.93%	<u>08:40</u>	73	2.70%	<u>09:24</u>	68	2.72%	06:44	93	4.25%	<u>09:23</u>	82	3.01%
Safer Routes to School	06:40	1	0.0%	00:00	0	0.00%	00:00	0	0.00%	02:41	2	0.08%	02:07	2	0.09%	00:00	0	0.00%
Traffic Management	<u>10:56</u>	58	2.0%	<u>11:29</u>	32	1.19%	<u>10:44</u>	53	1.96%	<u>10:16</u>	59	2.36%	<u>09:48</u>	57	2.60%	<u>09:55</u>	57	2.09%
Walking and Pedestrian	<u>15:49</u>	4	0.1%	<u>15:36</u>	4	0.15%	<u>12:06</u>	2	0.07%	<u>10:45</u>	5	0.20%	<u>12:52</u>	3	0.14%	05:47	7	0.26%
																		11.07
Winter Maintenance	<u>08:03</u>	8	0.3%	<u>10:34</u>	14	0.52%	<u>09:02</u>	7	0.26%	06:00	26	1.04%	05:54	26	1.19%	<u>08:25</u>	302	%
TOTAL NO. OF CALLS		2884			2697			2703			2504			2189			2727	

Table 2 - Calls by topic to Contact Centre: December 2010 to May 2011

CALL TOPIC	Dec-10			Jan-11			Feb-11			Mar-11			Apr-11			May-11		
	Av Call Handle Time	No of calls	% of calls	Av Call Handle Time	No of calls	% of calls	Av Call Handle Time	No of calls	% of calls	Av Call Handle Time	No of calls	% of calls	Av Call Handle Time	No of calls	% of calls	Av Call Handle Time	No of calls	% of calls
Bridges	<u>15:55</u>	3	0.12%	04:29	2	0.06%	<u>09:43</u>	6	0.22%	05:23	7	0.25%	04:48	8	0.44%	06:49	3	0.15%
Carriageway	<u>09:45</u>	465	%	<u>11:00</u>	1814	%	<u>11:05</u>	1416	%	<u>10:33</u>	1283	%	<u>10:10</u>	680	%	<u>10:46</u>	644	%
Casualty Reduction	06:03	8	0.31%	<u>08:03</u>	13	0.41%	07:12	14	0.51%	08:03	27	0.98%	06:44	18	0.98%	<u>10:31</u>	20	1.00%
Complaints	<u>14:28</u>	6	0.23%	<u>13:16</u>	9	0.28%	<u>16:26</u>	29	1.05%	<u>10:55</u>	35	1.26%	<u>11:54</u>	16	0.87%	<u>09:29</u>	9	0.45%
Compliments	05:57	10	0.39%	05:18	6	0.19%	<u>07:58</u>	6	0.22%	05:22	9	0.33%	07:26	6	0.33%	05:09	5	0.25%
Cycling	03:12	6	0.23%	04:34	9	0.28%	06:40	6	0.22%	<u>07:49</u>	9	0.33%	02:47	6	0.33%	07:18	8	0.40%
Development Control	01:37	2	0.08%	05:44	2	0.06%	00:00	0	0.00%	00:00	0	0.00%	00:00	0	0.00%	<u>08:05</u>	4	0.20%
Footway	<u>08:56</u>	23	0.89%	<u>09:28</u>	41	1.28%	<u>10:05</u>	52	1.89%	<u>10:33</u>	88	3.18%	<u>11:23</u>	61	3.32%	<u>10:59</u>	90	4.49%
General	<u>08:34</u>	185	7.20%	<u>09:27</u>	318	9.93%	<u>08:54</u>	324	%	<u>08:21</u>	333	%	<u>08:04</u>	271	%	<u>09:18</u>	249	%
General TfB	<u>08:21</u>	13	0.51%	07:01	17	0.53%	06:21	26	0.94%	<u>08:37</u>	33	1.19%	<u>08:01</u>	23	1.25%	<u>07:57</u>	64	3.19%
Grass & Trees	<u>09:35</u>	47	1.83%	<u>08:57</u>	129	4.03%	<u>09:13</u>	139	5.05%	<u>09:58</u>	146	5.27%	<u>09:32</u>	212	%	<u>10:06</u>	373	%
Extents/land Charges	06:53	27	1.05%	04:38	40	1.25%	06:18	47	1.71%	04:46	66	2.38%	04:19	41	2.23%	05:12	62	3.09%
Licenses	06:10	75	2.92%	07:05	85	2.65%	<u>07:51</u>	109	3.96%	07:03	121	4.37%	07:06	121	6.59%	06:35	133	6.63%
Lighting/Electrical	<u>08:45</u>	368	%	<u>08:36</u>	524	%	<u>08:44</u>	431	%	<u>09:48</u>	436	%	<u>08:51</u>	257	%	<u>09:44</u>	228	%
Parking	07:13	34	1.32%	<u>08:37</u>	70	2.19%	<u>08:19</u>	72	2.61%	<u>09:49</u>	91	3.29%	<u>07:35</u>	69	3.76%	07:22	78	3.89%
Safer Routes to School	00:00	0	0.00%	02:29	3	0.09%	02:04	2	0.07%	<u>09:49</u>	1	0.04%	00:00	0	0.00%	00:00	0	0.00%
Traffic Management	<u>11:15</u>	36	1.40%	<u>10:30</u>	56	1.75%	<u>10:10</u>	54	1.96%	<u>10:33</u>	68	2.46%	<u>09:12</u>	40	2.18%	<u>12:54</u>	33	1.65%
Walking and Pedestrian	06:26	56	2.18%	<u>10:35</u>	7	0.22%	06:28	4	0.15%	06:31	3	0.11%	<u>13:43</u>	2	0.11%	00:00	0	0.00%
Winter Maintenance	<u>07:56</u>	1206	%	<u>09:02</u>	58	1.81%	<u>08:49</u>	17	0.62%	<u>09:42</u>	13	0.47%	04:34	6	0.33%	04:30	2	0.10%
TOTAL NO. OF CALLS		2570			3203			2754			2769			1837			2005	

