

**MOLE VALLEY LOCAL AREA
TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMME BID
FOR 2003/04 – 2005/06**

**Mole Valley Local Committee
11 December 2002**

KEY ISSUE:

The County Council Executive has asked all Local Transportation Managers to submit an updated three year programme of transportation schemes justifying the effectiveness of the programme in achieving local transport plan targets. The quality of the bid will be reflected in the size of the additional allocations over the next 2 to 3 years. The LTP funding bid is to be based on indicative funding levels, and includes schemes to the value of 50% further potential funding. The Local Committee is recommended to agree the proposals.

SUMMARY:

All Local Transportation Services have been issued with guidance for developing the LTP on a consistent basis, so that a judgement can be made as to the effectiveness of the programme in achieving Local Transport Plan (LTP) targets. This report with its annexes will form the basis of the Mole LTP bid, to be submitted by 20 December 2002. It should be noted that there is a need to retain flexibility to the programme and also to ensure that the funding bid to the LTP Group, and consequently The Executive, for the year 2003/04 is robust, targeted and achievable.

Report by:

Roger Archer-Reeves,
Local Transportation Manager

Surrey Atlas Ref:

All

Mole Valley District Wards

Division(s)

All

County Electoral

N/A

OFFICER RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Committee is asked to agree

- (i) that this report forms the basis of a bid for the local area transportation programme in the District of Mole Valley for 2003/04, 2004/05 and 2005/06.**
- (ii) that an 'intermediate' bid is made for the STAR project in the Dorking Rural Box as indicated in Annexe 7.**
- (iii) that a 'major' bid is made to progress with the A24 Capel to M25 scheme as indicated in Annexe 8.**

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

- 1.1 In 2001/02 Surrey County Council submitted its first full LTP in accordance with government requirements. The LTP documents included a costed five year implementation programme.
- 1.2 It is necessary to continually review the LTP programme to ensure a flexible and equitable approach that reflects the needs of the community, within the objectives of the LTP.
- 1.3 With the introduction of the Local Committee's this financial year it was decided that £250,000 LTP grant would be devolved to each of the 11 programme areas on a lump sum basis. This was followed by an additional budget allocation to take into account expenditure already committed, which was carried forward from the previous financial year. Finally a supplementary allocation was made which was based upon a supplementary bidding process which required robust justification of how any additional monies would be spent this financial year if they were allocated.

2. DISTRIBUTION OF THE LTP TRANSPORTATION SCHEME FUNDING IN 2003/04

- 2.1 It has been agreed that the 11 LTP areas will continue to receive an enhanced lump sum devolved budget but the size of this lump sum will depend on a comparison of total road length, population and injury/accident statistics. On the basis of this assessment, Mole Valley Transportation Service will receive a lump sum of £460,000 per year. In addition, depending on the quality of the programme in achieving progress with LTP targets it is possible that up to 50% extra funding over and above the base figure will be awarded. Approximately £1.4million will be set aside across the County to 'reward' good bids. If all bids are considered good then the additional 'reward' would amount to approximately £130,000 each.
- 2.2 Any scheme estimated to cost over £500,000 will need to be justified and submitted as an "intermediate scheme" to be considered for central funding. The number and size of intermediate schemes being requested across the whole of the County will dictate the amount of the monies to be distributed to each District.
- 2.3 Schemes estimated to cost over £5 million will need to be justified and submitted as a "major scheme" for application to G.O.S.E. for funding.
- 2.4 The bid 'methodology, is attached as **Annexe 1**.

3. ISSUES TO BE CONSIDERED AS PART OF SCHEME PROGRAMME BID

3.1 The five LTP objectives have been used to compare schemes as detailed in **Annexe 2**. The LTP objectives are confirmed for the assistance of Members as:

A: Integration – to improve co-ordination between all forms of transport, and to integrate transport with other policies.

B: Environment – to protect and improve the environment of Surrey and health of its people by reducing the adverse effects of motorised transport.

C: Safety – to improve safety and security of transport for all travellers.

D: Economy – to promote an efficient transport system which supports a sustainable economy.

E: Accessibility – to make it easier for everyone to travel to everyday facilities, especially people without a car.

3.2 The programme bid is to be based on the ability of the local district office to meet and deliver realistic targets for the year.

3.3 The new guidance has also asked that not only do individual schemes need to be focused on achieving specific target outcomes but how the schemes relate to one another and other local community strategies should also be considered. It is acknowledged that with limited funds available programmes need to be well focused if they are going to make a significant impact in achieving the LTP objectives. The emphasis and priorities of programmes is being referred to as “themes”. Themes are a combination of schemes and measures which when acting together will deliver a targeted outcome. This will usually be achieved by having a long term programme. The Mole Valley area themes are targeted upon all of the objectives in the LTP.

3.4 The Mole Valley transport programme is closely linked to many of the corporate aims and objectives of Mole Valley District Council (MVDC). It is also fully integrated into the joint community strategy and community safety strategy which responds to crime and disorder issues. We are also working with many community groups such as the mole valley cycle forum, the mole valley access group and many other local community and resident associations.

