

Title of meeting:	Cabinet Meeting for Traffic and Transportation Decision Meeting
Date of meeting:	24 th November 2016
Subject:	ETRO 33 - Bus lane between Havisham Road and Church Street
Report by:	Alan Cufley, Director of Transport, Environment and Business Support
Wards affected:	Charles Dickens
Key decision:	No
Full Council decision:	No

1. Purpose of report

- 1.1. To consider the experimental traffic scheme (Experimental Traffic Regulation Order 33/2015) which removed a section of Bus Lane between Havisham Road and Church Street at Mile End Road.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1. **To retain the lining changes and make permanent Experimental Traffic Regulation Order 33.**

3. Background

- 3.1. A decision was made at Traffic & Transportation Committee in March 2015 to suspend the restrictions on the Mile End Road approach bus lane between Havisham Road and Church Street for a minimum 6 month period through an experimental traffic regulation order (ETRO) and also to shorten the southern end of the bus lane in Mile End Road approach between Havisham Road and Church Road by approximately 20 metres, plus 20 metres lining from the northern end of the bus lane be remove
- 3.2. The decision also included a requirement to monitor the impact of the experimental traffic regulation order, including journey times, accident statistics and usage by cyclists.
- 3.3. The Experimental Order (ETRO 33) was made in May 2015, coming into effect on 1 June 2015, with the final works completed in October 2015.

4. Results of Experimental Traffic Order

- 4.1. The final layout has been in operation since October 2015, and in order to make a reasoned appraisal of the operation of the Experimental Order, manual count surveys

have been commissioned with journey time data having been collected prior to implementation and during the experimental period. Local bus operators have also been consulted on their experience using Mile End Road since the section of bus lane was removed.

- 4.2. The experimental order was subject to an initial 6 month consultation period from the making of the order on 1 June 2015. One representation was received on behalf of the Portsmouth Cycle Forum commenting on the proposal because of their concerns for the safety of cyclists (the full representation is included at appendix A).
- 4.3. Journey times have been monitored between M275 Jct 1 and Park Road. A full week has been selected from May 2015 and May 2016 to provide a comparison of journey times. A comparison of weekday AM & PM peaks has been undertaken across the sample weeks to determine average journey times. Fig.1 below shows the recorded times.

	11-15 May 2015	9-13 May 2016
Weekday AM Peak 08:00-09:00	7m 41s	6m 46s
Weekday PM Peak 17:00-18:00	7m 8s	7m 23s

Fig 1: Journey Times between M275 Jct 1 and Park Road

- 4.4. The results show that the AM peak times have decreased between May 2015 and May 2016. The times during the PM Peak have increased slightly in the same period.
- 4.5. Traffic volume data for vehicles using the M275 has also been gathered for May 2015 and May 2016. The peak hours for journey times in mid-week were 8-9am and 5-6pm, the volumes for these times are shown below on Fig .2.

	11-15 May 2015	9-13 May 2016	Difference
AM flow @ 08:00-09:00	3458	3354	-3%
PM flow @ 17:00-18:00	3679	3618	-1.7%

Fig 2: M275 SB Traffic volumes

- 4.6. The figures show that the volumes of traffic entering the city in May 2016 have reduced slightly compared with the same week the previous year. It could be concluded therefore that the decrease in journey time during the AM Peak is in part due to less vehicles entering the city at this time. The PM Peak however saw an increase in journey time but a small decrease in vehicle numbers. This would suggest that journey times on the route from the M275 through the City Centre to Park Road are effected not only by the volume of vehicles on this route, but by opposing routes. Unfortunately data is not available for routes such as Church Street and Lake Road which interrupt inbound traffic flow but it is likely that an increase in traffic volume on these routes has increased the journey time into the city.
- 4.7. In addition to journey time surveys, 3 manual counts were also carried out to log the number of cyclists that made use of the bus lane prior to implementation of the ETRO and also during the trial once the bus lane restriction had been removed. This count was carried out in response to the deputation received at the initial decision meeting

that raised concerns that cyclists would be put at risk and subsequently be put off using the route.