Calls under the General TfB topic include a wide range of enquiries including: reporting water leaks, requests for disabled parking badges, requests to remove ragwort, enquiries around public liability insurance, utility company enquiries, and requests to sweep leaves. Work is being done by the contact centre to differentiate these general calls in order to provide better data and to improve call resolution.

Data from the Contact Centre shows that of the 22500 customer contacts received during the period May-September 2011, phone call contact was the most frequent (63%), followed by Email (23%), and then the through the website (14%).

4. Selection of TfB discussions / comments raised at Local Area Forums

Local Area Forums make provision for transport and highways issues to be raised to local members and service providers for discussion. Each Local Area Forum operates slightly differently to another but most allow an agenda item from Transport for Buckinghamshire updates or items. Reading through the action notes and minutes from Local Area Forums, local people also raise transport and highways issues through other discussion items including Question Time and Petitions. Responses to raised issues are replied to through a range of options including the Chairman's Update, the TfB update and directly by TfB Local Area Technicians/officers.

Officers from the Localities Team will be present at the 2nd November evidence session to provide further information on the types of issues raised at Local Area Forums about TfB services and how these issues are discussed and then progressed. The following sections are taken from the Transport for Buckinghamshire update items on the Action Notes of Local Area Forums to provide an introduction to these discussions.

Beaconsfield Forum TfB update - 27 January 2011 Action notes

Members noted the update report from Transport for Buckinghamshire. Chris Schwier responded to the following issues:

- A Winter Maintenance Operational Plan had been agreed by the Cabinet Member and is available via the following link:
<http://www.buckscc.gov.uk/moderngov/ieDecisionDetails.aspx?ID=2111>
- There were 4 gangs fixing about 100 – 120 potholes. Category 1 potholes were dealt with first and were usually fixed by the end of the following day. The pothole gangs try and fix potholes in a concentrated area to obtain value for money. Estate roads do not take priority and potholes are only fixed if the traffic travels at a high speed. This has to be balanced against the claims made against the Council for vehicle damage.
- £120 million has to be spent on roads to get them to a good standard. The Council had received a capital grant of £31.5 million; the proposal out for public consultation was that £7 million be spent on roads to help improve their condition by resurfacing. A decision will be made at Council on 17 February 2011.
- A Member referred to inadequate pothole repairs. He commented that a clause could be built into the contract that repairs are done for free if it needs repairing within 12 months of being fixed. Chris Schwier reported that the Council had an alliance with Transport for Buckinghamshire who had their own operatives that deliver the service back to the Council. It did not operate in the same way as a standard contract. The contract was performance managed.

Winslow and District Local Area Forum TfB update - 2 March 2011 Action notes

Ann-Marie Davies, from Transport for Buckinghamshire, started by explaining that TfB are currently being reviewed which has resulted in the loss of a number of posts. She said that the number of Local Area Technician has been reduced by 50% and a number of LATs are having to re-apply for their jobs. She promised to keep Members updated on further developments in this area. She asked Members to be mindful of this situation in terms of managing expectations. Ann-Marie reported that all schemes for 2010/11 have now been completed.

The transportation delegated budget for 2011/12 has been increased to £36,769.50 (it was £17,815 last year). Ann-Marie circulated the bids to Members for them to consider in light of the increase in the budget.

