

Traffic Management Act Part 6

July 2019



To view more research from the Local Government Association Research and Information team please visit: <https://www.local.gov.uk/our-support/research>

Contents

Summary	4
Methodology	4
Key messages	4
Introduction	5
Methodology	5
Traffic Management Act 2004 Part 6.....	6
Use of TMA.....	6
Common Issues	6
Traffic Offences.....	7
Police	8
Trial.....	10
Annex A: Questionnaire	12
Annex B: Responses to open ended questions	15

Summary

In June 2019 the Local Government Association (LGA) conducted an online survey of traffic management officers on the Traffic Management Act 2004. The Traffic Management Act 2004 introduced civil enforcement of traffic offences in England and Wales. Part 6 of the Act allows councils outside of London to enforce moving traffic offences.

The results will be used to inform the LGA's policy position on this issue and to demonstrate to Government whether there is still a need for more effective traffic management powers.

Methodology

An online survey was sent to officers responsible for traffic management in all 118 single and upper tier councils in England; London councils were excluded from the survey as these powers already exist in London under separate legislation. A total of 65 submitted responses – a response rate of 55 per cent.

Key messages

- Nine in 10 respondents said that their authority would consider using the full powers of the Traffic Management Act (2004) including Part 6 if it was available.
- Over nine in 10 responding authorities said that based on existing evidence of their local roads the most common issues that their local authority would use the Traffic Management Act to improve were safety (95 per cent) and congestion (92 per cent).
- Around nine in 10 (89 per cent) respondents said that should the Government agree, their council would like to be considered for any future trials of the enforcement of moving traffic conventions.
- Sixty seven per cent (43 respondents) said that the police do not currently actively enforce any moving traffic offences in their local authority area.

Introduction

In June 2019 the Local Government Association (LGA) conducted an online survey on the Traffic Management Act 2004. The Traffic Management Act 2004 introduced civil enforcement of traffic offences in England and Wales. Part 6 of the Act allows councils outside of London to enforce moving traffic offences, like making banned turns, exceeding weight limits and stopping in yellow box junctions. In order for the powers to be turned on the Department for Transport (DfT) is required to pass secondary legislation. Despite the 2004 Act now being 15 years old this secondary legislation has never been introduced to parliament and moving traffic offences can only be enforced by the police under criminal law.

The LGA has been calling on the DfT to introduce these powers since 2004. We therefore conducted a survey of officers responsible for traffic management to better understand the extent to which councils would welcome the introduction of these powers, how they would intend to use them and the extent to which the Police actively enforce them.

The results will be used to inform the LGA's policy position on this issue and to demonstrate to Government what continued need there still is for more effective traffic management powers

Methodology

An online survey was sent to officers responsible for traffic management in all 118 single and upper tier councils in England; London councils were excluded from the survey as these powers already exist in London under separate legislation. A total of 65 submitted responses – a response rate of 55 per cent.

Traffic Management Act 2004 Part 6

This section provides full results for each survey question.

Use of TMA

Respondents were asked if the full powers of the Traffic Management Act (2004) including Part 6 were available, would their local authority consider using it to enforce moving traffic offences to improve network performance. Over nine in ten (91 per cent) said that they would consider using it to enforce moving traffic offences.

Table 1: If the full powers of the Traffic Management Act (2004) including Part 6 was available, would your local authority consider using it to enforce moving traffic offences to improve network performance?

	Per cent
Yes	91
No	2
Don't know	8

Base: all respondents (65)

Common Issues

Respondents who said that they would consider using the Traffic Management Act (2004) including Part 6 were then asked, based on existing evidence of their local roads, what were the most common issues their local authority would use the Traffic Management Act to improve. They were asked to rank up to three options. Half of the respondents (50 per cent) ranked safety as the most common issue they wished to improve, a further 38 per cent ranked it as the second most common issue. Nearly half (46 per cent) ranked congestion as the most common issue they wished to improve with a further 41 per cent ranking it as the second most common issue they would like to use the Act to improve.

Table 2 shows the total counts per issue. Nearly all respondents (95 per cent) said that one of the most common issues that their local authority would use the Traffic Management Act to improve was safety, this was followed closely with congestion at 92 per cent. Three quarters (75 per cent) said that air quality was one of the most common issues that their local authority would use the Traffic Management Act to improve.

Table 2: If yes, based on existing evidence of your local roads, what are the most common issues your local authority would use the Traffic Management Act to improve?

	Per cent
Safety	95
Congestion	92
Air Quality	75
Asset damage	17
Better interaction with Strategic Roads Network	8
Other	5
Don't know	0

Base: all respondents who said that they would consider using the Traffic Management Act to enforce moving traffic offences to improve network performance (59)

Traffic Offences

Respondents were asked, of the possible traffic offences that their local authority could enforce for, which were the most important for their local authority area; respondents could select up to five. The most cited traffic offences were Marking conveying the requirements in paragraph 11 of Part 7 of Schedule 9 (box junction) (68 per cent) and Goods vehicles exceeding the maximum gross weight indicated on the goods vehicle symbol prohibited (box junction) (54 per cent), this was closely followed by No right/left turn for vehicular traffic (53 per cent).

