

Notice of Meeting

Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Economic Growth Decisions



Date and Time

Tuesday, 24
September 2024
12.00 pm

Place

Woodhatch Place, 11
Cockshot Hill,
Reigate

Contact

Joss Butler
Joss.butler@surreycc.
gov.uk

Web:

[Council and
democracy
Surreycc.gov.uk](https://www.surreycc.gov.uk)

Twitter:

@SCCdemocracy



Cabinet Member:
Matt Furniss

If you would like a copy of this agenda or the attached papers in another format, e.g. large print or braille, or another language, please email Joss Butler on Joss.butler@surreycc.gov.uk .

This meeting will be held in public at the venue mentioned above and may be webcast live. Generally the public seating areas are not filmed. However, by entering the meeting room and using the public seating area or attending online, you are consenting to being filmed and recorded, and to the possible use of those images and sound recordings for webcasting and/or training purposes. If webcast, a recording will be available on the Council's website post-meeting. The live webcast and recording can be accessed via the Council's website:

<https://surreycc.public-i.tv/core/portal/home>

If you would like to attend and you have any special requirements, please email Joss Butler on Joss.butler@surreycc.gov.uk. Please note that public seating is limited and will be allocated on a first come first served basis.

AGENDA

1 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

All Members present are required to declare, at this point in the meeting or as soon as possible thereafter

- i. Any disclosable pecuniary interests and / or
- ii. Other interests arising under the Code of Conduct in respect of any item(s) of business being considered at this meeting

NOTES:

- Members are reminded that they must not participate in any item where they have a disclosable pecuniary interest
- As well as an interest of the Member, this includes any interest, of which the Member is aware, that relates to the Member's spouse or civil partner (or any person with whom the Member is living as a spouse or civil partner)
- Members with a significant personal interest may participate in the discussion and vote on that matter unless that interest could be reasonably regarded as prejudicial.

2 PROCEDURAL MATTERS

a MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

The deadline for Members' questions is 12pm four working days before the meeting (18 September 2024).

b PUBLIC QUESTIONS

The deadline for public questions is seven days before the meeting (17 September 2024).

3 PETITION: ROAD SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS IN THE VICINITY OF SANDCROSS SCHOOL

One petition has been received requesting Surrey County Council to implement measures to calm both moving traffic and parking in the vicinity of Sandcross School and improve facilities for walking and wheeling to the school. The aim is to encourage active travel to the school and substantially reduce the ongoing daily concerns about the safety of Sandcross School pupils and their families on the school run

139 people signed this petition.

The full details and the petition response will be published in a supplementary agenda.

4 PETITION: MIXNAMMS LANE KT16L

One petition has been received requesting Surrey County Council to apply The Highways Act X1 1980 to the owners of Mixnams Lane KT16 to make permanent repairs to the road bringing the road to highways standard and include adequate drainage to cope with the regular flooding which causes the road to break up annually to a dangerous state of repair, Causing much damage to vehicles to vehicles due to pot holes under water.

204 people signed this petition.

The full details and the petition response will be published in a supplementary agenda.

5 COUNTYWIDE INTEGRATED TRANSPORT SCHEMES PRIORITISATION PROCESS AND 25/26 DELIVERY PROGRAMME (Pages 5 - 22)

To seek the approval of the modified prioritisation process for the Countywide Integrated Transport Schemes (ITS) programme, established by the Cabinet in February 2022, following a review by the Cross-party member reference group.

The Cabinet Member is also asked to approve the schemes that have been prioritised for delivery, as part of this programme, from 2025/26.

Annex B to follow.

6 REVISION OF THE CHARGE FOR SUSPENDING BUS STOPS IN SURREY (Pages 23 - 32)

To ensure the Council can cover costs and maintain efficient local bus service operations and delivery, it is proposed that the Council increase the charge for suspending a bus stop.

It is proposed that the bus stop suspension charge increases from the current level of £150 (maximum two-day charge) to £175 per day for a maximum three-day charge. It is also proposed that a new charge of £600 per stop per day be introduced if works take place at any bus stop without prior authorisation.

This change will help the Council to grow a sustainable economy so everyone can benefit, enable a greener future, and ensure no one is left behind.

Terence Herbert
Chief Executive
Published: 16 September 2024

MOBILE TECHNOLOGY AND FILMING – ACCEPTABLE USE

Members of the public and the press may use social media or mobile devices in silent mode during meetings. Public Wi-Fi is available; please ask the committee manager for details.

Anyone is permitted to film, record or take photographs at Council meetings. Please liaise with the committee manager prior to the start of the meeting so that the meeting can be made aware of any filming taking place.

The use of mobile devices, including for the purpose of recording or filming a meeting, is subject to no interruptions, distractions or interference being caused to any Council equipment or any general disturbance to proceedings. The Chairman may ask for mobile devices to be switched off in these circumstances.

Thank you for your co-operation.

QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

Cabinet and most committees will consider questions by elected Surrey County Council Members and questions and petitions from members of the public who are electors in the Surrey County Council area.

