

# Scrutiny Commission for Environment & Regeneration

## Review of Traffic Management in Conservation Areas

October 2008



Telford & Wrekin  
COUNCIL

## CONTENTS

Introduction	Page 2
Newport High Street Scheme	Page 3
Consultation Process	Page 7
Design of Traffic Management Schemes in Conservation Areas	Page 9
Conclusions and Recommendations	Page 13
Summary of Recommendations	Page 17
Appendix 1 : List of Activities	Page 19

# 1 – INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 In September 2007, the Council's Cabinet asked the Scrutiny Commission to review the Local Safety Scheme that had been implemented on Newport High Street in 2006. We agreed to undertake this review after we had finished one of the reviews that we had already committed to. We held our first meeting to look at Newport High Street in March 2008. We held an initial meeting with Council officers to get some background information on the key features of the scheme and why it had been put in place. We identified a small number of key stakeholders to consult regarding the scheme so that we could gauge the views of people who live and work in Newport.
- 1.2 We considered the views that we had received from these key stakeholders in May. As scrutiny aims to look at issues that affect more than one ward, we decided to look at some of the wider issues involved, using the example of Newport High Street as a case study. Our focus was on how traffic management schemes are implemented in conservation areas. We looked specifically at how the decision is taken to implement a traffic management scheme, the consultation process used, and the process for designing schemes, in particular any special considerations given to schemes proposed for conservation areas.
- The Council has a duty to designate as a conservation area any area "of special architectural or historic interest, the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance." There are seven conservation areas in the Borough – the Severn Gorge, Wrockwardine, Horsehay & Spring Village, Wellington, Newport, Edgmond and High Ercall.
- 1.3 A full list of our activities for this review is provided at Appendix 1. A number of people took the time to contribute their views either in writing or in meetings to our review. We would like to express our thanks to them for their contributions.
- 1.4 We have made a number of recommendations in Section 5 of this report which we feel will improve the way the Council designs and implements traffic management schemes in conservation areas. We will monitor the progress of those recommendations which the Council's Cabinet agrees to implement.

**Councillors Louise Lomax and Vic Tonks  
Scrutiny Commission for Environment & Regeneration**

## 2 – NEWPORT HIGH STREET SCHEME

- 2.1 The Local Safety Scheme was designed for Newport High Street to improve road safety. There had been 21 injury accidents in the 5 years prior to work starting on the scheme. These are accidents which have been reported to the police as they have resulted in either slight, serious or fatal injury to a person. The Local Safety Scheme proposed a 20mph zone along the High Street, and Department for Transport advice is that a 20mph zone should be supported by physical measures. In Newport, these measures included a raised junction, two pinch points and a built out bus boarder. The scheme was funded by a Department for Transport grant which was specifically for the introduction of a Local Safety Scheme.
- 2.2 Work began in February 2006 and the scheme was completed in June 2006. In August 2006, the Newport Chamber of Commerce submitted a 2,500 name petition to the Council against the scheme. This petition was particularly opposed to the bus build out which was causing congestions as waiting buses restricted the two-way flow of traffic. Opposition to the build out was echoed by Newport Town Council. The main problem was the transfer of passengers between the 481 and 519 bus services, as the 481 waited at the bus build out for up to 10 minutes.
- 2.3 To resolve these issues, a new bus interchange was created in the Stafford Street car park. Buses would still stop at the High Street bus stop, but only to pick up and drop off passengers. The bus interchange became operational in February 2007.
- 2.4 In response to our request for views, we received written submissions from the Chamber of Commerce, the Civic Society, Newport Town Council and additional views from two individual members of the Town Council, the Regeneration Partnership and two of the bus companies that use the Stafford Street interchange. We also met with representatives from the Civic Society and Chamber of Commerce and two of the Newport ward members. Their views are summarised here.
- 2.5 **Newport Town Council**
- The Town Council supports the principles of the 20mph zone and would like to see the speed restriction extended. However, this scheme was poorly implemented.
  - The bus stop build out should be removed.
  - One of the individual members that wrote to us said that many people in Newport wanted to keep the reduced speed limit but without any physical barriers, while the other members said that people were happy with the pinch points, and the pinch point by the church works well as an informal crossing point.

