

**RUNNYMEDE LOCAL AREA**  
**TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMME**  
**PROGRESS FOR 2003/04 – 2004/05**  
**AND BID**  
**FOR 2005/06 TO 2010/11**

**22<sup>nd</sup> OCTOBER 2004**

## **KEY ISSUES**

The Transportation Select Committee has asked all local transportation directors to submit an updated forward programme of transportation schemes justifying the effectiveness of the programme in achieving local transport plan (LTP) targets. The quality of the bid will be judged against the other ten programmes and the outcome will reflect the size of the additional allocations next year. This bid will also be used to inform the development of next Countywide 5 year Local Transport Plan 2 programme.

## **SUMMARY**

Local transportation directors have previously been issued with guidance for developing the Local Transport Plan on a consistent basis, so that a judgement may be made as to the effectiveness of the programme in achieving LTP targets. This report will form the basis of the Runnymede LTP bid, to be submitted by 12<sup>th</sup> November 2004.

## **OFFICER RECOMMENDATIONS**

That the Committee agree:

- i. that this report forms the basis of a bid for the transportation programme in the Runnymede area for 2005/06 to 2010/11.**
- ii. that the Local Transportation Director be authorised to carry out any final amendments to the bid document prior to the final submission date on 12<sup>th</sup> November 2004.**

## SECTION 1

### Review of first 6 months of 2004/05

1.1 The table below illustrates the progress made in the first six months of 2004/2005 for road safety schemes.

<b>Scheme</b>	<b>£1,000 Cost</b>	<b>Road Safety Target Set October 2003</b>	<b>Actual Result Achieved by October 2004</b>	<b>Comment</b>
Tite Hill / Middle Hill, Englefield Green, Road Safety Scheme	79	Accident reduction. Base level, Tite Hill 5 in 3 years. Middle Hill 1 in three years	To early to report at October 2004	Construction due to start 11 <sup>th</sup> October 2004.
Tite Hill / Middle Hill, Englefield Green, Road Safety Scheme	79	Reduce 85 <sup>th</sup> percentile speeds Base level respectively for Tite And Middle 44 and 43 mph.	To early to report at October 2004	Construction due to start 11 <sup>th</sup> October 2004.  30 mph limit
Magna Carta School Layby, Thorpe Road, Egham	30	To reduce potential for conflict on Thorpe Road and reduce congestion.	Initial view from all partners that the potential for conflict has been reduced.	Construction completed September 2004.
Sandhills Lane Virginia Water – Safe Routes to School improvements	12	Increase in Children walking to St Ann's Heath Junior School	To early to report at October 2004	Construction completed August 2004.
London Street junction with Pound Road, Abbey Road, Bridge Road, Chertsey Pedestrian Improvements	Dev' Fund' 18	To increase accessibility.	Safety concern from some residents being addressed following Safety Audit	Construction completed August 2004.
Rowtown and Ongar Hill Road Safety Scheme	80	To reduce injury accidents. Base level in 2003 10 in three years	To review following construction.	Consultation reported to Committee 10 September 2004. Design commenced.

1.2 The table on the next page illustrates progress made during the first six months of 2004/2005 for cycling schemes.

<b>Scheme</b>	<b>£1,000 Cost</b>	<b>Walking/ Cycling Increase Target Set October 2003</b>	<b>Actual Result Achieved by October 2004</b>	<b>Comment</b>
Green Lane Cycleway	120	Increase by 7%. Base level 74,300 trips per year. Target 75,600 per year	To early to consider at October 04	Scheme construction to start August 2004
Green Lane Cycleway	120	Injury Accident reduction. Base 9 in 3 years.	To early to consider at October 04	Scheme construction to start August 2004
A30 Egham Bypass Toucan Crossing	80	Increase cycle trips by 7%	To early to consider at October 04	Construction completed June 2004. (Carried forward from 2003/04)
A30 Cycleway St Judes Road to the Borough Boundary	140	Increase by 7%.	To early to consider at October 04	Scheme substantially completed July 2004.
A30 Cycleway St Judes Road to the Borough Boundary	140	Injury accident reduction.	To early to consider at October 04	Scheme substantially completed July 2004.