Table 3 shows the full list of possible traffic offences that local authorities could enforce.

Table 3: Of the possible traffic offences that your local authority could enforce for, which are most important for your local authority area?

	Per cent
Marking conveying the requirements in paragraph 11 of Part 7 of Schedule 9 (box junction)	68
Goods vehicles exceeding the maximum gross weight indicated on the goods vehicle symbol prohibited	54
No right/left turn for vehicular traffic	53
Entry to and waiting in a pedestrian zone restricted	39
Route for use by buses, pedal cycles and taxis only	36
One way traffic	34
No entry for vehicular traffic (when the restriction or prohibition is one that may be indicated by another traffic sign subject to civil enforcement)	31
No U-turns for vehicular traffic	31
Motor vehicles prohibited	27
Entry to and waiting in a pedestrian and cycle zone restricted	17
Vehicular traffic must proceed in the direction indicated by the arrow	17
All vehicles prohibited except non-mechanically propelled vehicles being pushed by pedestrians	12
Route for use by pedal cycles only	8
Vehicular traffic must comply with the requirements described in paragraph 3 of Part 4 of Schedule 3	7
Vehicular traffic must turn ahead in the direction indicated by the arrow	5
Buses prohibited	3
Route for use by pedal cycles and by pedestrians only	3
With-flow cycle lane	3
Priority must be given to vehicles from the opposite direction	2
Route comprising two ways, for use by pedal cycles only and by pedestrians only	2
Other	10

Base: all respondents who said that they would consider using the Traffic Management Act to enforce moving traffic offences to improve network performance (59)

Police

All respondents were asked whether in their view the police currently actively enforce any moving traffic offences in their local authority area. Sixty seven per cent (43 respondents) said that the police do not currently actively enforce any moving traffic

offences in their local authority area, in contrast nearly a quarter (22 per cent) said that the police do actively enforce moving traffic offences in their local authority area.

Table 4: In your view, do the police currently actively enforce any moving traffic offences in your local authority area?

	Per cent
Yes	22
No	67
Don't know	11

Base: all respondents (64)

Respondents who said that police currently actively enforce moving traffic offences in their local authority area were asked whether they consider the enforcement the results of public pressure. Of the 14 respondents who were asked this question nine responded that some active enforcement by police in the local authority area has been the result of public pressure.

Table 5: If yes, do you consider their enforcement the result of public pressure?

	Count	Per cent
Yes, all active network enforcement by police in our local authority area has been the result of public pressure	1	7
Yes, some active network enforcement by police in the local authority area has been the result of public pressure	9	64
No	2	14
Don't know	2	14

Base: all respondents who in their view consider the police to actively enforce any moving traffic offences in their local authority area (14)

Table 6 shows, for the 14 areas where police currently actively enforced moving traffic offences, which specific offences are enforced.

Table 6: Which moving traffic offences are currently actively enforced by the police in your local authority area?

	Count	Per cent
Vehicular traffic must proceed in the direction indicated by the arrow	5	15
No right/left turn for vehicular traffic	4	12
One way traffic	4	12
Goods vehicles exceeding the maximum gross weight indicated on the goods vehicle symbol prohibited	4	12
No entry for vehicular traffic (when the restriction or prohibition is one that may be indicated by another traffic sign subject to civil enforcement)	3	9
Route for use by buses, pedal cycles and taxis only	2	6
Vehicular traffic must turn ahead in the direction indicated by the arrow	2	6
Motor vehicles prohibited	2	6
Entry to and waiting in a pedestrian and cycle zone restricted	1	3
Vehicular traffic must comply with the requirements described in paragraph 3 of Part 4 of Schedule 3	1	3
Buses prohibited	1	3
No U-turns for vehicular traffic	1	3
Entry to and waiting in a pedestrian zone restricted	1	3
Other	2	6

Base: all respondents who in their view consider the police to actively enforce any moving traffic offences in their local authority area (14)

Trial

Nearly nine in ten respondents (89 per cent) said that should the Government agree, their council would like to be considered for any future trials of the enforcement of moving traffic contraventions. Four per cent said that they would not like to be considered for any future trial and seven per cent said that they didn't know.

Table 7: Should the Government agree, would your council like to be considered for any future trials of the enforcement of moving traffic contraventions?

	Per cent
Yes	89
No	4
Don't know	7

Base: all respondents (57)

Annex A: Questionnaire

1. If the full powers of the Traffic Management Act (2004) including Part 6 was available, would your local authority consider using it to enforce moving traffic offences to improve network performance?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

2. *If yes*, based on existing evidence of your local roads, what are the most common issues your local authority would use the Traffic Management Act to improve?

Please rank up to three of the options below

- Safety
- Congestion
- Better interaction with the Strategic Roads Network
- Air quality
- Asset damage
- Other (please state)
- Don't know

3. Of the possible traffic offences that your local authority could enforce for, which are **most important** for your local authority area?