A Member queried the cost of salt bins (£450). Ann-Marie explained that it is a one-off purchase which then puts the salt bin on the refilling route and it also includes lifetime maintenance of the bin.

A Member felt that the footpath in Winslow should be considered a priority on safety grounds alone. The Member for Winslow Town Council suggested that part of the payment could be funded by the town council and the remaining amount paid for by the delegated budget and the main highways budget. Ann-Marie said that she would explore this idea with her colleagues but felt that it may be difficult to get any further funding from the main highways budget at this time.

A Member asked for more information about the scoring used to score the bids. Ann-Marie explained that all the bids have been scored by Simon Dudley who scores each bid based on various criteria. She went on to name the areas that attract scoring, such as accessibility, safety, etc. Susie Yapp, Lead Area Officer, went on to say that match-funding should be encouraged to enable the money to go further. Ann-Marie went on to say that, in the past, they have asked for a contribution towards the cost of a project rather than match-funding, as this can be difficult for the smaller parishes.

A Member remarked on the state of the roads on the A421 and said that some of the potholes are dangerous and said that as soon as the holes are filled, they start to deteriorate again. Ann-Marie responded by saying that she is aware of the potholes in the Pitchcott area and she reminded Members to log any potholes through the Service Information website.

A Member asked about traffic management and whether Bucks County Council is funding the zebra crossing project. Ann-Marie said she would look into this further outside the meeting.

Addendum – since the meeting, Kevin Allen has responded directly to Winslow Town Council with the following response – “The replacement of the existing beacons with LED upgrades has certainly taken place at the correct crossing. I must add though that we do intend replacing the 'full shields' currently in use around each beacon with 'half shields'.

This alteration should allow the 'flash' of the beacons to be more noticeable. This further piece of work is due to be completed by the end of this week 11 March 2011”.

A Member asked for more information about TfB's consultation relating to the Local Transport Plan. Ann-Marie gave the Member her business card, asked the Member to contact her directly with his comments and she would ask the relevant team, to respond.

Beeches Local Area Forum TfB update – 2 March 2011 Action notes

Members received, for information, the report of the Head of TfB. Members agreed that it was an excellent report giving details of work over the county. They also commented in the amount of information received during the extreme weather, via the Service Information Centre (SIC) website. Chris Schwier stated that the site was constantly updated and it was hoped there would be further improvements in future.

The Missendens Community Partnership TfB update – 1 June 2011 Action notes

Pedestrian Crossing, High Street, Prestwood

Kim Hardwick told members that a consultation about the pedestrian crossing in Prestwood High Street (funding had been agreed for this in 2010/11 from the Transport delegated budget)

was now being carried out, with an estimated completion date for the crossing of August / September 2011.

Service Information Centre

Kim Hardwick asked that any transport-related problems be reported to the Transport for Buckinghamshire Service Information Centre:

<http://www.transportforbucks.net/Transport-and-roads.aspx>

The Service Information Centre was also the first port of call for information on community gangs, grass cutting, road works etc. Problems reported to the Centre would be logged and passed to Mike Barber, the Local Area Technician. The Chairman urged members to log problems in this way rather than contacting Mike Barber directly.

Greater Aylesbury Local Area Forum delegated budgets and TfB update items - 13 June 2011 Action notes

Kimberley Hardwick advised that in March it was understood that the delegated budget for the Greater Aylesbury LAF was increasing and the Forum was invited to submit additional bids. The officer advised that following a change in Leadership the expected increase to the delegated budget was re-allocated to road resurfacing. Which roads will be resurfaced will be agreed in consultation with the local County Councillor. The available monies for the LAF has therefore returned to the original sum of £ 25,841.00

Kimberley Hardwick advised that all the bids received for the delegated budget have been costed and scored. Following a discussion of the schemes Members agreed to support the following schemes:

1. Improvements to Clinton Crescent – Grasscrete - £3,375
2. 2x VAS – Watermead, Spine Road - £15,600
3. Improvements to Walton Way Bollards and Verge improvements - £3,755
4. Removal of disused bus shelter from junction of Welland Road and Ellen Road - £675

It was highlighted that Watermead Parish Council had agreed to contribute £750 towards the costs of each of the vehicle activated signs (VAS). If the criteria is not met for one or both VASs the money will be returned to the LAF.

Mr Dudley highlighted that clarification was still awaited regarding whether the cost quoted for the removal of the bus shelter included Ringway Jacobs costs.

Addendum: Post Meeting Note: Following discussion with our Passenger Transport section it has been confirmed that there are contract costs associated with the removal of this bus shelter. The good news is that these costs can be absorbed within the delegated budget funding that is currently available.

