



**MINOR IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAMME  
2008/09**

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL  
LOCAL COMMITTEE (GUILDFORD)**

**12<sup>th</sup> FEBRUARY 2008**

**KEY ISSUE**

This report recommends options for the programme of minor schemes depending on the level of funding which is made available.

**SUMMARY**

The report explains the uncertainties regarding next year's minor improvements funding and proposed two possible funding scenarios. It make recommendations as to programmes of schemes which could proceed under each of these scenarios. It also suggests a list of alternatives for the Committee' consideration.

**Report by**

**Surrey Atlas Ref.**

LOCAL HIGHWAYS MANAGER

N/A

**GUILDFORD B.C. WARD (S)**

**COUNTY ELECTORAL DIVISION (S)**

ALL

ALL

**OFFICER RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Committee is asked to agree:

- (i) that in the event that funding in the region of £380,000 is made available, the schemes set out in paragraphs 15 and 16 should form the basis of the minor schemes programme for 2008/09.
- (ii) that in the event that funding in the region of £760,000 is made available, the schemes set out in paragraphs 15 to 18 should form the basis of the minor schemes programme for 2008/09.
- (iii) that if necessary a further report be brought to a future meeting to clarify the programme when detailed allocations have been made.
- (iv) that notwithstanding recommendations (i) and (ii) above, the Committee consider and decide which if any of the options set out in paragraphs 20 to 30 should be agreed. [Note that if any Member of the Committee is so minded, an amendment to the recommendations should be proposed, seconded and voted upon.]
- (v) that the £12,000 developer funding be used to fund a feasibility study into the A25 Midleton road cycle facilities.
- (vi) that officers be authorised to proceed with any necessary actions including traffic orders, advertisements and notices of intent in order to deliver these projects as soon as 2008/09 budgets are known.

**INTRODUCTION and BACKGROUND**

- 1 At its last meeting on 13 December 2007 this Committee considered (Item 15) the recommendations of the Transportation Task Group regarding schemes to be added to the forward programme. This followed the meeting of the Task Group on 26 November 2007.
- 2 This report is concerned with the minor schemes programme for 2008/09. It therefore excludes reference to all schemes where substantial completion is expected by 31 March 2008.
- 3 That said, some costs from the 2007/08 programme may overlap into 2008/09. Reasons for this include:
  - slippage in the constructor's programme
  - delays due to weather conditions
  - delays due to objections arising from consultation or formal advertisement (e.g. see report at Item 9 on this agenda)
  - residual costs such as Stage 3 Safety Audits and any works required as a result of these
  - late billing by the constructor

Any such costs must take the highest priority in 2008/09 in the event that

residual budgets cannot be carried forward (see paragraph 5 below).

- 4 As noted in the 13 December 2007 report, four projects which were due to start feasibility and design during 2007/08 have not done so, due to a lack of suitable staff resources. This has led to a small predicted underspend, although this has been offset by the late addition of the feasibility study for the A3100 Portsmouth Road controlled crossing into the programme. The four delayed projects are therefore carried forward to 2008/09 in their entirety (but see paragraph 20 below).
- 5 At the time of writing, it is not clear how any under- or over-spends from 2007/08 will be treated. Some years ago these were accumulated across the transportation service as a whole and accounted for centrally. More recently, each local manager was made responsible for his own annual expenditure, and underspends could be carried forward, while overspends became the first call on the new financial year's budget.
- 6 Also at the time of writing, neither the Local Transport Plan (LTP) capital budgets nor the Local Capital Allocation available to each Local Committee have been decided. Nevertheless it is important that a programme of schemes is agreed in order that officers may maintain progress.
- 7 Last year's LTP funding for Guildford was increased from £620,000 to £657,000. This was supplemented by the £100,000 Local Capital Allocation which the Committee agreed should be spent on highway improvements, making a total of £757,000.
- 8 Early discussions about the overall highways capital budget have suggested increasing the investment in capital maintenance as a possible strategy, with improvements funding being substantially reduced to allow a significant increase in major maintenance.
- 9 This report therefore makes two alternative assumptions:
- Option A** that the sum available will be about half of last year's figure (£380,000) and
- Option B** that the sum available will be broadly as per last year's figure (£760,000)

#### **THE CURRENT MINOR SCHEMES PROGRAMME**

- 10 Schemes on the forward programme agreed by this Committee on 13 December 2007 fall into the following groups:

## 11 Those where feasibility and design commenced during 2007/08

| Scheme No. | Title   | Feasibility / Design (£000) | Construction (£000) | ARR | BCR  |
|------------|---|-----------------------------|---------------------|-----|------|
| 7/337      | York Rd j/w London Rd, Guildford - carriageway widening | 25                          | 206                 | 39  | 5    |
| 7/345      | Aldershot Road, Guildford - Pedestrian facility         | 10                          | 65                  | 40  | 7    |
| 7/359      | Portsmouth Road, Guildford - Pedestrian Crossing        | 15                          | 95                  | 0   | 0.27 |

Notes:

ARR = Annual Rate of Return. This measures accident reduction against scheme costs.