Please select up to 5

- Vehicular traffic must proceed in the direction indicated by the arrow
- Vehicular traffic must turn ahead in the direction indicated by the arrow
- Vehicular traffic must comply with the requirements described in paragraph 3 of Part 4 of Schedule 3
- No right/left turn for vehicular traffic
- No U-turns for vehicular traffic
- Priority must be given to vehicles from the opposite direction
- No entry for vehicular traffic (when the restriction or prohibition is one that may be indicated by another traffic sign subject to civil enforcement)
- All vehicles prohibited except non-mechanically propelled vehicles being pushed by pedestrians
- Entry to and waiting in a pedestrian zone restricted
- Entry to and waiting in a pedestrian and cycle zone restricted
- Motor vehicles prohibited
- Motor vehicles except solo motor cycles prohibited
- Solo motor cycles prohibited

- Goods vehicles exceeding the maximum gross weight indicated on the goods vehicle symbol prohibited
 - One way traffic
 - Buses prohibited
 - Route for use by buses, pedal cycles and taxis only
 - Route for use by tramcars only
 - Route for use by pedal cycles only
 - Route for use by pedal cycles and by pedestrians only
 - Route comprising two ways, for use by pedal cycles only and by pedestrians only
 - With-flow cycle lane
 - Contra-flow cycle lane
 - Marking conveying the requirements in paragraph 11 of Part 7 of Schedule 9 (box junction)
4. In your view, do the police currently actively enforce any moving traffic offences in your local authority area?
- Yes
No
Don't know
5. *If yes*, do you consider their enforcement the result of public pressure?
- Yes, all active network enforcement by police in our local authority area has been the result of public pressure
Yes, some active network enforcement by police in the local authority area has been the result of public pressure
No
Don't know
6. Which moving traffic offences are currently actively enforced by the police in your local authority area?
- List of all possible traffic offences.*
7. Does your local authority currently have an effective working partnership with the police to enforce traffic violations? For example, some councils are doing this for weight restriction enforcement. If so, please provide details below:
8. Out of the contraventions that you chose in question three, please describe an example from your network, including the local benefits, where use of enforcement powers would either tackle a current or foreseen problem on your network or support a wider ambition, for example promoting more cycling.

9. Should the Government agree, would your council like to be considered for any future trials of the enforcement of moving traffic contraventions?

Yes

No

Don't know

10. If you would like to make any additional comments on the subject of moving traffic contraventions please do so below:

11. Would you be happy for the LGA, or partner organisations working on its behalf, to contact you for further follow up work? For example, we may want to support local modelling of how future implementation may work.

Annex B: Responses to open ended questions

The following three tables contain respondents' responses to open text questions. All data has been anonymised.

Table 8: Does your local authority currently have an effective working partnership with the police to enforce traffic violations?
Whilst there are localised agreements with the Police to help enforce "hot spots" the police lack resources to enter into a more intensive enforcement regime.
We do have a good working relationship with the police however the police have limited resources which effects the amount of enforcement that can be carried out.
Working with [local partnership] and [local partnership and Neighbourhood's Policing we do receive some enforcement of speed, weight violation and banned movements
Bus lanes and weight restrictions are enforced by the Council.
Speed watch popular. Working group looking at HGV routeing and parking gaining momentum.
We only have a partnership with the police for the Safety Camera Partnership
This work is primarily undertaken through the safer Roads Partnership, but sadly Police resources are rarely directed towards issues such as weight limit enforcement.
Yes, we currently monitor a weight restriction in [place redacted] using ANPR and pass evidence onto the Police
Yes, the local Road Safety Partnerships is effective in relation to the FATAL 4 priorities (e.g. speeding). However, enforcement of obstruction, yellow box markings, pavement parking, etc. is low priority for the police given the demands on resources relating to more serious criminal activity and anti-social behaviour.
We work closely with the police but they have no resources to dedicate to moving traffic offences.
No interest
We do work with them closely but resource is always an issue.
Not specifically but they will respond if we contact them with certain offences.
Yes. [Council] trading standards operate lorry watch scheme for participating parishes. Also close working relationship with speed management in rural communities
We are in the process of setting up a weight restriction enforcement trial between our trading standards team and [area] police. There is also a camera partnership for speed enforcement.
Whilst [the council] work in partnership with the Police, the Constabulary's Roads Policing resources have been reduced resulting in priority being given to policing activity linked to casualty reduction.
There is a local Road Safety Partnership which includes local police teams, however traffic offences are dealt with by the Central Motorway Police Group who concentrate on vehicle speed, mobile phone use, seat belt and vehicle condition enforcement.