## 2.6 **Regeneration Partnership**

- All of the traffic calming measures should be removed as they have made the town more dangerous (except for the pedestrian crossing which had been funded by the Town Council).
- The Partnership is not opposed to reducing the speed of traffic through the town but the 20mph restriction is unnecessary toward this end. If the only way to remove the traffic calming measures is to remove the 20mph zone, the speed restriction should be removed.

## 2.7 **Chamber of Commerce**

- The public attitude against the scheme has not changed over the last 2 years.
- The scheme was not asked for nor consulted upon, yet when the Chamber had sought other improvements they were told there was no funding available.
- The accidents that were the reason for implementing the scheme would not have been prevented by the measures put in place.
- There has been a detrimental effect on the historic character of the High Street.
- The bus boarder causes congestion even with the interchange in use, as buses still stop to drop off and pick up passengers.
- Although some find the pinch point by the church a convenient pedestrian crossing, it is hazardous, particularly at night. The pinch points on the canal bridge and Lower Bar serve no useful purpose.
- The speed of traffic on the High Street is controlled naturally by the day time congestion without the need for a 20mph limit. The type of drivers who speed in the evening and night time are unlikely to observe the reduced speed limit.
- The Chamber agree that safety is paramount but strongly request a return to the pre-2006 position. If this is not possible for legal or central government reasons, the scheme should be reviewed with proper consultation.

## 2.7 **Newport and District Civic Society**

- Agree with the principle of safety, but question whether this scheme was the only way to achieve it.
- Call for the removal of the 20 mph zone and associated build outs (except for the pedestrian crossing which was funded by the Town Council).
- The design, quality of finish and signage substantially detract from the street scene.
- The scheme has exacerbated the economic fragility of businesses in the High Street.
- Support the Chamber of Commerce in requesting a return to the pre-2006 situation.

## 2.8 **Bus companies**

- Shropshire County Council operates one bus service using the bus interchange and has had no problems reported since using the interchange.
- D&G Coach and Bus Ltd. also runs one service using the interchange. The only issue that drivers reported was that some elderly passengers have said that they don't like walking to the interchange and feel more vulnerable waiting there than they did in the High Street.

## 2.9 **Newport Ward Members**

- Newport has traditionally had the widest High Street in the area and traffic flowed well. We support the principle of a 20mph zone but this scheme has stopped the traffic moving.
- The bus build out doesn't fit with the appearance of the High Street as a conservation area.
- The interchange works well, although it has meant a loss of parking spaces in the Stafford Street car park, including a number for disabled people.
- There has also been a loss of 10 – 12 parking spaces along the High Street opposite the bus build out to enable two way traffic when there is a bus parked.
- The pinch points are hazardous and there have been a number of incidents where cars passing each other at the pinch points have hit wing mirrors.
- The offset pinch points by Adams Grammar School are used as bus stops by school buses. At the end of the school day this blocks the road as a bus waits on each side of the road.
- There was poor consultation prior to the scheme and work started the day after a public consultation meeting was held, which gave the impression that people's views didn't count.
- The knowledge of the Town Council was not fully utilised.

## 2.10 We were provided with the complaints that were submitted to the Council regarding the scheme around the time of its introduction. The main themes were:

- Lack of consultation before implementation and ongoing disregard for people's objections and comments
- Questioning whether the accidents used as reasons for the scheme were caused by speeding or just poor driving and whether the scheme will actually reduce the type of accidents recorded. There was also a feeling that the measures put in could cause more accidents.
- Congestion caused by the bus boarder. Congestion is also caused at the pinch points when delivery vehicles are loading and unloading.
- The traffic calming features don't fit with the street scene.
- The reduction in on-street parking is inconvenient for people who shop in Newport and will have a negative impact on businesses.

