

Item 20

**LTP TASK GROUP REVIEW
2005/06 PROPOSED PROGRAMME AND LTP2 LOCAL
PRIORITY PROGRAMME**

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL'S
LOCAL COMMITTEE IN SURREY HEATH.**

28 October 2004

KEY ISSUE:

The report sets out the Local Transport Plan (LTP) Task Group recommendations following its meeting on Thursday 11th August 2004 for approval and to form the basis of the 2005/06 LTP bid and an indicative 5 year LTP2 local priority programme.

SUMMARY:

A report was taken to the Local Committee in Surrey Heath on 10th June 2004 proposing the formation of an LTP Task Group to review the current programme of LTP schemes. The Task Group met on Thursday 11th August 2004.

The report shows the proposed programme for 2005/06 and an indicative 5-year spend profile for the LTP2 programme based on Task Group scheme priority whilst maintaining regard for a balanced programme amongst the individual transport strategies. The task Group would also prefer the programme to remain as flexible as possible with schemes being introduced or brought forward to reflect changes in funding or priority.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATIONS:

That the Local Committee in Surrey Heath:

- (i) approve the LTP Task Group recommendations as set out in Annex A for the financial year 2005/06 and Annex B for the subsequent five year LTP2 local priorities, and
- (ii) that these form the basis of the Local Committee's bid.

INTRODUCTION and BACKGROUND

1. The Environment and the Economy Select Committee task group has previously agreed, in line with Government Office guidance, the methodology for distribution of the annual LTP settlement. The task group recommended that the integrated transport budget should be allocated via

bids made by the Central Services and the 11 Local Transportation Offices.

2. As the 11 Local Transportation areas vary significantly in size, population, length and type of highways, structures and nature of their transport problems a suitable methodology was devised. This is a two stage process consisting of a formula element together with a qualitative assessment to provide a competitive element, between the Local Transportation Offices and raise the standard of bids overall. Therefore, the allocation methodology consists of a fixed sum of £250k for each LTS area and increased proportionally by population size, length of highway network and accident statistics (KSI's). This has made up the allocation referred to as the base figure of which Surrey Heath's is set at £440k.
3. This report concentrates specifically on the integrated transport budget devolved annually to the Local Committee and information on committed/intermediate schemes.

ANALYSIS AND COMMENTARY

4. Guidance given to all Local Transportation Offices for their bids this year requested a detailed programme for 2005/06 and an indicative five year programme leading toward LTP2. Revised bid guidance in September indicated that for 2005/06 the Surrey Heath bid would be based around the figure of £440k plus a further 25% (£550k). For each of the following five years the bid programme should be based on the base figure plus a further 35% (£594k). In addition the Local Transportation Offices were asked to submit one intermediate scheme (schemes above £500k but below £5 million).
5. The Local Committee's LTP task group met in August 2004 to identify the 2005/06 programme and to agree the local priorities for the indicative five year LTP2. The task group have also indicated their wish that the programme remain as flexible as possible to take account of situations that may arise. This could in some cases delay the delivery of existing projects.
6. The proposed programme for 2005/06 is shown in Annex A and is based on the level of funding indicated above. However, with the qualitative assessment of the bid the Local Committee could receive a lower settlement figure and a scheme or schemes may need to be postponed from the programme. Similarly a higher settlement figure would allow additional schemes to be added to the programme. The columns in the table show these differing budget scenarios and suggest how a reduced or increased budget would be allocated.

Committed/ Intermediate Schemes

7. Funding was allocated this March for the junction Improvement at the A322 Church Lane/Shafesbury Road, Bisley. Land Acquisition and statutory undertakers plant diversions are currently being progressed and further funding of approximately £750k is required in 2005/06 to enable

completion of the scheme. As an intermediate scheme The Executive is required to give funding approval in February/March next year.

8. In addition an intermediate scheme bid of £800k will be made for the provision of a central safety barrier along the Lightwater Bypass.

LTP2 Programme

9. Surrey is required to submit its proposed countywide programme for LTP2 in April next year along with its APR submission. Consultation is currently being carried out for LTP2 and therefore the proposed five-year programme is based on the value of possible schemes grouped amongst the different topic strategies. These values are based on the priorities determined by the LTP task group coupled with the requirement for a balanced programme amongst these strategies. Furthermore the LTP2 programme is required to be split among four 'shared priorities' dictated by Government Office. These are Congestion, Accessibility, Road Safety and Environmental including Air Quality. For clarity the 'Local Priorities' table shown in Annex B indicates a total spend profile for the topics strategies across all four shared priorities plus an indication of the 'percentage spend' against the 5-year budget.

CONSULTATION

10. There are many views that have been obtained with regard to LTP scheme proposals, albeit in relation to individual schemes. These views are noted and are important, receiving due consideration. However, the main thrust of the review has been in relation to the whole District and closely allied to the targets and objectives of the LTP.
11. Specific consultation is being undertaken for LTP2 and the shared priorities matrix may be subject to further change before final submission.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

12. Close financial management of the capital budget will be maintained in order to maximise use of the limited funds available.

SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IMPLICATIONS

13. Surrey has embraced the concept of sustainable development, which is the foundation of Surrey's Local Transport Plan and is committed to the vision of making Surrey a better place. Funding from the integrated transport budget will be expended on projects and schemes in line with this vision whilst fulfilling its key commitments.

