

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**LOCAL COMMITTEE (SURREY HEATH)****DATE: 2 OCTOBER 2014****LEAD OFFICER: ANDREW MILNE – AREA HIGHWAYS MANAGER (NW)****SUBJECT: HIGHWAYS UPDATE****DIVISION: ALL****SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

To report progress made with the delivery of proposed highways schemes, developer funded schemes, and revenue funded works for the 2014/15 financial year.

To seek approval of the contingency plans as laid out in section 2.1.14 of this report.

To report on relevant topical highways matters.

To provide an update on the latest budgetary position for highway schemes, revenue maintenance and Community Enhancement expenditure.

RECOMMENDATIONS:**The Local Committee (Surrey Heath) is asked to:**

- (i) Note the progress with the ITS highways and developer funded schemes, and revenue funded works for the 2014/15 financial year,
- (ii) Note progress with budget expenditure,
- (iii) Approve the contingency plans as laid out in section 2.1.14 of this report,
- (iv) Note that a further Highways Update will be brought to the next meeting of this Committee,

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

The above recommendations are made to enable progression of all highway related schemes and works.

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND:

- 1.1** Surrey County Council's Local Transport Plan (LTP) states the aim of improving the highway network for all users, through measures such as reducing congestion, improving accessibility, reducing personal injury accidents, improving the environment and maintaining the highway network so that it is safe for all users.

2. ANALYSIS:

2.1 Capital programme for 2014/15

- 2.1.1 Following the Surrey Heath Committee Local Committee meeting held on 5 December 2013, it was agreed to promote delivery of an additional lane between the Toshiba roundabout and Frimley Park Hospital roundabout.
- 2.1.2 This project remains the highest ranking priority for Surrey Heath, and considerable investment has already been made in the design process.
- 2.1.3 The cost of constructing the additional lane was estimated to be between £604,000 and £846,000, with the higher figure including an allowance of £254,000 towards diversion of utility apparatus and unforeseen construction risks.
- 2.1.4 In 2013/14, £622,574 was been set aside for this project, comprised of:
- a) £130,872 PIC monies
 - b) £185,000 s106 funding
 - c) £306,702 Local Committee capital
- 2.1.5 Taking into account the cost of design and modelling in 2013/14, and completion of the crossing upgrades, approximately £156,000 was used in the 2013/14 period. This allowed for £466,000 to be brought forward into the 2014/15 financial year for this project.
- 2.1.6 It was initially assumed that the cost of delivery would be £846,000, and that allowing for the £466,000 carry forward, a further £380,000 of capital would be required to complete this project.
- 2.1.7 Surrey Heath Local Committee agreed to use the entirety of their 2014/15 capital allocation towards this project (£306,702).
- 2.1.8 Progress**
- 2.1.9 Detailed design has now been completed, and final costs have been received from Surrey Highway's contractor, Kiers, together with final estimated costs from the majority of utility companies affected. Based on this information, it is anticipated that this scheme will fully utilise the available monies.

2.1.10 Stage 2 of the safety audit process has been completed.

2.1.11 Due to a delay with cost information from two of the utility companies affected, the delivery timescale has been revised. The works will be completed in two phases, with phase 1 (the utility works) being completed before Christmas 2014, and the construction phase commencing on 1st February 2015, with the intention of works being completed by the end of March 2015. It must be emphasised though that weather conditions and other factors can influence works programmes, and that the dates indicated may be subject to change.

2.1.12 Risks

2.1.13 The primary risk to the successful completion of this project is any unforeseen significant increase in costs arising from associated utility works. Although the risk level is considered to be low, following receipt of final estimated costs from the majority of the utility companies affected, it is important that this is highlighted to the Surrey Heath Committee.

2.1.14 Contingency planning

Contingency planning is necessary to ensure the effective use of Committee capital funding in the event of unforeseen circumstances. Although it is unlikely that contingency works will be necessary, the following prioritised list of Localised Structural Repair works have been proposed in the event of the Toshiba Project not being able to progress in 2014/15. It is still recommended that items would be funded from this list in the order shown, to the value of any remaining capital funding:

Priority	District	Road Number	Road Name	Location	Limits	Length	Estimated Area m2	Estimated Approx Cost £22/m2	Running Total
1	Surrey Heath	D533	Oakwood Rd	Windlesham	From outside no.1 to no.7	35	196	£4,312	£4,312
2	Surrey Heath	D3502	Holly Hedge Close	Frimley	Whole length	142	800	£17,600	£21,912
3	Surrey Heath	D3441	Chantry Court	Frimley	Approach & turning area	61	396	£8,712	£30,624
4	Surrey Heath	D3439	Apex Drive	Frimley	Full Length	174	1030	£22,660	£53,284
5	Surrey Heath	D3546	Kirkstone Close	Frimley	Whole Length of cul de sac	94	655	£14,410	£67,694
6	Surrey Heath	D3488	Edgemore Rd	Frimley	junction edgemore / martindale rd / goldney rd	60x6m 10x6m	420	£9,240	£76,934
7	Surrey Heath	D3522	Highclere Drive	Camberley	cw heavy crazing / structural failure	at junction with A325 portsmouth rd 40x6m	240	£5,280	£82,214
8	Surrey Heath	D3502	Holly Hedge Rd	Frimley	Section from Holly Hedge Close Jet to J/W Lauder Close	71	451	£9,922	£92,136