Please note the following regarding questions from the public:

1. Members of the public can submit one written question to a meeting by the deadline stated in the agenda. Questions should relate to general policy and not to detail. Questions are asked and answered in public and cannot relate to “confidential” or “exempt” matters (for example, personal or financial details of an individual); for further advice please contact the committee manager listed on the front page of an agenda.
2. The number of public questions which can be asked at a meeting may not exceed six. Questions which are received after the first six will be held over to the following meeting or dealt with in writing at the Chairman’s discretion.
3. Questions will be taken in the order in which they are received.
4. Questions will be asked and answered without discussion. The Chairman or Cabinet members may decline to answer a question, provide a written reply or nominate another Member to answer the question.
5. Following the initial reply, one supplementary question may be asked by the questioner. The Chairman or Cabinet members may decline to answer a supplementary question.

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS, TRANSPORT AND ECONOMIC GROWTH**

DATE: 24 SEPTEMBER 2024

REPORT OF: MATT FURNISS – CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS, TRANSPORT AND ECONOMIC GROWTH

LEAD OFFICER: OWEN JENKINS - INTERIM EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, HIGHWAY, INFRASTRUCTURE & PLANNING

SUBJECT: COUNTYWIDE INTEGRATED TRANSPORT SCHEMES PRIORITISATION PROCESS AND 25/26 DELIVERY PROGRAMME

ORGANISATION STRATEGY PRIORITY AREA: GROWING A SUSTAINABLE ECONOMY SO EVERYONE CAN BENEFIT, ENABLING A GREENER FUTURE, EMPOWERING COMMUNITIES

PURPOSE OF REPORT:

To seek the approval of the modified prioritisation process for the Countywide Integrated Transport Schemes (ITS) programme, established by the Cabinet in February 2022, following a review by the Cross-party member reference group.

The Cabinet Member is also asked to approve the schemes that have been prioritised for delivery, as part of this programme, from 2025/26.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

It is recommended that the Cabinet Member approve:

- a) The proposed prioritisation process set out in Annex A of the report;
- b) The proposed ITS schemes to be funded from the planned 2025/26 Countywide Integrated Transport Scheme budget set out in Annex B of the report; and
- c) To delegate authority to the Highways Engagement and Commissioning Manager to make any minor amendments to the schemes which may be required to ensure that the schemes are progressed, in consultation with the relevant Divisional Member and, where required, the Cabinet Member.

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Cabinet established the Countywide ITS budget in February 2022, as part of changes to highway decisions, and requested that officers develop a prioritisation process for the fund. The prioritisation process has since been reviewed and amended by a cross-party Member Reference Group, and additional feedback recommendations, to ensure that no one is left behind and that all communities have an opportunity to access this programme of works. The revised prioritisation process now needs to be agreed so that schemes can be approved and progressed to the design and delivery stage.

DETAILS:

Background

2. The Countywide ITS budget was established as part of a range of proposals to support Members in having more influence on promoting schemes that would benefit their residents. Under these new proposals, Members can prioritise and promote one scheme for consideration within their division per year.
3. Schemes for delivery during the 2022/23 financial year (22/23 FY) were determined from those previously agreed at the local and joint committees to help progress to delivery. Alongside this, during 22/23 FY, a new process was established to determine and agree schemes for delivery for the 23/24 FY onwards. This process was then modified for the 24/25 FY and now the 25/26FY, in response to feedback received.
4. We are now in the third year of determining the Countywide ITS programme and have based the prioritisation of the programme on the assumption that the budget will remain at £3.0m for 25/26. The actual budget available for 25/26 will be determined as part of the annual budget setting process, and therefore the final confirmed programme will be subject to change dependent upon the available budget.

Prioritisation Process, Reviews & Response to feedback

5. At the Cabinet meeting on the 22 February 2022, it was agreed that officers would develop a prioritisation process for the Countywide ITS programme, with a steer provided from the Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee. The cabinet Member for Highways and Community Resilience formally approved the initial prioritisation process in November 2022. This prioritisation process was then subject to a further review by a cross-party Member Reference Group in March 2023.
6. Several elements of the process and prioritisation process were discussed by the Member Reference Group. The focus was on achieving greater transparency and communication of the process, identification of additional

tools that could support County Councillors to identify the scheme that would best benefit the local community, and improving how County Councillors were kept informed of the process.

7. In addition to this, the group were keen to understand the scoring process better, and to support the development of tools to ensure that it was easy for residents and all County Councillors to understand.
8. Building on this feedback the following tools were developed or reworked and circulated to all County Councillors at the beginning of the second year of this approach:
 - The flow chart for the process was redesigned to help make the process clearer.
 - A guide of estimated costs for potential schemes was provided to check costings (it was noted that these are estimates only which could change as a scheme progresses)
 - A scheme nomination proforma was provided for all County Councillors to complete for transparency of requests and ease of identifying potential alternative options.
 - A briefing note on what is likely to make a scheme successful was produced for guidance.
 - A FAQs document on the process was produced from key questions that had been received from County Councillors or residents in the first year for transparency and support.
 - Updates on the nominated schemes were included within the monthly highways financial updates for County Councillors to make it easier to track the progress.
 - The scoring criteria was reviewed to ensure that rural communities were not disadvantaged by the new approach.
9. Further feedback has been used to modify this process to make it clearer that, as it is not possible to define what is a rural community, that for the purposes of this process the boundary of Parish Council areas is used. There is also more clarity that consideration is given to the Healthy Streets for Surrey approach to the development of schemes. Members will also have the opportunity to fill out a short survey, following completion of a scheme in their division, to help inform future improvements to this process and scheme delivery.
10. In progressing the third round of this process, which is focused on looking at schemes for design and delivery in 2025/26 financial year onwards, 69 schemes have been nominated by County Councillors for prioritisation to the Countywide ITS programme. Each nominated scheme has been technically assessed on the broad feasibility and deliverability of the scheme.
11. The nominated schemes and their associated technical assessment have subsequently been prioritised using the modified process attached at Annex A. This has then been moderated to ensure a consistent approach countywide.