## SECTION 2 OBJECTIVES AND TARGETS Table 1 LTP2 performance indicators organised under shared priority headings

Shared priority heading	Local Transport Plan 2 (LTP2) Mandatory indicators (provisional) - to be finalised by Department for Transport	Possible Surrey local indicators -to be developed/agreed with Local Transportation Service
Congestion	<b>Congestion</b> (vehicle delay) <b>Mode share (Public Transport, cycling, walking)</b> of journeys to work, school and urban centres <b>Traffic flow</b> - vehicle km & peak flows <b>Travel plans</b> - proportion of workforce covered by <b>Parking</b> - total provision, proportion of short stay <b>Cycle trips</b> - number and length	<b>Real Time Passenger Information (RTPI) indicator</b> (% of area/population/ bus stops) Or Network Management Information Centre – coverage?
Environmental impact & Quality of Life	<b>Air quality</b>	<b>Freight Quality Partnership</b> - number <b>Noise</b> – linked to quiet surfacing (as Road Traffic Reduction Act (RTRA) target 2) Limit quantity of <b>emissions</b> – (as RTRA targets 2&3) No of days max <b>pollution</b> levels are exceeded <b>Fear of crime?</b>
Accessibility	<b>Accessibility</b> of key services by Public Transport, walking and cycling) – using Accession model <b>Public transport</b> patronage <b>Bus performance</b> and satisfaction	<b>Accessibility</b> of new developments <b>Demand Responsive Transport (DRT) and/or Community transport schemes</b> <b>Cycling</b> – extent of network, training, cycle parking, % who think it safe to cycle <b>Road crossings</b> (but need outcome indicator)
Road safety	Number of people killed or seriously injured ( <b>KSI</b> ) ( <b>Best Value performance indicator 99</b> ) Number of <b>children KSI</b> ( <b>BV99</b> )	Reduce <b>slight casualties</b> <b>Safe Routes to Schools schemes</b> - number <b>Speed reduction</b> – average reduction for selected lengths <b>Equestrianism</b>
Road maintenance	Principal roads <b>Best Value Performance Indicator 96</b> Non principal roads <b>Best Value Performance Indicator 97</b>	

## SECTION 3

### PROBLEMS AND OPPORTUNITIES

3.1 The table below illustrates a **Strengths Weaknesses Opportunities and Threats Analysis** for the Transportation in Runnymede.

<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Weaknesses</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❑ Relatively flat borough with short distances between centres of population and has great potential for walking and cycling. These particular modes of transport are attractive from the point of view of addressing social exclusion.</li> <li>❑ Most main roads have effective highway width to achieve extensive off-road cycle network with shared or even segregated cycle tracks.</li> <li>❑ 55% of cycle links are already in place and general awareness is growing of what could be achieved if the network were joined up.</li> <li>❑ Runnymede has an extensive network of “Safer Runnymede” Closed Circuit Television.</li> <li>❑ Borough Council continue to fund Yellow Bus Initiative</li> <li>❑ The use of the mobile speed camera and interactive signs.</li> <li>❑ The implementation of the quality bus partnership for the Windsor to Englefield Green, Egham and Staines route.</li> <li>❑ Significant progress in implementing on street parking enforcement through Joint Member Working Group.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❑ The airport generates passenger and airport worker movements but also additional movements from support services and industries.</li> <li>❑ The current M25 widening works between Junctions 12 and 14 is creating additional traffic flow on local borough roads.</li> <li>❑ Segregation due to the motorway network.</li> <li>❑ Vacant office blocks could indicate a perceived difficulty with access.</li> <li>❑ The impact of six railway level crossings within the Borough.</li> </ul>
<b>Opportunities</b>	<b>Threats</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❑ Close working relationship with the Runnymede business community through the Runnymede Business Partnership.</li> <li>❑ Partnership with NHS at St Peter’s Hospital in Chertsey.</li> <li>❑ Royal Holloway College, University of London are beginning to implement an effective company transport.</li> <li>❑ Runnymede air quality monitoring area continues to provide useful information demonstrating that local initiatives are reducing pollution in the locality.</li> <li>❑ 7 improvements to the local transportation network have been gained from Section 278 Agreements or from Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act Agreements over the past year:</li> <li>❑ Close working with Rights of Way Group on for example Chertsey to Thorpe Cycleway study using an existing Right of Way.</li> <li>❑ The potential to use the existing “Safer Runnymede” Closed Circuit Television system for monitoring the effectiveness of the new on street parking enforcement service.</li> <li>❑ Potential income from Local Public Service Agreement bid for speed management.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❑ Businesses choose to relocate out of the area due to the impact of traffic congestion.</li> <li>❑ Thorpe Park generates up to 17,000 visitors per day and might develop an all season programme.</li> <li>❑ Potential further impact from gravel extraction.</li> <li>❑ Flood plain is susceptible from increased risk due to climate change.</li> </ul>

## SECTION 4

### LTP 2 STRATEGY

- 4.1. The Runnymede Local Transport Programme has been structured to reflect the draft Local Transport Plan 2 strategy.
- 4.2. An assessment has been made with topic strategy managers of how important these strategies are within the Runnymede area. The Strategy Matrix table below in the next page indicate in agreement with topic strategy managers whether a strategy is a high medium or low priority. The priority is reflected in the distribution of the funding across the programme.