BCR = Benefit / Cost Ratio. This measures other benefits e.g. to cyclists, pedestrians and public transport against scheme costs.

## 12 Those where feasibility was due to start in 2007/08:

| Scheme No. | Title   | Feasibility / Design (£000) | Construction (£000) | ARR | BCR |
|------------|---|-----------------------------|---------------------|-----|-----|
| 7/352      | East Horsley Village safety scheme                                      | 17                          | 115                 | 229 | 11  |
| 7/348      | A31 Hog's Back, J/W B3000 Puttenham Interchange, Junction Improvements  | 20                          | 145                 | 196 | 3   |
| 7/339      | A247 Send Barns Lane & Send Road, Send, - Pedestrian & cycle facilities | 20                          | 150                 | 166 | 9   |
| 7/340      | A25 Boxgrove Road, Guildford - Pedestrian Facility at AA roundabout     | 10                          | 60                  | 0   | 7   |

Notes:

ARR = Annual Rate of Return. This measures accident reduction against scheme costs.

BCR = Benefit / Cost Ratio. This measures other benefits e.g. to cyclists, pedestrians and public transport against scheme costs.

## 13 Those listed as 'awaiting funding':

| Scheme No.   | Scheme Location   | Estimated Cost  | ARR        | BCR       |
|--------------|---|-----------------|------------|-----------|
| 7/120        | A25 Shere Rd, Newlands Corner, Shere, Provision of pedestrian facility<br>Total PIA's 0 [(Pedes 0), (P/C 0)]                      | £132,000        | 0          | 8         |
| 7/256        | A320 Chertsey Street, Guildford j/w North St, Improvements. <i>Related to Friary re-development</i>                               | N/A             | N/A        | N/A       |
| 7/305        | Pirbright Village Safety Scheme Phase II<br>Total PIA's 8 [(Pedes 0), (P/C 0)]  | £66,000         | 133        | 5         |
| <b>7/313</b> | <b>A248 Kings Road, Shalford<br/>Provision of footway &amp; Pedestrian facility<br/>Total PIA's 1 [(Pedes 0), (P/C 0)]</b>        | <b>£121,000</b> | <b>10</b>  | <b>10</b> |
| 7/325        | A246 Guildford Road j/w The Street, Effingham - Provision of Right Turn Filter<br>Total PIA's 1 [(Pedes 0), (P/C 0)]              | £77,000         | 8          | 6         |
| 7/329        | Onslow Village to station<br>Cycle facilities<br>Total PIA's 40 [(Pedes 16), (P/C 4)]   | £88,000         | 558        | 7         |
| 7/330        | Artington to Town Centre<br>Cycle facilities<br>Total PIA's 17 [(Pedes 1), (P/C 1)]   | £99,000         | 210        | 9         |
| 7/331        | Chilworth to Shalford<br>Cycle facilities<br>Total PIA's 9 [(Pedes 0), (P/C 1)]   | £110,000        | 100        | 6         |
| 7/347        | Shere Village Safety Scheme Phase 2<br>Total PIA's 02 [(Pedes 1), (P/C 1)]  | £88,000         | 29         | 5         |
| <b>7/349</b> | <b>A25 Midleton Road, Guildford from Dennis roundabout to Ladymead - Cycle facilities<br/>Total PIA's 15 [(Pedes 0), (P/C 0)]</b> | <b>£165,000</b> | <b>112</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| 7/351        | Egerton Road, park barn – Pedestrian and cycle facilities   | N/A             | N/A        | N/A       |
| 7/354        | Jacobs Well Rd/Clay lane/ Blanchard Hill, Jacobs Well Safety improvements<br>Total PIA's 11 [(Pedes 0), (P/C 0)]                  | £215,000        | 64         | 1         |
| <b>7/355</b> | <b>Stoughton Area (between Grange Rd and Worplesdon Road)</b>   | <b>?</b>        | <b>?</b>   | <b>?</b>  |
| 7/356        | A320 Woking Road/Jacobs Well Road Junction Improvements<br>Total PIA's 3 [(Pedes 0), (P/C 0)]                                     | £77,000         | 51         | 7         |
| <b>7/358</b> | <b>Vale Road, Ash</b>   | <b>95,000</b>   | <b>202</b> | <b>5</b>  |

Those schemes in **bold** text above are discussed in paragraphs 23 to 31 below.