12. The schemes prioritised to be progressed to the design and delivery stages from the 2025/26 financial year are listed in Annex B.
13. The Cabinet Member has also reviewed this proposed programme (Annex B) to ensure that communities have a fair opportunity to this funding (no scheme has more than £350,000 allocated to it from this budget). This includes ensuring that there is also a fairer opportunity for County Councillors who have nominated a scheme in a Parish Council area to have their scheme prioritised for this programme.
14. Schemes put forward by County Councillors that are not in Annex B could be resubmitted for consideration for the 2026/27 financial year, or County Councillors may put forward an alternative scheme, this is their choice.

Analysis and Commentary

15. 69 schemes were submitted by Divisional Members to be considered for delivery through the Countywide ITS Fund (one scheme is a joint submission, and eleven County Councillors did not submit a scheme).
16. Each of these schemes were technically assessed and scored against the criteria in the prioritisation process.
17. Following this exercise, the schemes listed in Annex B are being recommended to be delivered through the Countywide ITS Fund from 2025/26 as these scored highest against the criteria and align with the aim to ensure that no community is left behind.

Consultation and Publicity

18. The Cabinet approved the establishment of an annual budget for integrated transport schemes at a meeting on 22nd February 2022. Following this, Members have been invited to submit a scheme on an annual basis for consideration.
19. The Highways Engagement and Commissioning Team have been in contact with all Members to talk through their schemes and provide them with guidance on the process.
20. A summary report on the outcome of the schemes and the benefits that this has provided for local residents will be reported for information on an annual basis to the Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee. There will also be informal discussions as part of the Members Briefings, as part of a lessons learnt approach to improving this process for future years.

RISK MANAGEMENT AND IMPLICATIONS:

21. A key element of the scoring process has been to ensure that any schemes that are recommended to be approved for design and construction can be delivered within the timescales, and that there are sufficient resources to complete the works.
22. It is proposed that authority is delegated to the Highways Engagement and Commissioning Manager to make any minor amendments to the schemes which may be required to ensure that the schemes are progressed, in consultation with the relevant Divisional Member and where required, the Cabinet Member. This is to manage the normal risks to any works programme.

FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS

23. The estimated cost of the projects identified in Annex B is within a guide figure of £3m, which is based on the current Countywide ITS budget. The actual budget for 2025/26 is yet to be finalised, and therefore the final confirmed programme will be subject to change dependent upon the available budget .
24. All projects have been assessed to ensure that they are deliverable and affordable within the relevant financial period. However, some schemes could be programmed for delivery in the following 26/27 Financial Year to minimise disruption to traffic (especially if the scheme is located near to a school).

SECTION 151 OFFICER COMMENTARY

25. The Council continues to operate in a very challenging financial environment. Local authorities across the country are experiencing significant budgetary pressures. Surrey County Council has made significant progress in recent years to improve the Council's financial resilience and whilst this has built a stronger financial base from which to deliver our services, the cost of service delivery, increasing demand, financial uncertainty and government policy changes mean we continue to face challenges to our financial position. This requires an increased focus on financial management to protect service delivery, a continuation of the need to deliver financial efficiencies and reduce spending in order to achieve a balanced budget position each year.
26. In addition to these immediate challenges, the medium-term financial outlook beyond 2024/25 remains uncertain. With no clarity on central government funding in the medium term, our working assumption is that financial resources will continue to be constrained, as they have been for the majority of the past decade. This places an onus on the Council to continue to consider issues of financial sustainability as a priority, in order to ensure the stable provision of services in the medium term.

27. In addition to these immediate challenges, the medium-term financial outlook beyond 2024/25 remains uncertain. With no clarity on central government funding in the medium term, our working assumption is that financial resources will continue to be constrained, as they have been for the majority of the past decade. This places an onus on the Council to continue to consider issues of financial sustainability as a priority, in order to ensure the stable provision of services in the medium term.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS – MONITORING OFFICER

28. The recommendation (c) delegates authority to officers to authorise and manage expenditure from the budget in accordance with the Cabinet Member's decisions. There are no further legal or legislative requirements relating to this budget.

EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY

29. All Members have been requested to submit a scheme that will benefit their residents. The schemes that have been recommended are those that support the Council to meet its Corporate Priorities, which are focused on inclusivity and leaving no one behind. There are no other equalities or diversity impacts arising from the scheme.

OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

30. None.

PUBLIC HEALTH IMPLICATIONS

31. All of the schemes have been assessed against their ability for the Council to meet the principles within the Local Transport Plan 4. There are no public health implications arising from this report.

WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

32. All approved schemes will be submitted to the Council's Highways Design Team for a more detailed scheme design, and following this, subject to no issues being raised, this will be programmed for delivery from 2025/26.
33. The outcome of the decision at this meeting will be reported on the Council's website and all Members will be contacted on the outcome.

