



Park Royal Signing Project - Technical Note 11

Subject:	Park Royal Signing Improvements – Work Review Report
Note Number	1 Version 1
Author(s):	Kevin Ratnasingam
Reviewer(s):	Mike Slinn
Date:	30 March 2007

1 Overview

- 1.1 This Note sets out to review the tasks that were carried out in planning and implementing the directional signing improvements and freight delivery map in Park Royal. The primary objective of this Note is to identify the lessons learnt and suggestions for improvements based on the work undertaken. The review and lessons learnt are reported for each stage of work carried out. We hope that the experience will reduce the need to re-invent the wheel and enable other FQPs to carry out similar work more efficiently.

2 Background

- 2.1 The proposal for this work was initiated in 2003/04 following a request from Park Royal Partnership regarding complaints that goods vehicle drivers faced difficulties in finding their way around the estate. The proposal for works involved 3 main stages:
- Stage 1 – Freight study at Park Royal, involving site observations, interviewing drivers, Park Royal businesses and freight operators serving Park Royal;
 - Stage 2 – Identify and prepare the proposals for improvement;
 - Stage 3 – Scheme implementation involving signage fabrication, on-site installation/retrofitting and producing the Park Royal Delivery Map.
- 2.2 The WLFQP brief for works excludes the appointment of contractors to carry out the fabrication, installation and approval of works on-site which would be dealt with by the respective highway authority.
- 2.3 Whilst Stage 1 of the work took a period of 6-8 months to complete, the other 2 stages took considerably more time due to the need to consult and to obtain approval from the relevant highway authorities.

- 2.4 The WLFQP successfully completed the directional signing improvements by 15 September 2006 and the Park Royal Delivery Map was launched on 21 September 2006.

3 Review of Stage 1 of Work

- 3.1 The study was managed by MVA Consultancy. In order to ensure that we obtained representative views on existing directional signage and problems of freight driver routing within Park Royal, we consulted drivers, businesses based in Park Royal and freight operators who were delivering or collecting from Park Royal.
- 3.2 We sought feedback on 3 main subjects:
- Trip frequency, familiarity with estate roads, route taken in/out of the estate etc. ;
 - Views on existing directional signing to and within the estate;
 - Views on possible improvement measures.
- 3.3 The final subject was most important as driver and business buy-in was essential for the proposed improvement measure/s.
- 3.4 Drivers were approached for their views over 3 days while they were loading/ unloading their vehicles either along the kerb or in private compounds. This proved to be an efficient way of soliciting feedback as compared to stopping drivers as they were driving on the road. A postal questionnaire was used for the business interview to enable us to capture as many responses as possible from the 3500 companies that were based in the estate. We interviewed freight operators over the telephone.

Lessons Learnt

- Consider issuing the business questionnaire through Park Royal Partnership as part of their data collection exercise to improve the response rate.

4 Review of Stage 2 Work

- 4.1 The TfL Route Manager and officers from LB Brent, LB Ealing, and LB H&F were consulted throughout the planning and design of the proposals for improvement. It was agreed that the WLFQP would fund the following improvements:
- Directional signing improvements on borough roads;
 - Directional signing improvements on the A40 and A406;
 - The Park Royal Delivery Map
- 4.2 Borough officers were unable to provide us with existing as-built drawings of existing directional signs on borough roads and these had to be measured on-site. TfL provided us with most as-built drawings on the TLRN but some were required to be measured on-site.
- 4.3 Most of the time for this work was spent in seeking approval of the proposed directional signing improvements, in particular revising the proposals to meet the highway authority's requirements. This delay could have been reduced if we had the opportunity to consult

TfL/borough officers who were reviewing the design earlier in the design process to minimise revisions. There was also the challenge of ensuring that the proposed signage improvements were consistent across borough boundaries.

- 4.4 We were fortunate that Park Royal's mapping contractors were able to provide (at a cost) the base map for the Park Royal Delivery Map. This saved time and cost as we were able to superimpose the relevant information on the base map.
- 4.5 Despite consulting TfL, boroughs and Met Police on the draft Park Royal Delivery Map and obtaining their approval that the information shown was correct, it later emerged that recent changes to road layouts were not shown on the map. The appropriate corrections have since been made to the second print version.

Lessons Learnt

- Create a task force consisting of the relevant officers from TfL, the boroughs and Met Police so that an agreement can be reached on how the directional signage improvements are implemented across borough boundaries.
- Reduce delays in obtaining design approval by consulting TfL/borough officers who are responsible for approving the design early in the design process.
- Consult TfL/boroughs/ Met Police for agreement on planned road/traffic management plans to ensure that the information shown on the delivery map is current.

5 Review of Stage 3 Work

- 5.1 To minimise cost, our design for directional signage improvements prioritised retaining the existing sign-face dimensions as much as possible. This would enable the contractor to use stickers over existing directional signs which show the new directional signing proposals. When this was not possible, i.e., additional wordings which require a revising the sign-face dimension, we consulted the appropriate officer responsible for approving the design to reduce the sign X-height to retain the original sign-face dimensions.
- 5.2 Our scope of work did not involve providing advice to the contractors on how to optimise the mounting of the new sign-face as their appointment was made by the relevant highway authority. The site works at LB Brent were carried out by the borough's streetcare contractors. Borough officers were therefore able to approve any on-site revisions that were necessary in carrying out the directional sign installation. Brent's streetcare contractors were also commissioned by LB Ealing to install the directional signage improvements on local roads at LB Ealing.
- 5.3 The TfL Route Manager commissioned their Route Stewards to carry out directional signage improvements on the A40 and A406.

Lessons Learnt

- Have clarity from TfL and boroughs over the individuals who are responsible
 - for the recording of existing sign faces,
 - for the signing strategy and the specification of new sign face information,

- for the design of the location of new signs and for the detailed sign faces and any new supports and
- for the approval of the signing strategy, the specification of new sign face information, the location of new signs and of the design of new sign faces and supports
- for the implementation of new sign faces, new signs and supports
- Retain the task force consisting of the relevant officers from the boroughs affected by the design to oversee the contractor appointment and to resolve on-site issues that are faced by the contractors.
- Consider how the proposed directional signage improvements can be implemented together with other signage improvement works to minimise cost. We understand that some of our directional signing proposals on the A406 were erected/ retrofitted while works were carried out on retrofitting the Wembley Stadium signs, hence involving only a single period of road closure.