- 14 In addition to the schemes listed above, the Committee has in previous years made the following allocations:

|   |                               |          |
|---|-------------------------------|----------|
| ➤ | New Road Marking & Signing    | £ 20,000 |
| ➤ | Safe Routes to School schemes | £ 20,000 |
| ➤ | Speed management              | £ 40,000 |

It is the view of officers that the first two figures should be protected, but the speed management figure could be reduced to £30,000.

### OFFICER RECOMMENDATIONS – OPTION A

- 15 In the event of substantially reduced funding, there is no opportunity for new projects to be commenced. The following projects are therefore recommended:

| Scheme No. | Title   | Feasibility / Design (£000) | Construction (£000) | Total      |
|------------|---|-----------------------------|---------------------|------------|
| 7/337      | York Rd junction with London Rd, Guildford      | 25                          | 206                 |            |
| 7/345      | Aldershot Road, Guildford - Pedestrian facility | 10                          | 65                  |            |
| 7/359      | Portsmouth Road, Guildford Pedestrian Crossing  | 15                          | 95                  |            |
|            | New Road Marking & Signing                      | -                           | 20                  |            |
|            | Safe Routes to School                           | -                           | 20                  |            |
|            | Speed Management                                | -                           | 30                  |            |
|            | <b>Totals</b>                                   | <b>50</b>                   | <b>436</b>          | <b>486</b> |

- 16 Clearly the total estimated cost of these projects (£486,000) would exceed a budget of £380,000. In practice this may not be a problem, as some projects may not survive the feasibility process, and their detailed design and construction costs may not therefore be incurred. In the event that all the above projects proved feasible, the construction of one or more would have to be deferred to a future year.

### OFFICER RECOMMENDATIONS – OPTION B

- 17 In the event of funding levels being similar to those in 2007/08, there would be a little more headroom to commence some new projects. Officers therefore recommend the projects listed for Option A, plus the following:

| Scheme No. | Title   | Feasibility / Design (£000) | Construction (£000) | Total        |
|------------|---|-----------------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| 7/352      | East Horsley Village safety scheme                                      | 17                          | 115                 |              |
| 7/348      | A31 Hog's Back, j/w B3000 Puttenham Interchange                         | 20                          | 145                 |              |
| 7/339      | A247 Send Barns Lane & Send Road, Send, - Pedestrian & cycle facilities | 20                          | 150                 |              |
| 7/340      | A25 Boxgrove Road, Guildford - Pedestrian Facility at AA roundabout     | 10                          | 60                  |              |
|            | <b>Sub-totals</b>   | <b>67</b>                   | <b>260 *</b>        | <b>327 *</b> |
|            | Projects as in Option A   | 50                          | 436                 | 486          |
|            | <b>Totals</b>   | <b>117</b>                  | <b>696 *</b>        | <b>813 *</b> |

\* Excludes figures in shaded boxes

- 18 Clearly, as with Option A, the total estimated cost of these projects (£813,000) would exceed a budget of £760,000. As before, this may not be a problem, as some projects may not survive the feasibility process, and their detailed design and construction costs may not therefore be incurred. In the event that all the above projects proved feasible, the construction of one or more would have to be deferred to a future year. The construction costs in the two shaded boxes above have not been included; these could not be incurred before 2009/10 unless other projects could not be delivered.

## OPTIONS

- 19 There is a considerable number of permutations and combinations possible, given the different funding scenarios and the number of schemes in the forward programme. Officers have recommended a balanced programme designed to address expectations while not raising unrealistic ones. This will inevitably mean disappointment to some communities. There is little scope to alter the proposed programmes under Option B, and almost none in Option A. Nevertheless alternatives which the Committee may wish to consider are as follows:

### Projects delayed from 2007/08

- 20 Officers generally recommend giving precedence to those projects where work has started and expectations raised. However the group of four projects (see paragraph 12 above) which should have commenced feasibility studies during 2007/08 did not actually do so. Officers have recommended these projects under the Option B scenario (but not Option A). The Committee may feel that projects lower down on the list should take precedence.



## **Speed Management**

- 21 The control of speed has been an important part of the Committee's programme for some time. The number of requests for revised speed limits is not as great as in previous years, however. The Committee may wish to consider whether the speed management programme should be reduced or deferred completely in 2008/09 given the pressure on resources.

### **7/359 A3100 Portsmouth Road Controlled Crossing**

- 22 The feasibility study into the A3100 Portsmouth Road pelican crossing was added to the programme in December 2007, following a meeting between Anne Milton MP, David Munro, SCC Executive Member for Transportation, Cllr David Goodwin, local residents and the head teacher of St. Nicolas' School. The feasibility study report is imminent. Officers have included the project on the programmes under both Options A and B, on the grounds that once a project has commenced it should be continued. The committee may support this, or alternatively may feel that the project has 'jumped the queue' and should wait its turn.

