



**OFFICER REPORT TO LOCAL COMMITTEE  
(MOLE VALLEY)**

**£92,000 CAPITAL BUDGET FOR HIGHWAYS IN 2010 / 2011**

**13 SEPTEMBER 2010**

**KEY ISSUE**

To seek approval for expenditure of a £92,000 capital budget for highways in Mole Valley in the 2010 / 2011 financial year.

**SUMMARY**

The Leader of Surrey County Council on 20 July 2010 announced £1m extra funding for the council's roads. He stated that each of the 11 local committees would be asked how and where the money should be spent. The budget available to the Mole Valley Local Committee is £92,000. It is important that proposals are agreed for expenditure on schemes that can be implemented during the current financial year. This reports sets out a recommendation for expenditure of the £92,000.

**OFFICER RECOMMENDATIONS**

**The Local Committee (Mole Valley) is asked to:**

- (i) approve use of the £92,000 capital funds for Mole Valley as set out in Annexe A.

## 1 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

- 1.1 The Leader of the Surrey County Council made a verbal statement at the meeting of the Council on 20 July, in which he announced £1m extra funding for the County's roads. He stated that each of the 11 local committees would be asked how and where the money should be spent.
- 1.2 The Leader asked that the money be allocated based on a formula looking at total road length and population. The amount for each committee is set out below, with Mole Valley receiving £92,000 :

Elmbridge	£101,000
Epsom & Ewell	£54,000
Guildford	£132,000
Mole Valley	£92,000
Reigate & Banstead	£112,000
Runnymede	£67,000
Spelthorne	£70,000
Surrey Heath	£77,000
Tandridge	£92,000
Waverley	£131,000
Woking	£73,000

## 2 ANALYSIS

- 2.1 The £92,000 is capital funding. It could be used for Integrated Transport schemes, parking schemes, carriageway surfacing schemes, footway schemes and drainage schemes. The funding should not be used for revenue items, however, the Local Committee has already allocated funds for drainage and Community Gang works, which are progressing successfully.
- 2.2 With so many competing demands for use of the funds it is difficult to determine a recommendation based on previously agreed priorities. Systems of prioritising types of scheme such as integrated transport or carriageway surfacing have been in place for some years, but we have not developed a numerical prioritisation system to compare one type of scheme against another.
- 2.3 The Head of Surrey Highways wrote to members of the Local Committee setting out some suggestions for utilising the funds during the current financial year. Councillors have also suggested some local priorities for use of the funding. In addition we have looked at last year's integrated transport schemes list and potential casualty reduction schemes. A list of all the various suggestions is set out in Annexe A.
- 2.4 Annexe A provides a recommendation for expenditure of the £92,000. The last column gives recommended allocations for particular schemes with the total allocated being equal to the £92,000 budget.

[www.surreycc.gov.uk/molevalley](http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/molevalley)

### **3 OPTIONS**

- 3.1 There are many options available for expenditure of the £92,000 budget. Any of the schemes listed in Annexe A could be funded and there could be many more ideas that are not listed. However, it would not be possible to achieve implementation of some schemes due to the need to deliver within the current financial year. Schemes such as carriageway patching will be more achievable within the time constraints than integrated transport schemes that may require feasibility and detailed design work. Schemes such as carriageway surface treatment are not recommended for the winter months.

### **4 CONSULTATIONS**

- 4.1 Members of the Local Committee were sent a draft copy of this report for comment on 18<sup>th</sup> August 2010.

### **5 FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS**

- 5.1 Approximately 50% of the works delivered are by Carillion acting as our Managing Agent, going out to the market place to seek best value. The works delivered directly by Carillion are always subject to robust discussions over value for money

### **6 EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS**

- 6.1 Surrey Highways always endeavours to undertake works on the public highway that do not prejudice any user group.

### **7 CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS**

- 7.1 There are none.

### **8 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 8.1 The Local Committee for Mole Valley has a budget of £92,000 for use on capital highways schemes in 2010/11. Annexe A sets out the recommendation for expenditure of the funding.

### **9 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 9.1 To allow officers to use the £92,000 capital funding as approved by the Local Committee.

### **10 WHAT HAPPENS NEXT**

- 10.1 Once the recommendations have been approved, highways officers will consider priorities and progress the works with Carillion.

**LEAD OFFICER:** Derek Poole, Local Highway Manager  
**TELEPHONE NUMBER:** 08456 009 009  
**E-MAIL:** [eastssurreyhighways@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:eastssurreyhighways@surreycc.gov.uk)  
**CONTACT OFFICER:** Michelle Armstrong, Principal Engineer  
**TELEPHONE NUMBER:** 08456 009 009  
**E-MAIL:** eastssurreyhighways@surreycc.gov.uk

Version No.      Date:                      Time:              Initials:              No of annexes: 1