Contact Officer:

Zena Curry – Highways Engagement and Commissioning Manager
zena.curry@surreycc.gov.uk

Consulted:

- Cabinet in the development of the budget
- Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee on the prioritisation process.
- All Divisional Members have been consulted on submitting a scheme

Annexes:

- Annex A – Proposed Prioritisation Process
- Annex B – Recommended list of schemes to be agreed for funding.

This page is intentionally left blank

Annex A

Proposed Countywide ITS Prioritisation Process:

This prioritisation process is a simplification of the prioritisation process used for the Surrey Instructure Plan projects and has been developed in discussion with the Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee and also with input from the Member Reference Group.

Each County Councillor has the opportunity to nominate 1 ITS project that is of highest priority locally in their division.

The nominated ITS schemes will have a technical assessment to see if each scheme is, in broad terms, affordable and deliverable.

Each nominated scheme has been scored against the following criteria: Congestion, Accessibility, Safety, Environment, Economy, and Affordability & Deliverability. There is a lot of detail behind each of these criteria, including links to LTP 4, Healthy Surrey, Greener Futures, Healthy Streets for Surrey etc. This detail is included in this Annex.

Schemes that score highly in terms of Safety and Affordability & Deliverability, will achieve the highest overall scores. This is to ensure that the schemes that deliver the best outcomes for highway users in terms of improving road safety, and are good value for money, receive a higher score. Also, each scheme will consider if Healthy Streets for Surrey measures could be introduced within each scheme.

The highest scoring scheme for each District or Borough will be progressed (subject to the estimated value not being great than £350,000), once eleven schemes have been identified, then the next highest scoring scheme in a rural area (defined as within a Parish Council area) in each District or Borough will be delivered subject to budget availability. In the event that there is not enough funding to prioritise all District and Boroughs, the schemes with the highest score will take precedence. This is to ensure no community is left behind.

The Cabinet Member has the ability to adjust scheme priorities to reflect local needs, levelling up, redressing imbalance impacting on rural communities or other County priorities.

The prioritised scoring has been carried out by Traffic Engineers who have detailed knowledge of each scheme location and have been moderated to ensure a consistent countywide approach.

This moderation ensures that different Traffic Engineers agree with the approach and score for each nominated scheme.

The prioritised schemes form the countywide proposed programme of work in Annex B to be delivered from the 2025/26 Financial Year, once considered for agreement by the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Economic Growth.

Each County Councillor who's nominated schemes is not prioritised in Annex B could decide to either nominate the same scheme again for the following FY or decide to nominate an alternative scheme.

Scoring Criteria:

Congestion

Vehicle journey time impact	congestion	-3 to +3	Increased congestion is not necessarily a negative score as could change behaviour towards active travel. Heat map of traffic congestion can be sourced from Google Streetview. Air quality impact of congestion links to the criteria under "Environment".
Improve bus time reliability	congestion		Removal of parking or implementation of bus lanes would be a positive score. Feedback from Passenger Transport team of feedback from Bus Operating Companies on any usual delays on routes/difficulties with timetable reliability
Limit private vehicular traffic growth	congestion		Measures to prevent through traffic in residential areas would be a positive score. Feedback from any traffic surveys or Google Streetview heat map could determine if a residential road is being used as a "rat run" (negative score if road is SPN4a or 4b)
Use technology to aid management of congestion	congestion		Average speed cameras could smooth traffic flows, and would be a positive score in the right location. A camera that would be likely to displace traffic could be a negative score. Links to Average Speed Camera criteria.
Separated cycle facility - to beat congestion	congestion		A separated cycle facility would be the highest positive score. Links to LCWIP, Active Travel, Placemaking, Major, Road Safety, flood alleviation schemes would be a positive score.

Accessibility

A1	Increase the number of walking trips	accessibility	-3 to +3	Increase the number of walking trips. Improvements to the ease of walking including wider pavements, improved crossing facilities a more positive score. Reductions in pavement width or removal of crossing facilities would be a negative score. Vivacity camera data is available in some limited locations on pedestrian and cycling use.
A2	Increase the number of cycling trips	accessibility		Increase the number of cycling trips. Increase the number of cycles parked at railway stations. Improved cycling and cycle parking facilities, upgrades of crossings to Toucan (where appropriate) would be a positive score. Better Points data can also be used to indicate an increased take up of active travel.
A3	Increase the number of public transport trips	accessibility		Increase the proportion of who can have can travel to hospital by public transport in 20 or 30 minutes. Increase the proportion of 16-19 year olds who have can travel to schools or colleges by public transport in 20 or 30 minutes. Increase bus patronage. Increase the number of all survey respondents who are satisfied with bus services. Increase the number of passengers who are satisfied with bus services. Improve bus punctuality. Increase the satisfaction with travel information. Feedback on this data can be requested from Passenger Transport
A4	Support Equality, Diversity & Inclusion	accessibility		Increase the satisfaction of disabled people with accessibility of town centres, see Surrey Coalition of Disabled People website. Schemes designed to improve access would have a higher score. Ensure access to services and engagement is available for all (consider time, day and date of engagement meetings and opportunities to shape our service and ITS schemes)
A5	Reduce community severance	accessibility		An example of a positive score would be a pedestrian crossing on a busy road that goes through a community residential area, where there are no or limited alternative crossing points.
A6	Encourage links between housing & health-care and other public facilities	accessibility		A scheme that provides additional pedestrian, cycling or public transport facilities to improve access to health or other public service provision would have a higher score. This links with the approach from Transformation initiatives. This can be determined by assessing the ETI interactive map, and facility locations.