2.11 We also looked at the police injury accident records for before and after the scheme was put in place. Between 30<sup>th</sup> September 2000 and 31<sup>st</sup> October 2005, there were 18 slight injury accidents and 3 serious injury accidents recorded along Newport High Street. After the scheme was put in place, between 1<sup>st</sup> February 2006 and 30<sup>th</sup> August 2008 there were 4 slight injury accidents recorded. This is an early indication that the scheme has been successful in its aim to reduce injury accidents, although as it is not a direct comparison we cannot be certain. However, if accidents were occurring at the same rate, we would have expected 9 slight injury accidents and 2 serious injury during this 31 month period.

### 3 – CONSULTATION PROCESS

- 3.1 The Network Management & Policy unit has recognised that there were some flaws in the consultation method previously used for Newport High Street and other traffic schemes. Changes have been made to the way the unit approaches consultation to make it more inclusive and more effective.
- 3.2 There is no formal process for consultation on traffic management schemes, as each scheme is slightly different and consultation is tailored to the particular scheme e.g. location, sensitivity, size. There are, however, two fundamental principles which now guide consultations – to make as many people aware of a scheme at the outset so they can participate in the consultation, and to keep people informed on an ongoing basis.
- 3.3 Although all local authorities are required to give notice of consultations on Traffic Regulation Orders in the public notices section of the newspaper, this section is perhaps unlikely to be read by many people. There is a need to raise people's awareness of consultations in different ways, to give them the best chance of participating in the consultation if they wish to. Letter drops may be used in future to advertise the initial consultation period as this is more direct than adverts in the newspaper. Any form of advertising relies on individuals to take note and respond therefore this approach will not guarantee further participation in consultations, but it will raise awareness among more people and enable them to participate if they wish.
- 3.4 The plans and Traffic Regulation Orders are now sent to the Cabinet Member, Ward Member(s) and Town / Parish Council. Where possible, letters are now sent to individual houses / businesses which will be affected by a new traffic management scheme. There is no evidence that this was undertaken for the Newport High Street scheme. Residents or businesses can often identify important issues from their day-to-day knowledge traffic on the road which traffic engineers are not aware of.
- 3.5 The new approach to consultation is being used in Wellington where changes are being made to the bus station. The initial consultation period is now closed. As the work progresses, there will be press releases and letter drops to nearby houses and businesses giving details of the work that is planned and ongoing updates, for example if there are delays to the expected finish date.
- 3.6 Another method of consultation which other Councils have found successful and which is being trialled in Wellington is to enable key stakeholders to be involved in the design of schemes from scratch. The project involves the repaving of Market Square / Church Street which may require some changes to traffic circulation. A workshop meeting is held with interested stakeholders to firstly identify the

objectives of the scheme. Stakeholders are then split into groups to discuss and put forward their proposals for a scenario that meets the agreed objectives. A number of scenarios will be agreed by the workshop and put forward for testing i.e. possible changes to the highway network around the centre, which will then be tested to assess their impact on traffic flows. For example, it could test the impact of changing a one way system or pedestrianising part of the centre..

- 3.7 This process allows for the objectives to be clarified and agreed at the outset, rather than the Council deciding the objectives and presenting a scheme for consultation which is meeting objectives that the community does not agree with. It also allows the stakeholders to appreciate the difficulties of balancing the competing needs and objectives of any traffic management scheme. This approach can be very effective but is also extremely time and resource intensive, therefore must be prioritised for use for schemes which are particularly sensitive or on a very large scale.

