	ID	Division	Parish / Town Council	Location	Scheme	Problem	Justification / Comments	Requested By	Estimated Cost (£)	Estimated Timescale Assuming smooth progress	RAG
1		BH&LS	Buckhurst Hill	Beech Lane, Buckhurst Hill	One way system along Beech Lane, giving traffic flow from A104 to High Road		Approval will need to be sought from Essex County Police. Please note that such a scheme may increase vehicle speed. If a one-way system is implemented, Officers would recommend traffic calming measures are included as part of the scheme.	Historic scheme list	£25 - 30,000 costs associated with traffic calming, Traffic Regulation Order, signs and lining	9 months	Amber
2		BH&LS	Buckhurst Hill		Pedestrian facilities at signal junction Feasibility study agreed	Difficulty crossing road	It is not considered entirely necessary that a crossing is installed at this location, as a facility already exists on the desire line. However, pedestrians to the east of Loughton Way are still required to cross Loughton Way to reach the existing pedestrian crossing. It is therefore suggested that pedestrian facilities are considered as part of the signal controlled junction on Loughton Way and possibly Roding Lane. However further investigation would be necessary to ensure that the provision of a pedestrian phase would not cause excessive delay and congestion at the signals.	Historic scheme list	£5,000 feasibility study agreed; £200,000 signal design and implementation	9 months	Amber
3		BH&LS	Buckhurst Hill	Westbury Road/Palmerston Road/, Buckhurst Hill	Review of all traffic measures put in place	Mini-roundabout is perceived unsafe with one way road. See also Amberley Road / Russell Road.	Local opposition to one way road. High and unequal flows create confusion. They need also to look left to check nothing is coming out of the upper part of Westbury Rd or that anyone is using the pedestrian crossing beyond the roundabout. Residents, who live in the top half of Westbury Lane, want to turn right at the roundabout to access their road, and they tell me they are terrified because of fast traffic coming up the hill. May be benefit to review of area.	Historic scheme list	Feasibility study £5,000	6 months	Amber
4		BH&LS	Buckhurst Hill	Farm Way/Forest Edge/Station Way, Buckhurst Hill	Traffic calming on Station Way/Farm Way, junction warning signs or VASs	Collision history / speeding on approaches	Previously AR site - lining improved. Route not on strategic network but no suitable location for traffic calming. Adjacent to County Boundary. Speed of roads does not meet ECC VAS policy (2009), Likely view to VAS restricted by on-street parking. Unclear what engineering solution can be installed (short of signalisation ~150k).	Historic scheme list	VAS Signs: £6,000 appro x. per sign. Traffic Calming £20- £30,000 £2K feasibility study Agreed	6 months	Red
5	IT368	BH&LS	Buckhurst Hill	Church Road / Russell Road / A121, High Road, Buckhurst Hill		Unclear problem (congestion?), more information required	Install give way signs? Check accident stats. (pending validation)		2k	3 months	
6		BH&LS	Buckhurst Hill	Church Road/Stag Lane/Beech Lane	Traffic calming measures/One-way system	Narrow residential roads, affected by speeding traffic and parking	Scheme requires validation	New request	TBC	ТВС	

Prioritisation Criteria for LHP



The following criteria have been used to prioritise the schemes across the various disciplines:

Improvement Schemes

All schemes prioritised by the strategic criteria identified within the Local Transport Plan (these have been identified as criteria to enable a simple appraisal of a scheme's alignment to the HST / ICS / EssexWorks objectives).

- Improves connectivity of development / regeneration areas (Weighted)
- Reduces journey times / improves reliability along major urban / inter urban routes (Weighted)
- Reduces the incidence / severity of collisions (Weighted)
- Increases the availability / awareness of travel choice
- Improves interchange between modes / services
- Reduces CO2 emissions
- Improves the management of freight
- Reduces travel impacts on the natural / built / historic environment
- Improves public perception of safety
- Protects the value of existing assets
- Improves asset safety / standard / resillience
- Improves journey experience
- Improves travel options for those with disabilities / mobility constraints
- Improves access to further education / jobs / services for those at risk of isolation
- Promotes healthier lifestyles
- Improves the quality of public spaces
- Improves access to strategic road network / major rail interchange
- Increases role of voluntary / charity sector in transport service provision
- Responds to a priority identified through public consultation

Bus Stop Improvements

Prioritisation ranked by:

- Safety and Security
- Accessibility physical accessibility and using the bus as a means to access key services (healthcare, education, etc)
- Punctuality & Congestion
- Customer Environment making bus travel more comfortable for existing and potential customers

Document Version:	Α		
Control Date:	31/08/12		

Form Ref:	Criteria		
	Page 1 of 2		

EssexITS

Scheme identified and prioritised by Five Year Road Map, based on the following criteria.

- Revenue Cost: Cost of item per annum including communications (and power?) costs
- Work Type: An indication of the type of work, number does not indicate preference just identification
- Congestion:
- Customer information:
- KSI / Safety:
- Carbon reduction:
- VFM:
- Equipment Reliability: Contribution to the a more reliable asset

Safer Roads

Prioritisation based on quantifiable collision history (intervention level based on four injury collisions in the most recent three-year period).

SCP

Prioritisation based on

- Duty of care to ECC employees working in the road (weighted)
- Volume of pedestrians
- Volume of traffic

PROW

Prioritisation based upon:

- To meet legal criteria such as the Equalities Act or where new routes have been added to the Definitive Map by legal process
- To improve important links in the PROW network and to help access key services
- To have the greatest impact on the greatest number of users, particularly the more vulnerable

Document Version:	Α
Control Date:	31/08/12

Form Ref:	Criteria
	Page 2 of 2