

POL	TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT INVESTIGATION	SEW3
------------	---	-------------

POLICY CODE:	SEW3
DIRECTORATE:	Engineering and Works Services
BUSINESS UNIT:	Engineering
SERVICE UNIT:	Road Design
RESPONSIBLE OFFICER:	Transport Engineer
FILE NO.:	182/001; 163/006
DATE FIRST ADOPTED:	8 December 2005
DATE LAST REVIEWED:	9 March 2017
ATTACHMENTS:	Yes
DELEGATED AUTHORITY REF.:	SEW3
VERSION NO.	3

Dates of Amendments / Reviews:	
DAPPS Meeting:	23 May 2013 27 August 2015 23 February 2017
OCM:	13 June 2013 10 September 2015

BACKGROUND:

The City receives a number of public requests for traffic management devices to be installed in local streets to improve road safety or address traffic related amenity issues. For the purposes of this policy, the definition of traffic management is considered to include traffic calming devices such as speed humps, speed platforms and slow points.

City officers can expend a great deal of time investigating individual enquiries, which is not an efficient or an effective way of using limited staff resources.

PURPOSE:

The purpose of this policy is to define an objective and transparent methodology, using recognised criteria, to evaluate public requests for traffic management devices to manage the behaviour of vehicle traffic in local streets.

POLICY:

City officers shall apply the following procedure for evaluating the need for the installation of traffic management measures on roads with an Access or Local Distributor road function:.

1. All public requests for traffic management devices in local streets shall be submitted in writing, and supported by substantiated reasons, together with details of the name of the street, the suggested location of the device and the name and address of the person or persons lodging the request.

2. The level of investigation will be guided by the following criteria:

Investigation level	Criteria
No investigation	The road has been investigated within the last 5 years; or
	The road is a cul-de-sac or road with no straight section greater than 100 metres; or
	Land development in the traffic catchment is not substantially complete (90% residential occupancy); or
	The road is classified as a District Distributor road
Investigate without the need for new traffic data	Traffic data exists and is less than 2 years old in areas where changes in land use are occurring slowly; or
	Traffic data exists and is less than 4 years old in areas with less than 10% change in traffic catchment or traffic generators.
Investigate by collecting new traffic data	When none of the above criteria apply

2. When investigation is justified, City officers will evaluate each traffic management proposal using the Traffic Management Warrant System attached to this policy.
3. Based on the completion of the Traffic Management Warrant System evaluation, City officers will determine whether or not the proposal can be supported.
4. Where the proposal is not supported the person or persons requesting the traffic management measure will be advised accordingly.
5. Where the proposal can be supported in its original or modified form, the proposal will be circulated to all affected property owners and occupants seeking comment on the proposal.
6. Following receipt of any comments during the public consultation phase, a report providing justification for the proposed remedial traffic management treatment will be prepared for the Council's consideration and determination.
7. Where funding for the installation of a proposed traffic management measure is not available in current operating budgets, the funds may be made available by the re-allocation of road maintenance funding or be considered for inclusion in the following or future year's budget.

TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT WARRANT SYSTEM

Table 1: Warrant criteria and weightings

Traffic Parameter	Range/Item	Point Scores for Each Parameter	
		Local Road	Local Distributor
1 Traffic Speed as 85 th percentile in 50km/hr zone	< 50	0	0
	50 – 53	2	2
	54 – 57	5	5
	58 – 61	10	10
	62 – 65	15	15
	66 – 68	25	25
	69 – 72	40	40
	73 – 76	65	65
2 Traffic volumes in vehicles per day (Average Weekday traffic flow)	1000 – 1499	4	0
	1500 – 1999	7	0
	2000 – 2499	10	0
	2500 – 2999	14	0
	3000 – 3999	18	4
	4000 – 4999	24	7
	5000 – 5999	30	12
	≥ 6000	39 + 9 per 1000	18 + 7 per 1000
3.1 Crash data ¹ (5 years – Fatal)	1 fatal	4	4
	2 fatal	20	20
	3 fatal	45	45
	more than 3	45 + 25 per fatal	45 + 25 per fatal
3.2 Crash data ¹ (5 years – Injury)	1 injury	3	3
	2 injuries	12	12
	3 injuries	27	27
	more than 3	27 + 15 per injury	27 + 15 per injury
3.3 Crash data ¹ (5 years – non injury)	1 non injury	2	2
	2 non injuries	6	6
	3 non injuries	11	11
	more than 3	11 + 5 per non	11 + 5 per non

¹ Crash reduction factor to account for higher traffic volumes applies.

Traffic volume factor

0 – 1000	1.0
1000 – 2000	0.9
2000 – 3000	0.8
3000 – 4000	0.7
4000 – 5000	0.6
over 5000	0.5

Traffic Parameter	Range/Item	Point Scores for Each Parameter	
		Local Road	Local Distributor
		injury	injury
4.1 Road design and topography Restricted sight crest curve	< 50 km/h	2	2
	50-60 km/h	6	6
	> 60 km/h	18	18
4.2 Road design and topography Restricted sight horizontal curve	< 50 km/h	2	2
	50-60 km/h	6	6
	> 60 km/h	18	18
4.3 Road design and topography Bends with unrestricted sight	< 50 km/h	0	0
	50-60 km/h	2	2
	> 60 km/h	6	6
4.4 Road design and topography Steep hill	< 50 km/h	1	1
	50-60 km/h	4	4
	> 60 km/h	10	10
5.1 Vulnerable road users Major bicycle or pedestrian crossing point	< 1000 vehicles	1	1
	1000 – 2000 vehs	2	2
	2000 – 3000 vehs	4	4
	3000 – 4000 vehs	6	6
	4000 – 5000 vehs	8	8
	> 5000 vehs	10	10
5.2 Vulnerable road users Important bicycle route	< 1000 vehicles	0	0
	1000 – 2000 vehs	1	1
	2000 – 3000 vehs	2	2
	3000 – 4000 vehs	3	3
	4000 – 5000 vehs	4	4
	> 5000 vehs	5	5
6.1 Activity Generators College	< 30 km/h	0	0
	30-40 km/h	0	0
	40-50 km/h	4	4
	50-60 km/h	10	10
	> 60 km/h	12	12
6.2 Activity Generators School	< 30 km/h	0	0
	30-40 km/h	2	2
	40-50 km/h	4	4
	50-60 km/h	8	8
	> 60 km/h	10	10
6.3 Activity Generators Retail	Under 30 km/h	0	0
	30-40 km/h	0	0
	40-50 km/h	2	2

Traffic Parameter	Range/Item	Point Scores for Each Parameter	
		Local Road	Local Distributor
	50-60 km/h	4	4
	> 60 km/hr	8	8
7.1 Amenity factors Trucks – ≥Austroads Class 3	< 1%	0	0
	1 - 2%	2	0
	2 – 3%	4	1
	3 – 4%	7	3
	4 – 5%	10	6
	> 5%	12	8
7.2 Amenity factors Peak hour traffic (Max. peak hour volume as % of total traffic)	< 10%	0	0
	10 – 20%	5	3
	20 – 40%	15	10
	> 40%	20	15

Table 2: Intervention warrants

Decision	Total Point Score	Action Response
Denoted as technical problem site	More than 50	Considered to be a site that has problems. Suitable solutions to be considered for funding and implementation.
Denoted as minor technical problem site	30 to 50 points	Consider low cost non-capital works solutions (e.g. signing and pavement marking) if appropriate. Review again after 2 years.
Denoted as a site with low safety and amenity concerns	Under 30 points	No further action required.