<p>Yes, the police will respond to requests for enforcement but their resources are limited and abuse of many traffic offences are a lower priority for the force. More work is undertaken on speed as this has a larger safety impact for the police.</p>
<p>No due to inadequate police resource. We do work in partnership but they simply don't have enough traffic officers. This isn't classed as a priority anymore for our local police force.</p>
<p>Partnership working is an aim adopted by this Authority and the Police, with joint enforcement operation in terms of parking taking place. However this is few and far between due to resources available on both sides.</p>
<p>The Council has an excellent working relationship with the Police being co-located in the same building. However, despite the best intentions of the Police, resource is extremely limited to undertake enforcement of traffic violations. Routine and regular enforcement does not take place but very limited campaigns are undertaken, sometimes in conjunction with the Council's civil enforcement officers.</p>
<p>Some very limited ad hoc arrangements to address specific problems, but no comprehensive enforcement.</p>
<p>We have a very strong partnership in relation to road safety and the use of safety cameras ([local] Safer Roads Partnership), however, other enforcement activities are very limited.</p>
<p>Collaborating on development of an initiative to enable images captured on an approved local authority device to be used to support prosecutions of traffic violations.</p>
<p>Not at present, however [sub-regional] authorities and the Police are currently working towards the establishment of a co-ordination group.</p>
<p>We do have an effective working relationship and the Police actively enforce traffic offences relating to road safety, such as speeding and use of a phone whilst driving. The issue is more regarding available resources that they have to effectively enforce moving traffic offences that occur regularly.</p>
<p>We have a good working relationship with the police but they do not have the resource to enforce moving traffic offences.</p>
<p>We do have a good working partnership with the Police in respect of obstructions, School parking related matters and support for in respect of Anti-social behaviour. We do not have a working partnership in relation to moving traffic violations.</p>
<p>Not for moving traffic offences but we do have for other (non-traffic) offences such as anti-social behaviour.</p>
<p>Yes, we work with [force name redacted] Police to encourage enforcement of speed limits in particular. We regularly meet with officers as a part of our Network Management duties.</p>
<p>Yes - we do joint operations in response to parking issues where other offences may be committed - vehicle tax, trading standards etc.</p>
<p>[Council] have an established connection with the local roads policing unit to target high priority locations, however given the reduction in the number of police resources this has become challenging for them and they are not always able to give the matter any attention. Specific requests for enforcement are considered on a case by case basis, however we have a new system in place where we raise concerns to the local policing teams in the form of bulletins produced by [sub-regional] Road Safety Partnership. The</p>

<p>aim of the bulletin is to include local complaints that council have received including issues associated with moving traffic offences. We will be giving them locations each quarter and a description of the issue that we would like the local policing team to look into and support.</p>
<p>Police resources not available except for occasional targeted operations</p>
<p>only via road safety partnership so focus on speed</p>
<p>We have a [sub-regional] Road Safety Partnership. This is predominantly focused on traffic issues around schools and traffic enforcement cameras for speeding, red-light running and speed-on-green issues.</p>
<p>We have a safety camera partnership with the police who we are currently in discussions with to secure funding for the installation of red light running cameras</p>
<p>We work together on targeted enforcement as best we can</p>
<p>The only traffic signage regularly enforced are speeding and one noncompliance red signal Active enforcement of moving traffic offences has all but ceased due to Police priorities</p>
<p>[area] Police are very engaged in proactive enforcement relating to particular safety campaigns, for example [scheme name redacted] (cyclists and equestrians). They do however have limited resources in Roads Policing.</p>
<p>We have a good working relationship with the Police and we support one another were ever possible, however, whilst they are very supportive of some safety campaigns they have limited resources to support other areas.</p>
<p>The council's Parking Services team undertake joint patrols around schools in the borough at pupil drop off and collection times to address road safety concerns related to parking, speed and obstruction issues.</p>
<p>[Council] works with [force name redacted] Police to support the [area] safer roads partnership that monitors speeding on the counties roads</p>
<p>Resource is so very minimal from the police, we get little to no support.</p>
<p>As a shire authority our communities actively provide the police with evidence of breaches specifically environmental weight restrictions for them to be able to enforce commensurate with their other duties</p>
<p>we generally only have effective partnerships with respect to speed enforcement</p>

Table 9: Out of the contraventions that you chose in question three, please describe an example from your network, including the local benefits, where use of enforcement powers would either tackle a current or foreseen problem on your network or support a wider ambition.

Pedestrian zones are often undermined by drivers ignoring the no entry instructions. This makes the area less attractive to visitors and lowers road safety, increases air pollution and damages the areas reputation. Effective enforcement will help to greatly reduce these effects.

[Local major] Junction The yellow box marking is regularly abused which causes congestion and delays especially to public transport as a bus lane links to the junction. Therefore if this was enforced it will reduce congestion, improve journey times and air quality. This will also help improve the wider local economy.

Town centre pedestrians

Enforcing box junction violations would ease flows on complicated signalised junctions where current blocking causes inefficiency.

Environmental weight restriction when contravened detract from air quality and safety of the area. Banned turns etc. introduce conflict and confusion at pedestrian crossing points eroding safety. Parking in cycle lane reduce the safety of cyclist as they have to merge with traffic that they should not have to. Blocking yellow boxes impacts on congestion, air quality and road safety.

[Local] Town centre cycle lane and no enforcement powers are present due to vehicular use within the lane.

We have some natural beauty spots near fast travelled roads which are protected by double white line systems. On sunny days these are frequently parked next to causing danger to other road users. The police do not actively enforce Access only or pedestrian zones so it would be useful if our CEOs had these powers.

Improve congestion and Road Safety at the [redacted] Roundabout by the introduction of yellow box markings.

Safety around schools, better access for cyclists, tackling obstruction and congestion for box junction.

Errant HGV routeing and parking, especially in a possible no deal scenario

Environmental weight restrictions are currently enforced by our Trading Standards Officers and this is difficult to resource and a transfer to our CPE team would provide a better way of resourcing.