## 4 – DESIGN OF TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT SCHEMES IN CONSERVATION AREAS

### 4.1 The Urban Form and Conservation Team

- 4.1.1 The Council's Urban Form and Conservation Team provides design advice across the Council, is responsible for various Heritage projects and co-ordinates the regeneration of the Borough Towns. The aim of urban design is about creating and supporting attractive places. It is about helping to make places which are safe and attractive, and which function and look good. The two Urban Designers within the team provide design advice to various Council teams, and also make comments on design aspects of planning applications. As traffic management schemes do not require planning permission, the Urban Designers do not automatically have the opportunity to comment on designs unless requested by the Traffic Management team.
- 4.1.2 The objectives of design in the historic conservation areas of the borough are:
- maintaining, supporting, repairing and enhancing the valued and distinctive local character and quality
  - sustaining and attracting the appropriate quantity and quality of activity e.g. movement, shopping, employment, living, leisure.
- 4.1.3 Highway design plays a very important part supporting achieving these objectives by helping to manage the speed and volume of vehicles, creating attractive, safe and accessible space for people, and by respecting the quality of the historic environment. In recent years there has been a substantial change in the approach to highway design with a move away from just meeting the needs of cars to meeting the needs of people and cars, exemplified by the government guidance *Manual for Streets*.
- 4.1.4 Appropriate vehicle behaviour can and should be achieved in our traditional borough towns whilst respecting and positively contributing to their historic townscape e.g. by the narrow streets, the use of appropriate paving and even by the removal of unnecessary traffic paraphernalia which not only detract from the historic appearance but can actually reinforce a detrimental bias towards the car instead of people.
- 4.1.5 The Urban Form & Conservation Team are currently pursuing the production of Public Realm Design Guides for the Severn Gorge and Newport conservation areas. The objective – after collaboration and consultation with all key stakeholders – is that these will state what is expected in these areas in terms of design, materials, street furniture, lighting, signage etc. The guidance will be for new work and ongoing maintenance to ensure consistency and enhancement of the local area.

## 4.2 **Guidance for traffic management scheme design**

4.2.1 The Urban Form & Conservation Team are guided by best practice and best contemporary guidance on urban design which involves traffic management design. While these documents do not always target conservation areas specifically, the principles they contain are universal. We considered a number of these guidance documents as part of this review.

### 4.2.2 ***Traffic Management and Streetscape, Department for Transport Local Transport Note 1/08***

- aims to enhance the appearance of the streetscape by minimising traffic signs, road markings and street furniture traditionally associated with traffic management schemes.
- Designers should recognise the flexibility within the regulations rather than take an overly cautious ‘belt and braces’ approach to design at the cost of functional and aesthetic requirements. Traffic engineers should have an awareness of streetscape issues, but should have good communication with urban designers to benefit from their training and in-depth knowledge with regard to design.
- Design integrity should be maintained from the design through to implementation and maintenance. Similarly high quality materials should be used for repair or replacement as are used when the project is installed. The maintenance requirements and costs should be considered from the outset of any scheme.
- Those involved in designing traffic management schemes have traditionally over-provided traffic signs and road markings for a number of reasons including to encourage road user compliance and from fear of contravening policy, design standards or guidance. However, local authorities have discretion in developing local policies and standards for traffic management schemes to enable more sympathetic design. High quality design is not necessarily more expensive and there may be opportunities to reduce costs if street clutter is reduced.
- Evaluation of schemes is important to ensure that local authorities learn from their mistakes and continue to build on good practice.

### 4.2.3 ***Streets for All: Practical Case Study 5 (Traffic Calming), English Heritage***

- Historic areas are more sensitive to traffic speed and volume and therefore traffic calming in these areas needs careful consideration.
- Standard traffic calming measures have had an adverse effect on the appearance of the street environment and have damaged the character of the street and the built environment.
- The success of small towns and villages depends on ease of access for pedestrians which can be helped by traffic calming.
- Traffic calming measures should be appropriate in their context, considering the type of street, speed of vehicles etc.

- Drivers will slow down if their normal perception of the street environment is challenged through integrated design.
- A scheme should blend with the existing materials and styles of the street
- Involving different disciplines such as engineers, urban designers and architects in the design process will lead to a much improved street environment.

#### 4.2.4 ***Paving the Way, Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE)***

- Streets have individual characters and qualities that define neighbourhoods, therefore traffic management designs should look more widely than just the needs of traffic.
- Specialist urban design is not given sufficient weight in training and policy-making in local authorities. Those responsible for street design should have adequate training. Local transport plans and development plans should contain strategies for improving and maintaining the streetscape.
- Generally the right design policies for streets already exist, but the problem is in how to implement them. This requires a change of attitude and priorities amongst politicians, policy-makers, practitioners and the public to make streets more function for all users.
- Issues which regularly conflict with good urban design include:
  - Confusion between guidance, regulation and responsibility with many different agencies and departments impacting on streets.
  - Materials and furniture used without respect for the streetscape or the way that streets are used by different users.
  - Poor management and maintenance of streets.