Note in the final report 4 further tables indicating the spend level during LTP2 against the four LTP2 “Shared Priority Objectives” will be included.

### 4.3 Local Examples

Strategy Managers are looking for real improvements for the user. The following seven examples of schemes within the Runnymede Transport programme provide evidence of compliance with the assessment criteria set out in the quality assessment criteria for 2005/06 Annual Progress Report submissions. The following bullet points have focused consideration of the examples selected:

- Synergy. How does the scheme contribute to the accumulative effect of our schemes working with each other?
- Has the scheme met the targets and objectives?
- How does the scheme contribute to tackling crime and disorder?

**The seven examples below will be presented at the Committee meeting.**

- 1) Magna Carta School Lay-by, Thorpe Road, Egham
- 2) A320 Vehicle Activated Signs and Speed Management Plan.
- 3) A320 cycle schemes and evidence from cycle monitoring.
- 4) The Avenue, New Haw Safe Routes to Schools scheme.
- 5) Station Approach, Virginia Water and Gateway Signing.
- 6) Quality Bus Partnership – Windsor, Englefield Green, Egham and Staines
- 7) Station Road junction with High Street, Brighton Road and Church Road, Addlestone – Traffic Signals and controlled pedestrian crossing.

RUNNYMEDE LTP1 2005/2006 Strategy/Local Priorities Matrix (Note: H=High,M=Medium,L=Low)						
	Priority	H	M	L	Cost £1,000	Reason for your analysis
<b>Passenger Transport</b>	<b>Strategy</b>				<b>50</b>	
	<i>Spend</i>		√			Investment on Quality Bus Partnership route targeted at route with highest service and frequency (4 per hour)
	<i>Impact</i>		√			Targeted to have greatest impact.
<b>Cycling</b>	<b>Strategy</b>				<b>104</b>	
	<i>Spend</i>	√				Flat topography across the borough assists development of network linking settlements with relatively short links.
	<i>Impact</i>		√			Investment for the future. Impact will be maximised when all missing links are in place. Comprehensive monitoring in place.
<b>Walking</b>	<b>Strategy</b>				<b>46</b>	
	<i>Spend</i>			√		Accessibility plan in place for each of the main towns.
	<i>Impact</i>		√			
<b>Travel Awareness</b>	<b>Strategy</b>				<b>20</b>	
	<i>Spend</i>			√		Working with two major employers: St Peters and Ashford NHS trust and Royal Holloway college.
	<i>Impact</i>		√			
<b>Road Safety</b>	<b>Strategy</b>				<b>40</b>	
	<i>Spend</i>		√			
	<i>Impact</i>	√				
<b>Parking</b>	<b>Strategy</b>				<b>0</b>	
	<i>Spend</i>			√		Decriminalised Parking Enforcement on programme to start from 8 November 2004. Funded from Local Allocation and central DPE funds.
	<i>Impact</i>			√		
<b>Speed Management</b>	<b>Strategy</b>				<b>90</b>	
	<i>Spend</i>		√			Physical Traffic Calming still receiving support from customers. Vehicle Activated Signs also being used to compliment physical measures.
	<i>Impact</i>		√			Recent schemes have reduced injury accidents by up to 75%.
<b>Safe Routes to School</b>	<b>Strategy</b>				<b>50</b>	
	<i>Spend</i>			√		Detailed Safe Routes to School strategy in place.
	<i>Impact</i>		√			
<b>Telematics</b>	<b>Strategy</b>					
	<i>Spend</i>		√		<b>72</b>	As part of improved controlled crossings.
	<i>Impact</i>		√			
<b>Traffic Management</b>	<b>Strategy</b>					
	<i>Spend</i>			√	<b>28</b>	
	<i>Impact</i>		√			
<b>Total</b>					<b>500</b>	

## SECTION 5

### PROGRAMME AND FUNDING

5.1. The detailed programme for 2004/05 through to 2010/11 is set out in the "F3/F4 excel" spreadsheet to be submitted with the bid. This spreadsheet has not been included with the Committee report. A summary of expenditure by DfT code is set out in the table below:

Based on groupings of DfT codes	gross total							
	2005-06		2005 06		2006 07		2007 08	
	2010-11							
	£000's	%	£000's	%	£000's	%	£000's	%
Passenger Transport	350	13	50	10	70	13	70	13
Cycling	1005	37	104	21	199	37	199	37
Walking	250	9	46	9	49	9	49	9
Travel Awareness	60	2	20	4	11	2	11	2
Road Safety	350	13	40	8	70	13	70	13
Parking	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Speed Management	100	4	90	18	22	4	22	4
Safe Routes To Schools	260	10	50	10	54	10	54	10
Telematics	200	7	72	14	38	7	38	7
Traffic Management	125	5	28	6	27	5	27	5
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2700</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>540</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>540</b>	<b>100%</b>

5.2. 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 a contribution of each scheme to the LTP shared priority objectives aimed at:

- Congestion.
- Environmental Impact.
- Accessibility.
- Road Safety.
- Road Maintenance.