In 2017 the Authority introduced a pilot initiative known as School Streets in the borough. The initiative sought to restrict school related traffic from entering roads in the immediate vicinity of three pilot schools through the introduction of the part time prohibition of driving restriction. Scheme objectives included seeking to address concerns associated with school gate parking, aid road safety, encourage sustainable forms of travel to school and contribute to the Councils Air quality improvement targets. The scheme has now been in operation for nearly 2 years and has over this time have demonstrated that the principles of the scheme can work in the right locations, positively influencing travel and traffic behaviour. Whilst generally well supported by the local community a consistent concern has been around a lack of regular enforcement of the scheme by the Police, who whilst supportive of the initiative have been able to regularly allocate resource to inspect and enforce the restrictions. It is believed that only a relatively low level of regular enforcement would be sufficient to make the scheme largely self-enforcing and the Authority is keen to obtain powers to enforce this contravention moving forward. The ongoing success of this initiative, which I am aware Authorities across the country are now looking to replicate, rests on more effective Local Authority lead enforcement. For further information on the scheme please see our last report on this matter here: [webpage redacted]

We have timed pedestrianised zones in 4 of our towns. We receive a lot of requests for gates to close to prevent vehicles entering these zones, but we state these are not necessary as there are sufficient signs. Some errant vehicles do enter these zone and we have repeatedly asked the police to periodically enforce them, but it is a low priority for them, so never do...

Box junctions are frequently congested as a consequence of drivers failing to traverse the box junction correctly.

Current examples include vehicles entering a weighting in pedestrian areas causing obstruction and safety issues

Targeted enforcement of priority box junction sites would help optimise junction capacity at peak times and support bus service punctuality. Enforcement of controlled parking or restricted zones around schools by camera would help improve air quality around schools and improve road safety at school run times.

we have a particular issue with HGVs 'rat running' through villages when there are road closures on to avoid having to follow strategic diversion routes. We could put in weight limits but as the police would not enforce them then there is little point. Where there are already weight limits then we could do some enforcement potentially.

Promotion of Bus usage, under LTP4, New development with bus access only. Reduction in casualties and rat running [local estate] into [town]

Enforcement powers can help remove the problem facing a number of restrictions which are being abused by mopeds and motorbikes conflicting with cycling. This has resulted in an increase in risk for cyclists and a poor crash record.

enforcement of pedestrian spaces with timed vehicular access - negates need for physical restriction (rising bollards)

Enforcement against moving vehicles in Town Centre pedestrian zone. Increased safety of pedestrians

Entry to pedestrian zone, [redacted]. Consistently ignored by drivers causing safety issues for pedestrians, damage to highway infrastructure and traffic movements that cause delays / queues at junction in AQMA

I don't think it is necessary to be too prescriptive on the use of camera enforcement, we would use cameras to tackle a range of violations where it was identified as the best solution and/or engineering measures were not possible. There are numerous box junctions that could benefit from camera enforcement as well as HGV/weight restrictions that could effectively be enforced.

Enforcement of banned turns would directly benefit casualty reduction in [area] We've had a number of collisions linked to the contravention of movement restrictions such as banned turns.

As a heavily congested metropolitan borough the issues of contravention of one way streets, weights limits, turning and U-turn traffic orders has a significant effect of the safety and amenity of local residents and all road users. Reducing KSI is a key strategy at both a local and regional level to support current approved Road Safety Strategies and Policies. The issue of entry and exit blocking on key strategic routes is key to reduce congestion and improve air quality. Box junctions are used to help control the issue of blocking, especially at peak times. However compliance with box junctions is sporadic and consequently exit and entry blocking is common, causing unnecessary delay and congestion at peak times.

The opportunity to enforce a weight limit would enable us to ensure a prohibition of goods vehicles aimed at addressing air pollutant levels is effective and delivers an improvements in air quality. This will benefit the wide community as well as those residents living within the extent of the Air Quality Management Zone.

Abuse of U-turns and prohibited turns create conflict with pedestrian movements creating safety issues due to unexpected vehicular movements

[The city] has an issue with air quality that it must address. Keeping traffic moving safely in congested area by keeping box junctions clear for example would be a great assistance in achieving improved air quality and reducing congestion. There are also parts of [the area] where motorists simply ignore signage such as no right or no left turns or one way streets. Being able to enforce these locations would assist us greatly in improving road safety especially in the more economically deprived parts of [the area] where there is a sense of lawlessness by motorists due to the lack of any police presence.