#### 4.2.5 ***This way to better streets, CABE***

This is a design guide published by CABE, which includes a number of design principles, including:

- Co-operation and integration between different local authority departments
- Connecting with place and history in design
- Establishing frameworks for public involvement and sharing of information
- Plan for high-quality skills and materials
- Develop inclusive designs which work for a range of users
- Encourage lower speeds through design rather than speed limits
- Balance the needs and interests of various stakeholders
- Aim for visual simplicity for example using a limited palette of simple, durable materials and street furniture.

#### 4.2.6 ***Manual for Streets, Department for Transport, March 2007***

- This document applies to residential and other lightly trafficked streets, but the principles may be applied to other types of road.

- Again, the fundamental principle of the document is that streets should be designed to meet the needs of all users and not just motorists.
- The document rates high streets as having a medium movement function but a medium to high place function. Good design is fundamental to achieving high-quality, attractive places that are socially, economically and environmentally sustainable.
- The amount of signage should be no more than is necessary. There is a statutory duty to sign any restrictions or prohibitions but the designer should determine how they should be signed and whether each sign is necessary to comply with that duty. Designers should begin by assuming a total absence of signs and only introduce them where they serve a clear function.
- Street furniture and lighting should be integral to the overall design and the quality of the design should be sustained through proper management and maintenance.

## 5 – CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### 5.1 Newport High Street Scheme

- 5.1.1 As this review did not focus solely on the issue of the Newport High Street, we did not carry out a wide ranging consultation to gather views on the High Street. There were differences of opinion expressed by those key stakeholders that we did consult even down to their views on particular physical measures installed – for example some argued that the pinch points are dangerous while others felt they provided a useful informal pedestrian crossing. As there was no consensus and our initial consultation was not wide reaching, we do not feel in a position to make any prescriptive recommendation about any changes that should be made to the scheme.
- 5.1.2 The majority of people who shared their views with us were supportive of the reduced speed limit, even though they may have disagreed with the particular measures of this scheme as a way to enforce the 20mph zone. Early indications are that the number of injury accidents occurring on the High Street have reduced since the scheme was implemented. Many of the accidents that were recorded prior to the scheme being introduced were shunts which may still be occurring, but as they tend to be at a lower speed, the risk of injury is reduced. We would therefore recommend that whatever decision is taken as to the future traffic management on the High Street, the speed limit should remain at 20mph.
- 5.1.3 In order for the 20mph zone to be self-enforcing, physical measures are required to slow the traffic. However, it is clear that a number of groups in Newport feel that their views were not taken into consideration in the design of the scheme that currently is in place. We agree that the consultation process was not robust. Those that regularly use a street will have day-to-day knowledge about the movement of traffic and the needs and wishes of the local community that scheme designers do not have. By utilising the local knowledge that exists, schemes can be designed to fit local needs and they will be more effective. Although it is unlikely in any consultation that a solution can be found to meet everybody's needs and wants, we believe that the level of dissatisfaction that still exists with this scheme warrants a review of the scheme using the approach to consultation that has since been adopted. The Newport Regeneration Partnership is leading on a regeneration project for Newport which may result in some changes to the High Street, so it will be timely to review the current scheme alongside any regeneration proposals that may impact on traffic flow through the town, to ensure that they tie in together.

#### **Recommendation 1a:**

**The speed limit on the High Street should remain at 20mph.**

**Recommendation 1b:**

**Traffic Engineers should liaise with the Council's Urban Designers to identify potential changes to the Local Safety Scheme which are more sympathetic to the character of Newport High Street.**

**Recommendation 1c:**

**Traffic Engineers should review the physical measures put in place for the Local Safety Scheme in consultation with the Newport Regeneration Partnership and other key stakeholders and local residents and businesses as part of planned consultation for any future regeneration schemes.**

**5.2 Designing traffic management schemes in conservation areas**

5.2.1 All traffic management schemes should be designed with sensitivity to their surroundings. This is especially important in conservation areas which have particular characteristics that should be preserved. We recognise that Traffic Engineers responsible for designing traffic schemes may have a particular brief – for example reducing speeds – but this should not be considered in isolation. The Council's Urban Form & Conservation team includes two Urban Designers who are able to advise traffic engineers on how schemes could be made more sympathetic to their environment, and their expertise should be utilised.