- 4.8. 12hour counts were carried out in May 2015 and June 2016 and a further AM/PM peak count in September 2016. Fig 3 shows the recorded numbers of cyclists using Lane 1 on Mile End Road (formerly Bus lane).

	11 May 2015	20 June 2016	20 Sept 2016
AM Peak 07.30-09.30	31	37	26
PM Peak 16:00-18:00	12	25	21
Total	43	62	47

Fig .3: Numbers of cyclists recorded using Lane 1 Mile End Rd during manual counts

- 4.9. These results show that whilst there is an uplift in cyclists in June (not unexpected due to the weather generally being better in summer months), the numbers of cyclists before (May '15) and after (Sept '16) the implementation of the order have remained steady with a slight increase in total when considering both AM & PM peaks together. On this evidence, the removal of part of the Mile End Road Bus lane has not impacted the numbers of cyclists using the route.
- 4.10. Casualty data was gathered prior to implementation of ETRO 33 and showed that there had been 5 accidents between Rudmore Roundabout and Church Street since April 2014 (when the lane layout was changed at Mile End Road). None of these were attributed to the layout changes at the end of the Rudmore on-slip that were implemented as part of the Park & Ride scheme.
- 4.11. Between June 2015 and June 2016 there were 3 recorded accidents between Rudmore Roundabout and Church Street Roundabout (this includes both the M275 southbound Flyover and A3 Mile End Road). The first of these involved a single vehicle that suffered a tyre blowout, the second involved a pedestrian attempting to cross the carriageway after climbing over crash barriers and the third was a "shunt" accident that occurred on the M275 flyover when a vehicle struck the rear of another vehicle that was stationary due to heavy traffic.
- 4.12. In comparison, during the previous year (May 2014-June 2015), there were 10 recorded incidents along the same route. The reduction in accidents is significant; whilst these are not necessarily as a direct result of the lining changes and ETRO 33, fears that road safety could be compromised as a result of the changes have not materialised.
- 4.13. One change that will have resulted in a positive impact on road safety is that vehicles travelling from Rudmore Roundabout (along A3 Mile End Road) wishing to turn left at the Church street are no longer forced to merge with traffic (from M275 Southbound) removing potential of conflict. Similarly the lining changes allow drivers from the M275 more time and opportunity to move into the left hand lane (for Church Street) and thus making the manoeuvre easier and safer as the concentration of lane swapping is spread out over a larger area.

5. Reasons for recommendations

- 5.1. Overall, the current layout with Experimental Order in place has had neither a positive nor a detrimental effect on journey times into the city centre from the M275.
- 5.2. One objection was received regarding the order, concerned about the impact on cyclists suggesting that there would be a decrease in the number of cyclists using the route. The evidence gathered shows that the number of cyclists using the route has not diminished and numbers have in fact increased slightly.
- 5.3. Road layout changes invariably take drivers some time to become accustomed to and initially can cause confusion and uncertainty. As such, road layout changes should be implemented only when there is a clear advantage to be gained. As the monitoring has demonstrated, in this case there is not a compelling reason to revert to the previous road layout.

6. Equality Impact Assessment

- 6.1 There is no requirement to complete an EIA as there are no issues arising from this report that relate to the Equalities Groups: Age, Disability, Race, Transgender, Gender, Sexual orientation, Religion or belief, relationships between groups, other socially excluded groups.