Safety

S1	Reduce KSI	safety	-7 to +7	Reduce the number of people killed or seriously injured (KSI) for all highway users. Data is available on Crashmap and could use data from a relevant Road Safety Working Group meeting. Should use data from preceding 3 years (and mindful of changes during Pandemic).
S2	Reduce Slight Casualties	safety		Reduce the number of slight casualties for all highway users. Data is available on Crashmap and could use data from a relevant Road Safety Working Group meeting. Should use data from preceding 3 years (and mindful of changes during Pandemic).
S3	Reduction in vehicle speeds	safety		A reduction in vehicle speeds would be a positive score, and may need additional engineering measures if the measured average mean speeds do not comply with the Setting Local Speed Limits Policy.
S4	Support Safe Routes to School	safety		Increase the share of school trips by modes other than single passenger in a car
S5	Improve street lighting	safety		Increase the percentage of the population who benefit from better lighting. Increased number of street lights is not necessarily a higher score if the environmental impact outweighs any potential benefits. Consider if the crime rate is higher in that location and if the Police consider that improved street lighting could reduce the amount of crime or the fear of crime.
S6	Reduce the KSI and Slight injuries to pedestrians and cyclists	safety		Specific measure in addition to overall rates, in order to give a higher priority to schemes that could reduce the number of personal injury accidents involving the highest priority, and vulnerable, highway users. Data is available on Crashmap and also through appropriate Road Safety Work Group meetings. Should use data from preceding 3 years (and mindful of changes during Pandemic).

Environment

E1	Improves Biodiversity	environment	-3 to +3	A scheme that incorporated improved biodiversity through planting an/or environmentally enhancing drainage features would score higher. This includes opportunities to incorporate appropriate species of street tree planting and blue heart wilding of verges.
E2	Opportunity for sustainable travel, buses & EV/non-fossil fuel	environment		Improvements to all forms of sustainable travel including walking, cycling, bus routes, emerging new sustainable technology forms of transport, installation of EV chargers etc would be a positive score.
E3	Encourage shift away from private cars	environment		Making it easier to use sustainable transport of any kind would give a higher score. Increasing uptake of behaviour change approach such as Better Points could increase score.
E4	Reduce traffic emissions to improve air quality	environment		Reduction in emissions in an Air Quality Management Area would have a higher score. Contribute to government target of reduction to net zero by 2050, a scheme to improve walking or cycling facilities would have a positive score
E5	Reduce the impact of HGVs	environment		Consideration should be given to where HGVs may be displaced to and in line with the SPN eg if HGVs are displaced from a residential road to a distributor road with a higher SPN, then the score could be higher. If the scheme promotes access for more sustainable deliveries, such as EV charging points, then the score could be higher.
E6	Infrastructure resilience	environment		Reducing flood risk, impact of other incidents and weather events results in a positive score. Incorporating SUDS approach would give a highest score.

Economy

EC1	Impact on journeys to education and training	economy	-3 to +3	Co-ordination and links to projects promoted by the Road Safety Team, or other <u>schemes promoting sustainable school travel would have a higher score.</u>
EC2	Impact on journeys to employment/town centres	economy		Co-ordination and links to projects promoted by the Placemaking Economy Team & TDP would have a higher score.
EC3	Impact on distribution routes	economy		Assess the impact of re-routing traffic required for distribution of goods and services. SPN 1 & 2 and some SPN 3 roads are more suitable for this traffic than residential roads. Co-ordination and links to projects promoted by Placemaking Economy Team & links to Freight strategy. Schemes that could displace distribution traffic in to residential areas would have a negative score.
EC4	Visual impact of scheme on Town/Village economic sustainability	economy		Schemes designed to enhance the environment and street scene of a Town or Village are more likely to be economically sustainable. More people are likely to visit, dwell and have a larger economic contribution. This type of scheme would have a higher score. Links with Healthy Streets design guide and Placemaking.

Affordability & Deliverability

AD1	Project is good value for money and/or has match funding	affordability & deliverability	-10 to +10	A positive score would be given for schemes that have a good some external funding or is a lower cost measure
AD2	Project is deliverable - time/cost/quality	affordability & deliverability		A positive score would be for a project where the cost & quality would not be compromised in order to meet timescales. A scheme is likely to have a negative score if there are land and/or legal issues such as where Common Land is required for a scheme.
AD3	Project has member & community support	affordability & deliverability		No member or community support would be the lowest score, either member or community support would be neutral, member & community support would be positive
AD4	Project is in broad terms technically feasible	affordability & deliverability		Outcome of technical appraisal and/or engineers assessment would determine score
AD5	Project links with other projects in locality	affordability & deliverability		A link with another project would be a positive score

Range -3 to +3	<p>Vehicle Journey Time impact</p> <p>Improve bus time reliability</p> <p>Limit private vehicular traffic growth</p> <p>Use technology to aid management of congestion</p> <p>Separated cycle facility - to beat congestion</p>	Score from -3 to +3 Score	<p>Congestion</p> <p>Linking to LTP4 Priorities</p>
Range -3 to +3	<p>Increase the number of walking trips</p> <p>Increase the number of cycling trips</p> <p>Increase the number of public transport trips</p> <p>Support Equality, Diversity & Inclusion</p> <p>Reduce community severance</p> <p>Encourage links between housing & health-care and other public facilities</p>	Score from -3 to +3 Score	<p>Accessibility</p> <p>Links with LTP4/LCwIP/Healthy Surrey</p>
Range -7 to +7	<p>Reduce KSI</p> <p>Reduce slight casualties</p> <p>Reduce vehicle speeds</p> <p>Support safe routes to school</p> <p>Improve street lighting</p> <p>Reduce the KSI and Slight injuries to pedestrians and cyclists</p>	Score from -7 to +7 Score	<p>Safety</p> <p>Links with Road Safety Team programmes</p>