5.2.2 As traffic schemes are not subject to planning permission, the Urban Form & Conservation Team is not automatically consulted as part of the process for implementing a scheme. However, if the advice of an Urban Designer is sought from the outset, it is more likely that a high quality scheme can be developed. If they are not consulted until the end of the process, it may be more difficult to incorporate their advice into the design. The input of the Urban Designers should be sought in a planned way, to ensure that they are contributing to all appropriate schemes.

**Recommendation 2a:**

**There should be an annual meeting between Urban Designers and Traffic Engineers to identify which of the traffic management schemes planned for the next financial year the Urban Form & Conservation Team need to give advice on.**

**Recommendation 2b:**

**Urban Designers should be involved from the initial stages of any traffic management scheme in a conservation area.**

5.2.3 Public Realm Design Guides detailing the type of materials that should be used in conservation areas would reduce the likelihood of inappropriate schemes being put in place. There are potential issues around higher maintenance costs for higher quality materials.

However, if design guides are produced in consultation with the environmental maintenance team, a range of potential materials could be agreed that are in keeping with the character of conservation areas but are not prohibitively costly to maintain.

5.2.4 Design Guides would ensure that appropriate materials are used when implementing new schemes and also in the ongoing maintenance and repair of schemes to maintain the integrity of each scheme. These Codes should be adopted as Council policy to ensure that they are given appropriate weight in future design in conservation areas.

**Recommendation 3a:**

**The Council should commission Public Realm Design Guides for all appropriate conservation areas as soon as possible.**

**Recommendation 3b:**

**The Cabinet should adopt the completed Public Realm Design Guides as formal Council policy.**

5.2.5 Many of the Council's traffic management schemes are designed by external consultants. They will not necessarily have the local knowledge to ensure that their design is sympathetic to the local area. They can also tend to follow design standards and regulations quite rigidly, rather than using the flexibilities that exist. The specification for each scheme commissioned for a conservation area should therefore include any relevant local information that might impact on the design. It should also refer the consultant to relevant documentation that can guide them.

**Recommendation 4:**

**When commissioning traffic management schemes, the individual specification for traffic management scheme designs in conservation areas should include any requirements that arise because of the nature of the conservation area. They should also make particular reference to any agreed Public Realm Design Code and the Department for Transport *Manual for Streets* and the English Heritage *Streets for All* documents.**

5.2.6 There were a number of lessons learnt from the way that the Newport High Street scheme was implemented which have brought about improvements to the way that other schemes are developed, for example, the current work in Wellington. Reviewing new schemes will help to identify good practice that could be utilised in other areas.

**Recommendation 5:**

**In order to ensure ongoing improvements, traffic management schemes implemented in conservation areas should be reviewed and the lessons learnt should be considered for other conservation areas as appropriate.**

### **5.3 Consultation**

- 5.3.1 Consultation will not always result in a consensus of opinion. This is perhaps particularly true in town centres where different groups – businesses, pedestrians, motorists, residents – want different things from a traffic scheme. However, by engaging as many interested parties as possible in the consultation, the Council can gather as much information as possible to try to develop a scheme that will best meet the needs of the majority.
- 5.3.2 We have been assured that the process has significantly improved since the Newport High Street scheme was consulted on and that far greater efforts are being made to contact local residents, businesses, Parish and Town Councils and other interested stakeholders. We were particularly impressed with the inclusive consultation that has been undertaken so far in Wellington, and the workshops planned for the next stage of the project. However, we appreciate that this approach is resource intensive and could not be used for every scheme.
- 5.3.3 Ward members and Parish and Town Councils have a great deal of local knowledge that could help even in the very early stages of designing a traffic management scheme. They may be aware of local sensitivities which may need to be included in the design specification. Consulting the relevant ward member/s early on in the process may help to identify issues which can be built into the public consultation.

#### **Recommendation 6:**

**Ward Members and Parish and Town Councils should be consulted at the earliest stage of a traffic management scheme to elicit their local knowledge.**

## SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations are summarised in the table below. We have assigned a priority level to each of the recommendations, and given an indication of the cost.