5.3. The updated programme has been ordered to take into account the likely financial year when the scheme could be built. It is rare for a scheme to progress from beginning to end in one financial year. Typically the feasibility and consultation and may be design will be carried out in one year with construction perhaps happening in one of the subsequent years.

#### 5.4. Programme Flexibility

The projected programme 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. At each of its



meetings the local committee will have an opportunity to review and amend the programme.

- 5.5. We are working with our development control colleagues and Runnymede Borough Council to focus in on development areas and corridors so that our LTP strategies can be quickly adapted to response to planning enquiries. An example of this has been our comprehensive review and report of opportunities for improving transport within the Causeway, Egham development area.

### **Buildability**

- 5.6 All schemes have been selected taking into account build ability to minimise risk of abortive preparation cost. Local members are involved very early on and throughout the schemes progress to minimise political risk. Consultation with local people and interest groups are extensive to gauge public opinion. Land ownership is investigated and schemes only pursued if the landowner is sympathetic to the scheme. The risk of escalating cost is minimised by accurate estimating prior to tending and construction through Surrey Highways Partnership. The Runnymede programme for the next two years is all deliverable within that time scale. The table in Section 1 (Review of the first six months of 2004/05 illustrates our commitment to scheme delivery.

## **SECTION 6**

### **MONITORING**

#### **How do you plan to monitor your programme?**

- 6.1 The monitoring of the local transport programme for Runnymede has been prepared using the monitoring toolkit.

#### **How do we know if we have achieved our desired outcomes?**

- 6.2 In our LTP bid document submitted in October 2003 we made a number of predictions for how our schemes in the programme would compare against targets across the LTP programme. The change in results during the last year will be reported in the bid document. A copy of an amended monitoring toolbox document will be provided to reflect monitoring on schemes within the Runnymede local transport programme.

#### **Give examples of before and after studies**

- 6.3 The seven scheme examples in Section 4 and presented to the Committee show specific schemes that have been implemented together with data collected before the scheme was constructed against data collected after the scheme has been completed, where this is available.

## SECTION 7

### INTERMEDIATE SCHEME BID

#### 7.1 Runnymede Roundabout Improvement Scheme

An initial feasibility study for improving capacity of the Runnymede Roundabout is reported to committee separately on the agenda for this meeting. The out-turn of the feasibility study was deliberately re-programmed to take consideration of the fact that any scheme improvement there could not be constructed until 2006 in order to follow on from work currently taking place on the M25 Motorway. The improvements identified at the roundabout will have significant benefits for non-car modes of transport as well as improving capacity of the junction reducing delays and therefore congestion experienced. It is likely that to progress this scheme a contribution of up to 25% will be needed from the local programme.

## SECTION 8

### PUBLIC PARTICIPATION AND INVOLVEMENT

- 8.1 Consultation and public participation forms an integral part of all scheme developments from initial feasibility through to post scheme implementation. Customer feed-back surveys are instigated following the implementation of all major schemes. Last year a transportation postal survey of a Runnymede focus group was used to establish public views of the service and monitor progress towards continuous improvement. In February 2003 a survey "how are we doing?" was also undertaken with all county and borough members and other interested groups and individuals. Feedback that we received from both these surveys indicated a high level of satisfaction with our service.

#### Consultation with the public regarding LTP 2.

- 8.2 The opportunity is being taken to use a number of existing meetings with Residents' and interest groups to talk through the issues to be addressed in Local Transport Plan 2. The advantage has also being taken to raise transportation as an area for questions in a current statutory consultation for the Local Development Framework.

## SECTION 9

### PARTNERSHIP WORKING

#### Partners

- 9.1 The following list details the main partners / partnership activities:

- Runnymede Borough Council
- Joint Action Group
- Crime and Disorder Partnership
- Local Strategic Partnership
- County Division liaison with Runnymede Borough ward Members
- Schools
- Ringway.

**Bordering Boroughs/Districts**

- 9.2 Close contact is maintained with the surrounding boroughs of Elmbridge, Spelthorne, Woking and Surrey Heath. There is also contact with Windsor and Maidenhead when schemes on that border such as the A30 cycle route, need to be considered continuously across boundaries. We are also working with them to progress the quality bus partnership between Windsor and Staines.

**Report by: Will Ward, Local Transportation Director, Runnymede LTS**

---

Lead Contact Officer: **David Mitchell**

Telephone: **01932 794 165**

Background Papers: **None**

---

Version: 1

Date: 7/10/04

Time: 18:00

Initials: DM

Annexes: 0