7. Legal implications

- 7.1. It is the duty of a local authority to manage its road network with a view to achieving, so far as may be reasonably practicable having regard to its other obligations, policies and objectives, the following objectives:
 - (a) securing the expeditious movement of traffic on the authority's road network;
and
 - (b) facilitating the expeditious movement of traffic on road networks for which another authority is the traffic authority
- 7.2. Local authorities have a duty to take account of the needs of all road users, take action to minimise, prevent or deal with congestion problems, and consider the implications of decisions for both their network and those of others.
- 7.3. An experimental order is similar to a permanent traffic regulation order in that it is a legal document which imposes traffic and parking restrictions such as road closures, one-way streets, banned turns, bus/cycle lanes, controlled parking and on-street parking places. Such Orders are made under Sections 9 and 10 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and all other enabling powers after consultation with the chief officer of police in accordance with Schedule 9 to the 1984 Act.
- 7.4. Unlike a permanent order an experimental order can stay in force for a maximum of 18 months while its effects are monitored and the Council decides whether or not to make the provisions permanent. There is no public consultation before the experimental traffic order is brought into effect, but from its commencement date there is a 6-month

public consultation that allows representations to be submitted based on experience of the traffic scheme in operation.

8. Director of Finance's comments

- 8.1 The costs of implementing the recommendations within the report and making the Experimental Traffic Regulation Order 33 permanent are estimated to total £1,100. These costs include advertising the permanent TRO in the press as well as the associated officer time. This will be funded from the Off-Street parking reserve.

.....
Signed by:
Alan Cufley
Director of Transport, Environment and Business Support

Appendices:

Appendix A - Written Representation from Portsmouth Cycle Forum
Appendix B - Road Layout Plan

Background list of documents: Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972

The following documents disclose facts or matters, which have been relied upon to a material extent by the author in preparing this report:

Title of document	Location

The recommendation(s) set out above were approved/ approved as amended/ deferred/ rejected by on

.....
Signed by:
Councillor
Cabinet Member for Traffic and Transportation

Appendix A - Written Representation from Portsmouth Cycle Forum

ETRO 33/2015: Removal of Bus Lane, Mile End Road

Portsmouth Cycle Forum would like to comment on the ETRO changing the long-established bus lane from Havisham St to Church St roundabout to a general traffic lane.

The initial request for this change suggested it would significantly reduce (even 'halve') car journey times into the city centre. Portsmouth Cycle Forum would like to see the evidence that such a change has happened, either from CCTV or survey. The subjective observation by our members is that traffic queues do not appear to have been reduced on the M275.

Observations by Portsmouth Cycle Forum members are that most of the traffic is still using lanes 2 and 3. Traffic turning left into Church St filters into lane 1 about 50m from the roundabout, where the white line changes from solid to broken. This means that traffic is still queuing at busy times. However, some drivers coming from the M275 are crossing over the two solid lines and hatching to get from lane 2 to lane 1. This is a violation of the Highway Code. We observe that drivers are doing this in the knowledge that they can now use what was a bus lane. Some drivers are staying in lane 1 but going straight ahead, where it resumes as a bus lane.

More seriously, drivers exiting southbound from the Rudmore roundabout are entering lane 1, at that point bus lane, because 200m further on the lane becomes general traffic. This lane is not open to general traffic and puts cyclists - legitimate users of the lane - in danger.

The last 50m of lane 1 before Church St roundabout has been general traffic for over 15 years, and throughout this time drivers have moved lanes early, despite the solid white line. This is inevitable because at some point left-turning traffic needs to get into lane 1 and if the traffic in lane 2 is queuing they get stuck behind it. Portsmouth Cycle Forum suggests the following improvements for safety and clarity:

The bus lane should be restored to its pre-ETRO state and extended southwards to continue (in lane 1) to the roundabout traffic signals. Other traffic should stay in lanes 2 and 3 (and the additional lane 4 starting 50m from the traffic lights). There should be a separate phased traffic signal on green allowing buses first while lanes 2, 3 and 4 are on red. The next phase would be green for vehicles in lanes 2 to proceed left or straight ahead, vehicles in lane 3 to proceed straight ahead and vehicles in lane 4 to proceed right or straight ahead. This is similar to Winston Churchill Avenue, where buses and bicycles are only given a green light by sensor.

We anticipate this would go some way to improving the flow of traffic, making it safer and avoiding dangerous manoeuvres.