It is not possible to provide detailed costings for the recommendations within this report without a considerable amount of additional work being undertaken by both scrutiny members and finance officers. However, the recommendations have been placed into one of three categories as follows:-

- Low cost indicates that the recommendation could be funded from within existing resources, although not necessarily in the current year.
- Medium cost indicates that the recommendation is anticipated to cost up to £10,000 which is not currently budgeted.
- High cost indicates that the recommendation is expected to cost more than £10,000 which is not currently budgeted.

Recommendation	Indication of cost	Priority level
<p><b>Recommendation 1a:</b> The speed limit on the High Street should remain at 20mph.</p>	Low	High
<p><b>Recommendation 1b:</b> Traffic Engineers should liaise with the Council's Urban Designers to identify potential changes to the Local Safety Scheme which are more sympathetic to the character of Newport High Street.</p>	Medium - High	Medium
<p><b>Recommendation 1c:</b> Traffic Engineers should review the physical measures put in place for the Local Safety Scheme in consultation with the Newport Regeneration Partnership and other key stakeholders and local residents and businesses as part of planned consultation for any future regeneration schemes.</p>	Medium - High	Medium
<p><b>Recommendation 2a:</b> There should be an annual meeting between Urban Designers and Traffic Engineers to</p>	Low	High

identify which of the traffic management schemes planned for the next financial year the Urban Form & Conservation Team need to give advice on.		
<b>Recommendation 2b:</b> Urban Designers should be involved from the initial stages of any traffic management scheme in a conservation area.	Low	Medium
<b>Recommendation 3a:</b> The Council should commission Public Realm Design Codes for all appropriate conservation areas as soon as possible.	Medium	High
<b>Recommendation 3b:</b> The Cabinet should adopt the completed Public Realm Design Codes as formal Council policy.	Low	High
<b>Recommendation 4:</b> When commissioning traffic management schemes, the individual specification for traffic management scheme designs in conservation areas should include any requirements that arise because of the nature of the conservation area. They should also make particular reference to any agreed Public Realm Design Code and the Department for Transport <i>Manual for Streets</i> and the English Heritage <i>Streets for All</i> documents.	Low	High
<b>Recommendation 5:</b> In order to ensure ongoing improvements, traffic management schemes implemented in conservation areas should be reviewed and the lessons learnt should be considered for other conservation areas as appropriate.	Low	Medium
<b>Recommendation 6:</b> Ward Members and Parish and Town Councils should be consulted at the earliest stage of a traffic management scheme to elicit their local knowledge.	Low	Medium

## APPENDIX 1 – LIST OF ACTIVITIES

We would like to express our thanks to all of the people who have contributed to our review, including those named below. To gather evidence for this review we undertook the following activities:

- Visit to Newport High Street and meeting with Council officers and Cabinet Member for Environment to gather background information on the Local Safety Scheme.
- Written views from:
  - Newport Chamber of Commerce
  - Newport Town Council and 2 individual members of Newport Town Council
  - Bus companies using the Stafford Street bus interchange
  - Newport Civic Society
  - Newport Regeneration Partnership.
- Meetings with:
  - Councillor Adam Stanton and Councillor Eric Carter – Newport ward members
  - Mark Freeman – Newport Chamber of Commerce
  - David Parker – Newport Civic Society
  - Nick Kitchen – Senior Traffic Engineer : Network Management & Policy
  - Stuart Freeman – Business Manager : Network Management & Policy
  - Andy Rose – Team Leader: Urban Form & Conservation
  - Michael Vout – Urban Designer
  - Paul Sherry – Principal Regeneration Officer
- Desk-based review of:
  - The record of complaints made to the Council regarding the Newport High Street Local Safety Scheme
  - Accident record for the Newport High Street Local Safety Scheme
  - *Traffic Management & Streetscape*, Department for Transport Note, March 2008
  - *Manual for Streets*, Department for Transport
  - *Streets for All: Practical Case Studies*, English Heritage
  - *Paving the Way*, Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE), 2002
  - *This Way to Better Streets*, CABE, 2007.