CRIME & DISORDER IMPLICATIONS

14. The promotion of quality schemes and projects that improve Surrey's highway infrastructure will assist in reducing the fear of crime and decrease the potential for injury accidents.

EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS

15. Throughout the scheme development process the Local Transportation Service will assess equality implications and its opportunities and constraints. A trained officer, for example, assesses the pedestrian mobility and impairment characteristics of schemes to seek and achieve the best possible outcomes whilst having regard for budget and practicality. Consultation is also carried out with the local disabled access group (DASH) regarding any potential difficulties.

Report by: Ian Haller, Principal Engineer, Surrey Heath Transportation Service

LEAD/CONTACT OFFICER: Ian Haller, Principal Engineer

TELEPHONE NUMBER: 01483 518276

ANNEXES: 2

BACKGROUND PAPERS: None

Annex A

**PROPOSED
INTEGRATED TRANSPORT
PROGRAMME 2005/06**

	Scheme	Scheme Type	< Reduced Local Settlement			25%	Improved Local Settlement >		
			10%	15%	20%		30%	40%	50%
1	Blackwater Valley Area QBP's	Passenger Transport	£30k	£30k	£30k	£30k	£30k	£36k	£36k
2	High Street, Bagshot nr. Post Office	Pedestrian Crossing	£40k	£40k	£40k	£40k	£40k	£40k	£40k
3	Chobham Rd, nr Tomlins Ave, Frimley	Cycle Route	£45k	£45k	£45k	£45k	£45k	£45k	£45k
4	Crawley Ridge Schools, Camberley	Safe Routes to Schools	£35k	£35k	£35k	£35k	£35k	£45k	£45k
5	Ravenscote School, Camberley	Safe Routes to Schools	£35k	£35k	£35k	£35k	£35k	£45k	£45k
6	The Green, Frimley Green	Safe Routes to Schools	£40k	£40k	£40k	£40k	£40k	£40k	£40k
7	Chobham Village Plan, Chobham	Traffic Management	£80k	£80k	£80k	£80k	£80k	£80k	£80k
8	Yorktown, Camberley	Traffic Management Ph1	£75k	£75k	£75k	£75k	£75k	£75k	£75k
9	Burma Road, Chobham	Road Safety	£24k ¹	£26k ¹	£48k ¹	£50k	£50k	£50k	£50k
10	Lightwater Area, Lightwater	Traffic Management Ph2	£60k	£60k	£60k	£60k	£60k	£70k	£70k
11	Junction Road Area, Lightwater	Street Lighting	£20k ²	£40k	£40k	£60k	£60k	£60k	£60k
12	Upper Chobham Road	Walking & Pedestrian					£ 5k	£ 5k	£ 5k
13	A322/M3J3, Lightwater	Traffic Management					£17k	£25k	£25k
14	Gordons School roundabout, West End	Traffic Management							£44k
		Indicative budget figure	£484k	£506k	£528k	£550k	£572k	£616k	£660k
		Variance +/-	-£66k	-£44k	-£22k		+£22k	+£66k	+£110k

Notes

- (1) Burma Road – Due to reduced budget difference to be made up from Local Allocation.
(2) Junction Road Area Lighting Scheme - Due to reduced budget difference to be made up from Local Allocation.

Annex A

LTP2 Strategy/Local Priorities Matrix (Note: H=High, M=Medium, L=Low)						
	Priority	H	M	L	Cost £,000's	Analysis
Bus Priority	Strategy					
	<i>Spend</i>			X	0	No further bus priority planned but some early investigations as part of Blackwater Valley bus network and new QBP's
	<i>Impact</i>	X				
Bus Infrastructure	Strategy					
	<i>Spend</i>		X		350 (11.78%)	Continues support to QBP's and improvements to infrastructure, RTPi etc.
	<i>Impact</i>	X				
Public Transport Interchanges	Strategy					
	<i>Spend</i>			X	0	Camberley Town Centre subject to redevelopment and improvements to bus/rail interchange likely in near future through development.
	<i>Impact</i>		X			
Park and ride	Strategy					
	<i>Spend</i>			X	0	No park & ride schemes planned at present.
	<i>Impact</i>		X			
Cycling Schemes	Strategy					
	<i>Spend</i>		X		400 (13.47%)	Cycle Forum agreed priorities now in place. Planned annual expenditure now forecast within LTP to increase build on cycle schemes where previous spend has been low. Other new routes supported by development funding.
	<i>Impact</i>			X		
Walking Schemes	Strategy				430 (14.48%)	Includes new footway priorities and safe routes to school programme.
	<i>Spend</i>	X				
	<i>Impact</i>	X				
Travel Plans	Strategy					
	<i>Spend</i>			X	140 (4.71%)	Focus on school travel plans and infrastructure improvements to facilitate them.
	<i>Impact</i>	X				
Local Safety Schemes	Strategy					
	<i>Spend</i>	X			765 (25.76%)	Targets priority accident locations and annual programme of safety barrier on high speed roads.
	<i>Impact</i>	X				
Road Crossings	Strategy					
	<i>Spend</i>		X		220 (7.41%)	Assists Safe Routes Programme.
	<i>Impact</i>	X				
Traffic Management & Traffic Calming	Strategy					
	<i>Spend</i>	X			665 (22.39%)	Targets local priority congestion areas.
	<i>Impact</i>	X				
Total					2970	