- 3.5 The former Mole Valley Partnership Area Transportation Committee agreed a joint parking strategy with MVDC and officers are currently progressing Decriminalised Parking Enforcement (DPE). A bid is being made centrally for funding further DPE work but it would be prudent to include for this aspect of work within our local bid. Appropriate parking standards with effective on-street parking enforcement is seen as essential if congestion is going to be eased and people encouraged to minimise unnecessary car trips to local town centres and transport interchanges.
- 3.6 The ongoing assessment of injury accident patterns requires regular funding to be assigned and the implications of regular congestion to the local economy are likely to reveal the need for significant transportation improvements in future years, following the transportation studies currently underway in the Town Centres of Leatherhead and Dorking. In addition closer partnership working with bus companies and the rail service providers may also involve significant yearly sums for joint projects to improve and integrate transport as well as reliability of service.
- 3.7 Consultation and public participation forms an integral part of all scheme developments from initial feasibility through to post scheme implementation. Mole Valley Transportation Service is committed to carrying out regular customer feedback surveys following the implementation of any significant scheme.
- 3.8 The Transportation Service works closely with the many schools across Mole Valley, with particular emphasis on the desire to reduce congestion in the vicinity of schools and on routes to schools. Considerable progress has been made to date on this issue.
- 3.9 Close contact is maintained with surrounding local transportation services of Reigate and Banstead, Elmbridge, Guildford and Epsom and Ewell (E & E). There is also contact with Royal Borough of Kingston and West Sussex County Council (WSCC) on cross boarder schemes and projects. Examples of this include Fastway (WSCC), A24 Major scheme (WSCC), Safe Routes to Gallops (E & E) and the Fetcham, Bookham and Effingham Study with Guildford Transportation Service to name a few.
- 3.10 **Annexes 3, 4 and 5** attempt to account for some of the above issues and therefore help to ensure that the order of ranking is both fair and justified.

4. PROGRAMME AND FUNDING

- 4.1 In order to simplify the collection of performance data for all the programme areas, a consistent reporting format has been developed, which takes into account the contribution of each scheme to the main LTP topic strategies aimed at:
- Widening travel choice
 - Managing traffic and restraining the demand for travel
 - Producing a more integrated transport system

- Planning and managing the highway network
- Addressing the transport needs of rural areas
- Helping to make freight distribution more sustainable
- Integrating transport with other policies

4.2 The updated programme indicated in **Annexe 6** has been reordered to take into account the financial year when the scheme could be built, resources permitting. It is rare for a scheme to progress from beginning to end in one financial year. Typically the feasibility and consultation may be carried out in one year with detailed design and perhaps construction during the subsequent 2 years. The timescales for a scheme to progress from beginning to end depends on many factors including the response to public consultation, the implications of financial, staff or contractual resources. An assessment has to be made of all these factors and the expected required cash flow to achieve the programme over a 3 year period, has been predicted. This prediction is shown in **Annexe 6**. The level of funding likely to be available will be significantly lower than the total sum indicated in column 2003/04. A final decision therefore needs to be taken as to which schemes form the basis of the final bid documents and hence the scheme programme.

5. ESTABLISHING A FLEXIBLE PROGRAMME TO CATER FOR OPPORTUNITIES THAT MAY ARISE

5.1 A projected 3 year plan of schemes needs to be flexible. There is always the possibility of development related opportunities, where there may be benefit in changing priorities to take advantage of matched funding or joint working to avoid abortive costs. Many different programmes of work are co-ordinated to minimise disruption to residents and road users.

6. BIDS FOR INTERMEDIATE SCHEMES COSTING MORE THAN £500,000

6.1 A scheme that has been identified as needing to be progressed as an intermediate bid is detailed in **Annexe 7**. This is the STAR project in the Dorking Rural Box. It is likely that this long outstanding and well justified scheme will require intermediate funding to enable it to be completed in future years. If intermediate funding cannot be assigned during 2002/2003, it is intended that it be put forward as an intermediate scheme for future years.

7. BIDS FOR MAJOR SCHEMES COSTING MORE THAN £5 MILLION

7.1 At the meeting of this Committee in October 2002, feedback on the consultation exercise for the A24 from Capel to North Holmwood, gap closures / provision of roundabouts scheme was given. The estimated sums highlighted to address ongoing injury accident problems, as well as other issues, are detailed in **Annexe 8**. This information will form part of the "major" scheme bid required to progress this scheme.

8. HOW THE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMME MIGHT BE ADJUSTED IF THE LTP CAPITAL FUNDING TO THE MOLE VALLEY AREA WAS INCREASED / DECREASED BY 25%

8.1 The bid guidance asked this question to be considered. The programme has already been produced to take into account the possible 50% increase in funding. If the capital programme were decreased by 25% (£125,000) then we have indicated on our updated current programme (**Annexe 6**) our priority order.

9. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

9.1 This report combined with the attached Annexes forms the basis of the bid documents. It is expected that results of the first year programme will be notified in February 2003, with indicative funding for the following 2 years.

CONCLUSIONS

This bid document has been produced in accordance with guidance issued to all Local Transportation Managers. The guidance itself is by necessity a lengthy document and to cover, in this report, all the points and justifications required is difficult. The major supporting information is contained within the attached annexes. The bid is primarily made up of an adjustment to the current Local Transportation Programme, which has been justified and evolved over a number of years in support of local transportation objectives and targets set in 2001. The success of this bid will effect the amount of funding the local committee receives for the transportation programme in Mole Valley next year and for the future two following years.

Report by: Roger Archer-Reeves, Local Transport Manager, Sustainable Development

LEAD/CONTACT OFFICER: Roger Archer-Reeves

TELEPHONE NUMBER: 01372 832620

BACKGROUND PAPERS: Previous Committee Papers