Obstruction / Pavement Parking Due to the general layout of the Borough, historically as factory towns with a vast majority of housing being terraced, a major issue is narrow streets and motorists obstructing the highway and pavements with vehicles, of which under current regulations the council Enforcement Officers cannot enforce too without a lengthy and costly TRO process and the installation of unnecessary street furniture. It would be the ambition of the Highway Authority to implement this to cover obstruction and pavement parking to allow Enforcement Officers to effectively deal with these issues. It is not the council intention to penalise everybody and there will be some instances where pavement parking is permitted, whereby safety is not the presiding issue. Cycle Route Enforcement It is a continued aim of this council to promote a healthy lifestyle and to be less reliant on the motorised vehicle. Promoted and creating further cycle only route would help achieve this, however feedback given suggests that many cyclists feel unsafe on our roads and current cycle route which link into them

Council enforcement of entry to and waiting in a pedestrian zone, would be beneficial. Pedestrians currently feel unsafe due to conflict with vehicles, creating an environment where they prefer to shop in out of town developments, leading to negative impacts for the local high street economy

Enforcement of box junction at [a] junction in [the area]. This location is highly congested close to the [town hospital] Hospital. The junction is controlled by traffic signals which frequently operate well below capacity due to vehicles obstructing the junction in contravention of the yellow box restrictions. Work at the location is already scheduled to widen the junction and install CCTV cameras to try to provide better management of the network. However without continued enforcement of the yellow box junction the benefits of any works are expected to be limited.

We have a number of junctions that are subject to exit blocking where yellow box markings would be beneficial - this would reduce both congestion and the negative effects of vehicle emissions (i.e. improve air quality). We also have a number of locations where we wish to restrict large vehicles, for example, where we have weak bridges or structures and to enhance lorry routing to remove large vehicles from unsuitable roads/environments - again this would enhance air quality and quality of life in rural/residential areas.

Enforcing maximum gross weight restrictions would enable us to address known AQMAs

The safety of our citizens is a key transport priority along with congestion management and sustainable travel. One example, of many, where use of enforcement powers would help support this priority is at a busy city centre junction that has no right/left turn restrictions placed on it to facilitate pedestrians crossing the side roads of the junction and in turn improve the junction's overall efficiency. The no right/left turn bans are contravened on a persistent basis however putting at risk the safety of the high number of pedestrians crossing there on a daily basis. The Police do not have the resources to address the problem so by enabling the local traffic authority to use civil enforcement powers to enforce these and other moving traffic restrictions, it will improve road safety, reduce congestion and enable the Police to focus on other priorities.

There are a number of heavily trafficked junctions in the borough with box junction markings which are regularly abused, with a detrimental impact on network management - the ability to carry out effective enforcement at such locations would improve our ability to manage the network and support local priorities such as safety and air quality.

Box junction enforcement is often given as an example where better compliance would benefit the efficiency of the network. Another good example is in [the] town centre where we have introduced a restriction for vehicles at night time to encourage dispersion of people away from the area, in order to look for taxis, and to promote road safety. The Police were fully supportive of the scheme. However, they do not have the resources to enforce it and late at night the restriction is completely ignored and vehicles are entering the area.

1) Yellow box junctions are frequently blocked in [the] city centre, which impedes the flow of traffic and contributes to congestion. 2) The Council would like to consider the use of School Street restrictions (prohibiting motor vehicles on certain roads at the start/end of the school day) but is concerned as to the effectiveness of such an initiative on a through road in particular because it does not have the powers to enforce it. School Streets may encourage more journeys to school to be taken on foot or bicycle, and reduce the amount of congestion and inconsiderate parking in the immediate vicinity of schools.

We have had to introduce a temporary weight limit to a structure. To be able to undertake enforcement we would help us manage the asset in the short term. Longer term enforcement of weight limits generally would assist with managing air quality/environmental issues and the protection of other assets

Goods vehicle - ensure appropriate use of network for environmental reasons; All vehicle prohibition - environment and safety reasons e.g. town centre [redacted] Street; One way traffic - safety to prevent accidents and congestion in one way roads

Effective enforcement of yellow box markings will improve road safety, air quality and congestion making our network more reliable and more efficient for all road users.

To ensure that the traffic flows are maintained and that access to public transport is maintained. To uphold policy for mode shift to sustainable forms of transport - bus priority, park and ride cycling etc. Clean Air etc.

We have a current structural issue with a bridge that we have needed to implement a weight limit in order to ensure the structure doesn't become impaired. We would like to enforce vehicles that are breaking this restriction and feel that civil enforcement would work as an overriding deterrent. In addition we have had to implement an advisory HGV only diversion route, we would also like to be able to place a temp TRO on this and be able to enforce this element.

Currently we are receiving weekly correspondence from the Community Safety Coordinator from [the] Business Improvement District regarding non-compliance of an existing prohibition of vehicles TRO through the pedestrian high street area of [the] Town Centre causing pedestrian / vehicular conflicts and safety concerns.

Box junction enforcement is seen as priority to aid congestion issues

[The council] has an ambition to create a de-trafficked city centre where private motor vehicles no longer dominate - allowing environments with the highest quality of public realm, and where walking, cycling and public transport are prioritised. This will be facilitated by creating a series of traffic cells to prevent through trips and control circulating traffic - pushing traffic back out to the ring road. The fact that we can't currently enforce moving traffic offences other than bus lanes/gates restrict the options in our toolkit to make the necessary 'closures'. This supports transport policy and air quality objectives.