<p>Range -3 to +3</p>	<p>Improves biodiversity Opportunity for sustainable travel -buses & EV/non fossil fuel Encourage shift away from private cars Reduce traffic emissions to improve air quality Reduce HGV impact Infrastructure resilience</p>	<p>Score from -3 to +3 Score</p>	<p>Environment Links with Greener Futures, Build Back Greener & Surrey Infrastructure Plan</p>
<p>Range -3 to +3</p>	<p>Impact on journeys to education & training Impact on journeys to employment/town centres Impact on distribution routes Visual impact of scheme on Town/Village economic sustainability</p>	<p>Score form -3 to +3 Score</p>	<p>Economy Links with SCC Strategic Objectives - no one left behind</p>
<p>Range -10 to +10</p>	<p>Project is good value for money and/or has match funding Project is deliverable - time, cost, quality Project has member & community support Project is in broad terms technically feasible Project links with other projects in locality</p>	<p>Score from -10 to +10 Score</p>	<p>Project Affordability & Deliverability</p>

County Councillors were contacted in October 2023

Process for each County Councillor to choose 1 ITS scheme to propose for prioritisation for delivery in

1 ITS scheme proposed by end of March 2024

County Councillor emails Councillors@surreycc.gov.uk with their preferred ITS scheme on the new Proforma, to put forward, with support from the

Stakeholder Engagement Officer (SEO) can support on simplified engagement with stakeholders and liaises with

Technical Assessments carried out May - August

Each 1 nominated scheme has a Technical Assessment to determine if proposal is, in broad terms, technically

Already identified ITS schemes with some assessing information available.

A meeting of County Councillors for each Borough or District area to discuss works programmes and

All nominated schemes are prioritised against the agreed prioritisation process and reviewed by Cabinet Member to

Already identified schemes with a feasibility/scoping study completed

October onwards – schemes progress for delivery from

Newly identified ITS scheme put forward by residents or other stakeholders.

Is the proposed 1 ITS scheme prioritised for the Countywide ITS programme?

Yes

No

Proposed Countywide ITS Programme from 2025/26
Based on £3m budget
Countywide prioritised programme of schemes agreed by the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Economic Growth Transport.
Programme that is affordable and deliverable and meets the agreed prioritisation criteria with stronger links to policies and strategies including LTP4, Greener Futures and

Option 1
County Councillor could decide to nominate the same scheme again for prioritisation in the next Financial Year.
County Councillor emails Councillors@surreycc.gov.uk with their preferred ITS scheme

Option 2
County Councillor could decide to nominate a different scheme for prioritisation in the next Financial Year.
County Councillor emails

Report Annually to CEH Select

End Page 21

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**MATT FURNISS, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS,
TRANSPORT AND ECONOMIC GROWTH****SURREY****DATE: 24 September 2024****LEAD OFFICER: OWEN JENKINS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR FOR
HIGHWAYS, INFRASTRUCTURE & PLANNING****SUBJECT: REVISION OF THE CHARGE FOR SUSPENDING BUS
STOPS IN SURREY**

ORGANISATION STRATEGY NO ONE LEFT BEHIND / GROWING A SUSTAINABLE ECONOMY
PRIORITY AREA: SO EVERYONE CAN BENEFIT / ENABLING A GREENER FUTURE

SUMMARY OF ISSUE:

To ensure the Council can cover costs and maintain efficient local bus service operations and delivery, it is proposed that the Council increase the charge for suspending a bus stop.

It is proposed that the bus stop suspension charge increases from the current level of £150 (maximum two-day charge) to £175 per day for a maximum three-day charge. It is also proposed that a new charge of £600 per stop per day be introduced if works take place at any bus stop without prior authorisation.

This change will help the Council to grow a sustainable economy so everyone can benefit, enable a greener future, and ensure no one is left behind.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

It is recommended that the Cabinet Member agrees to:

1. Increase the charge to suspend a bus stop to £175 per day for a three-day maximum period, which will apply to all works promoters, developer works, utility works and other third party works, excluding those works undertaken by the County Council.
2. Introduce a new charge of £600 per bus stop per day for works that close a bus stop or take place at any bus stop without proper authorisation, which will apply to all works promoters, developer works, utility works and other third party works, excluding those works undertaken by the County Council.
3. Delegate the approval for further changes to the Director of Highways & Transport in consultation with the Cabinet Member.

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

Bus stop suspension charges were last increased in September 2017, when the Council raised them to the same level as neighbouring Transport for London (TfL). TfL have increased their charges, so to better align the Council's charges with TfL an increase is proposed. The additional income will assist the Council to support the delivery and operation of the local bus network across Surrey.