General Update

Members had received the Transport for Buckinghamshire report. Mr Dudley made the following comments:

- Following the change in leadership Peter Hardy is the new Cabinet Member for Planning and Transportation.
- The annual winter review is in its early stages.
- Following the change in Leadership at the County Council, Martin Tett who is the new Leader, has set his vision for the Council and stated that roads are to be a priority. There is extra money in the capital maintenance programme following the re-direction of £2.28million. Mr Tett has said that there will be a 2 year programme of investment in the road network and all County Councillors have been asked to identify their top 5 roads.

The programme of sites should be published in July. Some works may commence in July 2011, others may require road closures and so will be programmed in later.

A Member enquired if there was any update on the grit bins at Buckingham Park.

Buckingham Local Area Forum TfB update - 30 June 2011 Action Notes

Simon Dudley, from Transport for Buckinghamshire, started by introducing David Hedley, the new Local Area Technician for the Buckingham area. He said that David is very happy to meet with Parishes to discuss their needs.

In March, it was understood that the delegated budget for the Buckingham Local Area Forum was increasing and Members were asked to submit additional schemes by 2 May to be considered at the June meeting. All schemes have been scored by one person to ensure consistency.

A change in Leadership and Cabinet at the County Council has seen the expected increase to the delegated budget reallocated. This means that the available money for the LAF has returned to the original sum of £26,603.27.

Following a discussion about all the proposed schemes, Members agreed the following schemes.

- Extension to footpath – Main Street Chackmore (£8,470)
- Application for 11 dropped kerbs – Twyford (£8,300)
- Passing bay/lay-by slip land road widening – Hillesden (£1,500)
- TSID – East Claydon (£300)
- Salt bin – Hillesden (£450)
- 2 x salt bins – East Claydon (£900)
- 3 x salt bins – Gawcott (£1,350)
- Salt bin – Lillingstone Lovell (£450)
- Salt bin – Whaddon Road (£450)
- 4 x salt bins – Westbury (£1,800)
- Salt bin – Tingewick (£450)
- Salt bin – Radclive cum Chackmore (£450)
- The total cost of the agreed schemes is £24,870.

Simon then provided Members with an update on Twyford Bridge and explained that there has been a change in Operations Manager (the new manager is Steve Jenkins) and Simon has arranged to take him to the bridge. Simon is also taking Peter Hardy, the Cabinet Member for Planning and Transportation, on 13 July to visit the bridge. Simon will provide a further update at the next meeting. He asked Members to email their comments to either himself or Roger Landells.

Patrick Fealey, AVDC Councillor, submitted 2 questions prior to the meeting which Simon responded to. These are as follows:

Question 1

“I understand that the issue of safety at the Water Stratford/Stowe crossroads has been raised previously and indeed with involvement of our local MP. I further understand that a survey was commissioned to improve this road junction. Please can you advise what the outcome of the survey was and any proposals put forward. Also as a result of this survey what actions are being taken. This junction continues to be a hazard for traffic coming from

Water Stratford and joining the A422.” Simon responded by saying that there have been 9 collisions in the last 10 years (8 minor ones) and it has not been identified as a priority.

Question 2

“At Westbury, the A422 has a speed restriction of 40 miles per hour – are there any plans to change this restriction?” Simon explained that when the speed limit review consultation takes place, local residents will have an opportunity to put forward their questions and concerns. Speed Limit Review for Area 14 will probably start in 2013/14.

A Member asked whether the speed reduction from 40mph to 30mph on the A413 at Padbury was still going ahead. Ann-Marie Davies said that she understood that it was proceeding but she said she would confirm this.

Addendum – Ann-Marie Davies has contacted the parish following the meeting to confirm they were not directly affected by the Area 13 postponed speed limit review as the parish was contained within Area 12 which has already been completed.

A Member expressed concern regarding the A422 at Westbury as cars are regularly speeding on this road and ending up in the verge. Simon urged the Member to respond to the speed limit review consultation and to copy their County Councillor into their email.

A Member explained that they had been waiting for a speed reduction on the road in Dadford which leads to Silverstone and they have been waiting for over 2 years now. The Member was very unhappy to learn of yet more delays in the speed limit review of the area.

A Member commented about the speed on the Tingewick Road out of Buckingham. The Member explained that the road passes a nursery and an industrial estate yet the speed limit is set at the national speed limit. The Member asked who is responsible for making the decisions regarding the appropriate limits.

The Chairman explained that he, and the other County Councillors for the area, are due to meet with the Speed Limit Review team on 3 August.

Simon Dudley updated Members on the Winter Maintenance review. He said that the roads in Thornton are currently being risk assessed again.

A Member said that the road to Charndon has some very dangerous potholes. Simon said that he would take a look at them.

END