There are numerous junctions along our Key Route Network where yellow boxes have been provided to deter vehicles from waiting obstructively within them. These are regularly blocked by inconsiderate drivers, which leads to congestion, local safety issues and poor air quality. In turn this leads to vehicles diverting from these routes and seeking "quicker" alternative routes, normally through what are primarily residential areas. This leads to safety issues around speeding and extraneous traffic and the resulting air quality issues that come with this. By empowering the city council to enforce this measure alone would lead to significant benefits at the locations where the markings are provided, in terms of more efficient traffic flows, reduction in dangerous manoeuvres to negotiate stationary vehicles, reduction in emissions, and greater safety on the surrounding local network. This will in turn support other wider ambitions of creating safer environments on local roads for vulnerable road-users, such as cyclists.

We have a complex (signalled) roundabout and large gyratory and both have areas where yellow box junctions have been laid. Unfortunately, these are completely disregarded and vehicles regularly park within the yellow box area blocking the conflicting traffic movement when they have right of way / receive a 'green' traffic signal. This effectively locks the roundabout / gyratory leading to: congestion, poor air quality, reduced safety and reduced accessibility to public transport

We have a number of high occupancy vehicle lanes that we would take a proactive approach to enforcement on to decrease congestion and improve air quality

Noncompliance left / right turns , no entries etc. would improve traffic flows

The selected enforcement in section three focus on banned turns and contravening manoeuvres. Enforcement of such manoeuvres would reinforce the confidence of pedestrians and cyclists that are currently adversely affected by vehicles turning at locations where they are not expected to. This enhanced focus would increase confidence and safety for these vulnerable groups. Additionally, the enforcement and management of Yellow Box junctions will benefit air quality and reduce problems and delays along congested corridors in the region.

The selected enforcement in section three focus on banned turns and contravening manoeuvres. Enforcement of such manoeuvres would reinforce the confidence of pedestrians and cyclists that are currently adversely affected by vehicles turning at locations where they are not expected to. This enhanced focus would increase confidence and safety for these vulnerable groups. Additionally, the enforcement and management of Yellow Box junctions will benefit air quality and reduce problems and delays along congested corridors in the region.

We have several pedestrianised areas that do not allow vehicles at certain times. Managing this through the use of physical methods, such as rising bollards is problematic and expensive to maintain. This is also an issue at a number of bus only restrictions, which are widely violated.

[The] town centre is a busy retail pedestrian zone with no vehicular access except for loading only during restricted periods. The no vehicle restrictions are ignored and abused by all vehicle types for short cuts and rat runs across the town centre. As part of this some vehicles are also ignoring one way signs and travelling along streets in the wrong direction to enter the pedestrian zone. The new enforcement powers would enable the council to take action to address the problem and discourage drivers from driving through the pedestrian zone making the town centre safer and more attractive to pedestrians which in turn helps boost the local economy and encourage businesses to stay/invest in the local area.

Road safety at junctions and level crossings is being compromised by traffic routinely ignoring the regulatory signage and road markings. Camera enforcement of the junctions and approach roads would ensure safety and also prevent unnecessary congestion where traffic blocks junctions or uses the opposite carriageway to avoid a queue

Improved safety and routing of HGV's in particular thought villages and areas which we wish to promote as market towns again, as they once were. We wish to protect these roads and the users and promote safety, along with more sustainable modes of transport. With this in turn, it will improve the life performance of our roads, especially in rural villages which cannot cope with the size of the vehicles.

Enforcement of Box markings would discourage blocking through junctions on the strategic road network to manage congestion.

Table 10: If you would like to make any additional comments on the subject of moving traffic contraventions please do so below

Whilst the idea of adopting moving contraventions under TMA is interesting there is, for some authorities, an issue that is not easily resolved. In a large county with 5k miles of road network the lack of infrastructure to monitor and capture offences is minimal and would require large scale investment. The ability to invest in such a manner these days is unlikely to happen. Ongoing funding would also have to be considered, including where fine/charges would be paid to. There is much work to be done on this matter.

It would be useful for Local Authorities to understand more about potential enforcement methods and financial implications of enforcing moving traffic contraventions themselves.

We are keen to expand our School Streets Initiative and will be taking a report on the schemes future to a July decision session for consideration. We are keen to engage and explore opportunities to trial LA enforcement of moving traffic offences outside of borough which we consider critical to the ongoing success of our pilot project.

ANPR camera enforcement is a "Smart City" approach to managing congestion and improving air quality and road safety. Enforcement legislation should be looking to recognise the advances in technology which can support clean air and road safety objectives.

[The area] is a very busy congested city that has a successful track record with increasing Public Transport use. These powers would enable the authority to remove illegal cars from areas of the city enabling the bus operator to increase capacity. The council considers these powers extremely important in delivering its policy to improve the cities safety record and increase walking, cycling and Public Transport use.

Having worked in London Councils for 20 years and only recently moving to [council], I find the disparity between what London can enforce and what County can enforce both frustrating and unfair, on us and the Police. The Police simply DO NOT have the resource to assist us and if we want to effectively manage traffic, particularly in urban areas, similar powers to London are essential.

We think there is a cost implication because enforcement would require ANPR cameras. We wouldn't have the power to stop vehicles which the Police have. There would be additional resource cost [could this be funded by the saving from the Police budget as they would not be enforcing?