Executive Summary:

Business Case

1. Historically, in Surrey the charge levied on works promoters, developer works, utility works and other third party works (excluding works undertaken by the County Council) when bus stops have had to be suspended and taken out of use were set at the same level as TfL.
2. The Council currently charges £150 per bus stop, with a maximum charge for two days. This means that there is currently a maximum charge of £300 per bus stop regardless of how long the bus stop is suspended and out of use to residents.
3. Ensuring that the Council has sufficient warning of works affecting bus stops means that the Council is able to provide advanced information to bus passengers and bus operators of bus stop closures and route diversions, thus minimising adverse impacts on residents.
4. Works impacting bus stops that are unknown to the Council create a barrier and logistical challenge to bus users who will be unaware buses are on diversion. When works are known about the Council will liaise with bus operators and the Council's Infrastructure Inspectors will post notices at those bus stops to inform passengers of the next nearest available bus stop. Currently there is no incentive for contractors working on Surrey's highway to notify the Council when bus stop suspensions are required. The introduction of a new charge, £600 per stop per day, will act as a deterrent to those undertaking works without prior notification. Unknown works will be identified and reported by the four Infrastructure Inspectors travelling around the County, alongside bus operators and residents.
5. The Council's suspension charge was last increased in September 2017.
6. A benchmarking exercise against ten local transport authorities has been conducted (see appendix A). Daily charges range from £108 to £360 per stop, with a variety of additional charges for late notification.
7. In Surrey 36% of "booked" bus stop suspensions since April 2023 have been for two or less days, with a high number of three-day suspensions

in comparison to two and four days. This could be works promoters adding an additional day for “comfort” as there is currently no additional cost for day three. Changing the charge to £175 per day for three days will encourage shorter suspensions of bus stops and reduce the inconvenience to passengers.

8. Additional bus stop suspensions and associated works necessitated the Council increasing the number of Inspectors from two to four. The increase in charges will support ongoing revenue cost and help the Council to support the delivery and operation of the local bus network across Surrey.

CONSULTATION:

9. A consultation has not been undertaken as the proposed increase in charge only impacts contractors working on Surrey’s highway. This does not directly impact our residents. However, the Council will review the bus stop suspension information available to anyone working on Surrey’s highway to ensure compliance and understanding of the proposed increased charge.
10. In making this change, the Council will review the bus stop suspension information available to anyone working on Surrey’s highway to ensure compliance and understanding of the proposed increased charge

RISK MANAGEMENT AND IMPLICATIONS:

11. Increasing the bus stop suspension charge could result in some companies failing to notify the Council of their bus stop suspension requirements to avoid the increased charge. This will be mitigated by the introduction of a new charge of £600 per day for failing to notify of works affecting bus stops.
12. In addition, in making these changes, the Council will review the bus stop suspension information available to anyone working on Surrey’s highway to ensure compliance and understanding of the new and proposed increased charge.

Financial and value for money implications:

13. The charge for work to suspend a bus stop has not been updated since 2017. Historically, the charges levied in Surrey were set in line with the charges levied by neighbouring TfL. A recent review of this charge shows the Council is currently under recovering the full financial cost of Bus Stop Suspensions. This proposed change moves the Council to a

position intended to fully recover the costs associated with Bus Stop Suspensions.

Section 151 Officer commentary:

14. The Council continues to operate in a very challenging financial environment. Local authorities across the country are experiencing significant budgetary pressures. Surrey County Council has made significant progress in recent years to improve the Council's financial resilience and whilst this has built a stronger financial base from which to deliver our services, the cost of service delivery, increasing demand, financial uncertainty and government policy changes mean we continue to face challenges to our financial position. This requires an increased focus on financial management to protect service delivery, a continuation of the need to deliver financial efficiencies and reduce spending in order to achieve a balanced budget position each year.
15. In addition to these immediate challenges, the medium-term financial outlook beyond 2024/25 remains uncertain. With no clarity on central government funding in the medium term, our working assumption is that financial resources will continue to be constrained, as they have been for the majority of the past decade. This places an onus on the Council to continue to consider issues of financial sustainability as a priority, in order to ensure the stable provision of services in the medium term.
16. The recommended fee changes are designed to fully recover the financial costs to the Council of Bus Stop Suspensions. As such, the Section 151 Officer supports the recommends.

Legal implications – Monitoring Officer:

17. The County Council has powers to charge for discretionary services related to a Council function. Any relevant statutory provisions must be complied with prior to the introduction of new fees and charges.
18. Section 93 of the Local Government Act 2003 ("2003 Act") and guidance issued in 2003 pursuant to section 96(3) of the 2003 Act empowers the Council to charge for discretionary services subject to certain conditions.
19. Discretionary services are those services authorised by statute that the Council is not required to provide but may do so voluntarily (s93(1)(a) 2003 Act). The Council can set the level of charge for each discretionary service. However proposed charges must have regard to the 2003 statutory guidance.