### **7/313 Kings Road, Shalford, footway & crossing facility**

- 23 This scheme was originally requested by Shalford Parish Council, although it is not clear whether it still enjoys their support. The crossing facility would benefit a range of road users close to the centre of the village, while the footway would connect the crossing to outlying parts of the village, and in particular to a sheltered housing facility. The scheme has a moderate benefit to cost ratio. As this report was in preparation officers were informed that developer funding of £5000 to conduct a review of waiting restrictions, and £6000 to contribute to pedestrian improvements is about to become available. The committee is invited to consider whether this project should be added to Option B at the expense of another project.

### **7/355 Stoughton traffic improvements**

- 24 The Committee will be aware that the Stoughton Community Association (SCA) has petitioned in favour of measures to deal with speed and volume of traffic throughout the Stoughton area, but with particular emphasis on Grange Road, Manor Road and Stoughton Road. Desired improvements / options include traffic calming, measures to control parking, and road closures. SCA have consistently requested a 'pan-Stoughton' approach, that is they do not wish to see the area-wide problems tackled on a piecemeal basis.
- 25 At a recent meeting with Anne Milton MP, David Munro, SCC Executive Member for Transportation, Cllrs. Pauline Searle and Wendy May and local residents, SCA representatives strongly requested that a full survey of traffic in Stoughton be undertaken as a matter of urgency. SCA is prepared to accept that a survey may not lead immediately and directly to improvements being designed and implemented.

- 26 Officers are concerned at this for two reasons. Firstly, as noted in paragraphs 19 and 20 above, when survey work is commenced, expectations are raised locally, and this should not be done without funding for implementation being reasonable assured. Secondly, if significant time were to elapse between the surveys and implementation, the surveys may need to be repeated, leading to additional delays and expense.
- 27 The information requested by SCA would require a wide range of survey work, including classified traffic counts, speed surveys, parking surveys and registration plate surveys. Without the registration plate surveys, it would not be possible to determine where drivers are entering and leaving the area of interest, nor to determine whether they have business in the area, or are merely 'rat-running'. Without this information, it would in turn be impossible to predict the effects of the desired road closures, and therefore to estimate the effects of diverted traffic on other routes.
- 28 The Committee is asked to note that a second residents' association in the same area, the Queen Elizabeth Park Residents' Association (QEPRA) does not support the measures being promoted by SCA.
- 29 This survey work would probably have to be commissioned from external sources due to the resources required. Officers have not estimated the cost of this in detail, but it is thought likely that it would cost between £30,000 and £50,000. Any eventual feasibility studies would be in addition to this. The committee is invited to consider whether this project should be added to Option B at the expense of another project.

#### **7/358 Vale Road, Ash road safety measures**

- 30 This project was added to the forward programme in December 2007 in recognition of its growing rate of personal injury collisions. As a result of this, this project has a high benefit to cost ratio. The committee is invited to consider whether this project should be added to Option B at the expense of another project.

#### **7/349 A25 MIDLETON ROAD CYCLE FACILITIES**

- 31 A sum of approximately £12,000 is available as a result of a developer agreement related to premises in Europa Park. This is required to be spent on improvements in the vicinity of the development. While £12,000 would fund little in the way of construction, it could be used to carry out feasibility and design work on the proposed cycle facilities along Middleton Road between Dennis Roundabout and the junction with Ladymead. This scheme is already included in the forward programme. The Committee should be aware that, as mentioned elsewhere in this report, carrying out the feasibility and design work will lead to pressure to include this project's construction in next year's programme.

**CONSULTATIONS**

- 32 All of the projects referred to in this report will be subject to appropriate individual consultation as they progress.

**FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS**

- 33 These are all covered above. Given the uncertainties about the funding available in 2008/09, the rules regarding carrying funds over into the new year, and regarding year-end outturn costs, it may be necessary to bring a further report to the Committee to update the position in due course.

**SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IMPLICATIONS**

- 34 Each scheme referred to in this report has site-specific environmental and economic implications which will be taken into consideration in future reports and as each scheme progresses.

**EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS**

- 35 This report has no implications for equality and diversity.

**CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS**

- 36 This report has no implications for crime and disorder.

**CONCLUSIONS AND REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 37 These are covered in the report.

**WHAT HAPPENS NEXT**

- 38 Assuming that the recommendations are agreed, officers will pursue the approved schemes to the extent that budgets permit once those are known.

---

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| <b>LEAD OFFICER</b>      | DEREK LAKE,<br>LOCAL HIGHWAYS MANAGER (GUILDFORD)               |
| <b>TELEPHONE</b>         | 01483 517501  |
| <b>BACKGROUND PAPERS</b> | Minor Improvements Programme Review Report,<br>13 December 2007 |

---