Powers for local authorities to be able to enforce moving traffic contraventions are long overdue in my opinion. Allowing councils outside of London to be able to enforce parking controls and bus lanes (albeit under the Transport Act 2000) but not moving traffic offences causes confusion and inconsistency. If local authorities were granted the necessary powers under Part 6 of the TMA it would enable them to take effective action to target only those restrictions that, if abused, cause the biggest safety issues and the most disruption to the highway network.

We need country wide consistency, being able to carry out enforcement is part of that goal

These powers need to be enabled to permit local authorities to address a number of issues or the police must be given the resources to adequately resource enforcement. It would be [the council's] preference that we take over full enforcement including the back office function so we can strive to make our city safer, cleaner and traffic travel around the city more expeditiously.

The lack of Part 6 enforcement for an Enforcement Authority restricts the effectiveness. It is not always possible for the Police to attend when reports are submitted and the general public is growing complacent as they feel that there is no punishment for these offenses, despite them being described in the Highway Code as offenses. It is felt that the move of Part 6 to CPE, will allow the highway network to be more effectively managed at a local level as well as maintaining national standards. It will also allow the Police to direct their limited resources elsewhere.

The Council along with the [redacted] Combined Authority, has been pressing the Department for Transport to enact these powers

Like many other Local Highway Authorities, [the council] works very closely with partner organisations such as the Police. We recognise that their resources are limited and that it is not always possible to divert resources to traffic management issues. The Council has invested heavily in technology to manage and regulate traffic such as average speed cameras, mobile speed enforcement and parking enforcement technology. We have the experience and resources to address a much wider range of issues but are prevented from doing so until changes are made in legislation.

This issue has been raised by authorities in our region over a number of years and we receive regular complaints from the public regarding non-enforcement. It is our understanding that the devolution of enforcement powers would also be well received by the Police, who have previously expressed concerns about their ability to respond to public requests for enforcement.

If the government is unwilling to fully provide moving traffic offence enforcement powers to local authorities, could it begin with some restrictions eg the prohibition of motor vehicles restriction to enable 'School Streets' schemes to be enforced?

[Redacted], like many towns and cities suffers from congestion and poor air quality. The ability for local authorities to enforce more moving traffic offences will create more compliance of restrictions that are in place to protect the travelling public. It will also free up the limited resource the Police have allowing them to focus on other priorities.

In order to assist in the mode shift from dependency on the car, clean air, the option of having moving enforcement powers would greatly help in improving journey times and the environment

Expansion of powers to Highway Authorities outside of London to take civil enforcement action to moving offences would help us to manage our busy networks and minimise congestion upon it.

In general [the council] would actively look to support such powers should they become available as active and targeted enforcement of such offences would greatly assist in carrying out our Network Management Duty. With the right approach to enforcement there could be considerable benefits to road safety, air quality and congestion/journey time management. There are some key principles that we would need to consider including: The need to balance the signing requirements within the TSRGD associated with these restrictions against the initiative to reduce signage and street clutter and process of appeals. Investigate how we could take this forward as a shared approach with Merseyside Police for speed enforcement offences as an example as I understand there are barriers with sharing data from certain camera devices. Updates to the Council's parking and civil enforcement policy and development of an enforcement protocol outlining methodology to be used. Public communication of enforcement plans and policies. Priority of enforcement activities focus on road safety, air quality and congestion management / enforcement in support of targets reflected in Council's Transport Strategy / Network Management Plan.

We currently undertake the enforcement of bus lanes via permanent camera enforcement sites. As such, we have the equipment, infrastructure and back-office functions already in place which can be further enhanced to undertake the wider moving traffic contraventions enforcement relatively quickly, should we be given these powers permanently or as part of trial.

The [transport strategy] sets out what a successful transport system might look like in order to support our economic, social and environmental ambitions for the long term. The efficient and safe operation of the road network and particularly the Key Route Network (KRN) has been identified as critical in facilitating delivery of the vision. The annual cost of congestion on the road network in [the sub-region] has been estimated by TfGM at over Â£1.3 billion per annum. TfGM and the [sub-regional] Highway Authorities support the case for the enactment of the Part 6 of the TMA within [the sub-region] the ability to enforce moving traffic offences would provide a key tool in enhancing safety, tackling congestion and improving journey time reliability on the network. Discussions have been held with [the police] in the course of preparing this response. [The police force] focuses its enforcement on traffic offences that have an impact on road safety (e.g. speed and drink driving) and does not have sufficient resources to routinely enforce offences that impact on congestion or operation of the network.

Network Management would be greatly empowered by the ability use moving traffic contravention powers and currently these powers are not fully used by the Police forces as they are over stretched and prioritise their actions to more serious criminality. Affording street authorities the powers will take pressure off the Police forces and also improve compliance

Whilst we welcome the opportunity to be able to enforce moving traffic violations, we are mindful of the resources required to currently enforce these restrictions as they can be draconian. The use of technology to be able to enforce would be welcome along with any changes in primary legislation to facilitate this.

Police advise that they will enforce moving traffic offences as and when resources allow.



Local Government Association

Local Government House
Smith Square
London SW1P 3HZ

Telephone 020 7664 3000
Fax 020 7664 3030
Email info@local.gov.uk
www.local.gov.uk

© Local Government Association, 5th August 2019