Equalities and diversity:

20. Bus stop suspensions have a negative impact on every person who uses the route, or routes, effected by the suspension. This impacts people from every protected group. However, the temporary removal or change to people's access to public transport will be most impactful for people with mobility issues, for example, due, but not limited to, age, disability, pregnancy or traveling with young children.
21. Contractors applying for bus stop suspensions have a right to work on the highway. Therefore, we must look at opportunities to manage and mitigate the impact of these bus stop closures to ensure that routes are returned to their normal operation as soon as reasonably possible.
22. Mitigation often results in diverting bus routes with temporary bus stops being used in some cases. However, this may not be helpful for people living in the area where the next bus stop or temporary bus stop is not accessible for them. This may be because of the distance or location of the next open bus stop.
23. In some rarer instances, mainly where there is going to be long term suspensions, covering weeks of diversions, a significant impact on a number of routes or impacting a large area, alternative transport may be provided. For example, the relevant contractor may pay for a minibus to operate to serve some of that area. In a situation like this, the Council will liaise with the contractor and operator but are not responsible for the delivery of the service as the mitigation option.
24. Not all potential mitigation options may be available or suitable for everyone who would otherwise use the bus service at the stop or stops being closed. In these instances people have the option to use the Surrey Connect DDRT service or Dial-a-Ride services, if they operate in those areas. If these are not available, lifts from friends or family, taxi or other private hire may be people's only option.
25. Given that bus stop suspensions happen all around the county in any given year, at different times and with differing lengths of closures it is not practical for the impact of closures on people with protected characteristics to be assessed on a per closure or overall basis.
26. Alongside managing any diversions or other mitigations, the approach in this report, to use fees and charges as a means to ensure that works do not take longer than they should, supports the reopening of bus stops and the reinstatement of bus routes to their normal schedules as soon as possible.

27. The impact of long running roadworks on bus services can cause significant issues for the reliability and performance for bus operators. This then creates an impact on people with protected characteristics wanting to travel by bus.

Other implications:

28. The potential implications for the following Council priorities and policy areas have been considered. Where the impact is potentially significant a summary of the issues is set out in detail below.

Area assessed:	Direct Implications:
Corporate Parenting/Looked After Children	N/A
Safeguarding responsibilities for vulnerable children and adults	N/A
Environmental sustainability	N/A
Compliance against net-zero emissions target and future climate compatibility/resilience	Buses are important and provide Surrey’s residents with a sustainable mode of travel, offering an alternative to the private car. The increase in bus stop suspension charges will help the Council to support the delivery and operation of the local bus network.
Public Health	N/A

WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

29. The next steps are:
- Works promoters, developer works, utility works and other third-party works will be informed of the revised fees that will commence in October 2024.
 - A review of the bus stop suspension information available to anyone working on Surrey’s highway will be undertaken to ensure compliance and understanding of the proposed increased charge to be in place by October 2024.

Report Author:

Valerie Sexton, Local Bus Service Planning Team Manager,
Valerie.sexton@surreycc.gov.uk Tel: 07971 673 264

Consulted:

Owen Jenkins, Executive Director for Environment, Infrastructure & Growth,
Lucy Monie, Director of Highways and Transport
Tony Orzieri, Strategic Finance Business Partner

Annexes:

Appendix A – Benchmarking of other Local Authorities

Sources/background papers:

None

Bus Stop Suspensions Charge - Benchmarking 2024

Bedfordshire

10 working days' notice must be given – failure to do so will result in a charge of £36.25, which will not be refunded if the application is refused
£220.30 per stop, per day, up to a cap of £1050 per stop
£85.40 for each temporary (dolly) stop required throughout the work

Bracknell Forest

Does NOT state anywhere if this is “per stop”, but as it requires a bus stop identification number have to presume it is per stop (and applicants would have to make multiple applications for multiple stops!)
£330 if 7+ days' notice given
£475 if only 3+ days' notice given
£775 if 2 or fewer days' notice given
must give 72 hours' notice” except for emergencies

Bristol City

7 days' notice must be given, or all charges listed below are doubled
£288 per stop (for the first two stops)
£92 for each additional stop after the first two stops
£115 for each temporary (dolly) stop required
A fee of £690 per stop if you close/work at any bus stop without proper authorisation
Cancellation fees:
-£80 to cancel an application already submitted and approved with more than 7 days' notice
-Full charge will still apply even if you cancel your application, if done with less than 7 days' notice
Additional fee of £76 per stop per “amendment” to BSS request (no details given as to what constitutes an amendment)

Buckinghamshire

£108 per stop (1 weeks notice required, except for emergencies)
Full payment required if notice of cancellation is given “too late” less than 1 weeks' notice

Hampshire

£123 for 1 stop
£139 for a pair of stops (definition given as to what constitutes “a pair” – it is not just any two stops, quite strict ruling)
Additional fees added to the above:
£199 admin fee (more than 24hrs notice)
£235 admin fee (less than 24hrs notice)
£277 admin fee (same day request)
£116 for each instance of being “unable to re-open stop” (assume this means the works being in place longer than agreed)

Hertfordshire

£160 per stop (4+ working days notice given)
£360 for the first stop if less notice given (and then £160 per stop as usual)
Additional £60 “admin fee” for all applications
(Additional charges for not finishing works on time, but no figures given)

Transport for London

Per stop:

£225 for 1 day

£75 for each additional day

Works that require a bus to go on diversion start at £1250 with no upper limit (though no guidance/extra details were given as to what extra charges may apply)

Suffolk

Per stop:

£150 for 1 day

£170 for 1 day (late request)*

£270 for 2+ days

£290 for 2+ days (late request)*

*less than 5 working days notice

West Berkshire

£192 for 1 stop

£224 for "a pair of stops" – no real detail about what this actually means, very barebones description

All of the above requires 10 working days notice (but no details as to charges/consequences of not providing this)

West Sussex

£336 per stop

Additional charges (not stated) for failure to clear site by agreed end date

This page is intentionally left blank