ITEM 8

9	Surrey Heath	B3012	Guildford Road	Frimley Green	Section - Both approaches and over canal bridge	100	511	£11,242	£103,378
10	Surrey Heath	D3567	Cheylesmore Drive	Frimley	Bell mouth & J/W Old Bilsey Rd		75	£1,650	£105,028
11	Surrey Heath	D3488	Old Bisley Rd	Frimley	Bell mouth & junction with The Maultway		252	£5,544	£110,572
12	Surrey Heath	D0004	Mill Pond Rd	Windlesham	Bell mouth & junction Nr no. 18	50	340	£7,480	£118,052
13	Surrey Heath	D3532	Kingsclear Park	Camberley	Full Length	333	1510	£33,220	£151,272
14	Surrey Heath	D3542	Inglewood Ave	Camberley	Full Length	698	4718	£103,796	£255,068
15	Surrey Heath	D3486	Tomlins Ave	Frimley	Whole length	282	1596	£35,112	£290,180
16	Surrey Heath	B383	Windsor Rd	Chobham	J/w Little Heath Rd, Windlesham Rd & Red lion Rd		575	£12,650	£302,830

2.1.15 This list has been considered by the Local Committee, who deferred making a decision on contingency schemes until the 2014/15 financial year, to allow the opportunity to respond to the changing condition of the highway network over the course of the Winter.

2.1.16 Since presenting this list for consideration, central planned maintenance programmes have been published. The items highlighted have now either been completed already from central budgets, or are planned for delivery from central budgets this financial year.

2.2 Revenue maintenance allocations and expenditure 2014/15

2.2.1 The 2014/15 revenue maintenance allocation for Surrey Heath is £226,525. Table 1 shows how these funds have been allocated, and the spend progress to date.

Item	Allocation (£)	Committed as at 22 nd September 2014 (£)
Drainage / ditching	50,000	40,120
Carriageway and footway patching	50,025	15,481
Vegetation works	90,000	93,870
Signs and markings	20,000	7,588
Parking	6,500	0
Low cost measures	10,000	2,476
Kier OHP	-	4,361
Total	226,525	£159,537

Table 1 – 2014/15 Revenue Maintenance Expenditure

2.3 COMMUNITY ENHANCEMENT FUND

2.3.1 The total 2014/15 Community Enhancement allocation for Surrey Heath is £30,000. Committee have previously determined to divide this fund equally between County Councillor Committee Members.

- 2.3.2 The Maintenance Engineer for Surrey Heath will provide guidance and assistance, organise cost estimates, and raise orders to ensure delivery of works.
- 2.3.3 To ensure that this fund is effectively spent, and to enable highways contractors to deliver works before the end of the financial year, it is recommended that all works should be agreed by 31st October 2014, and that in the event of no firm spending decisions being made by this date, the Maintenance Engineer will determine suitable works and organise their delivery.
- 2.3.4 A summary of spend progress is shown in Table 2.

Member	Allocation (£)	Committed as at 22nd September 2014 (£)
Bill Chapman	5,000	1,009
Denis Fuller	5,000	0
David Ivison	5,000	0
Chris Pitt	5,000	0
Mike Goodman	5,000	2,043
Adrian Page	5,000	0
Total	30,000	3,052 committed

Table 2 – Community Enhancement Fund spend progress

2.4 Other highways related matters

- 2.4.1 The second quarter of the year has seen a reduction in the level of enquiries compared to the extremely high volume during the first quarter, mainly due to better weather. For the first half of the year, 87,775 enquiries have been received, giving an average of almost 14600 per month for the calendar year, down from 19000.
- 2.4.2 For Surrey Heath specifically, 5636 enquiries have been received since January, of which 2972 were directed to the local area office for action, and 96% of these have been resolved. This response rate is slightly above the countywide average of 95%. Although the response rate remains high, we are working hard in conjunction with our contractors to improve and also reduce the need for customers to chase for an answer.
- 2.4.3 The reduction in customer contacts has also been reflected in the volume of complaints received; 208 for the 6 months to the end of June compared to 143 for the first quarter. The North West area including Surrey Heath has received 28 stage 1 complaints. The main reasons for these complaints are listed as being communications, and the failure to carry out works to either the required standard or timescale. The Service is reviewing the customer service KPIs and is particularly looking at advance notification of works on the highway through our Customer Stakeholder Engagement Plan.

3. OPTIONS:

- 3.1 Options, where appropriate, have been presented in this report.

4. CONSULTATIONS:

- 4.1 Consultation is routinely carried out for highway-related schemes with relevant key parties, including residents, Local Members, Surrey Police and Safety Engineering. Specific details regarding consultation and any arising legal issues are included in individual scheme reports as appropriate.

5. FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS:

- 5.1 Proposed ITS schemes are prioritised to ensure that the maximum public benefit is gained from any funding made available. So far as is practicable, Officer proposals follow the Countywide scheme assessment process (CASEM) and the prioritisation order determined by this.
- 5.2 The Committee Capital and Revenue Maintenance budgets are used to target the most urgent sites where a specific need arises, to keep up with general maintenance activities that reduce the need for expensive repairs in the future, and to support local priorities. The nature of these works is such that spend may vary slightly from that indicated in Table 1.

6. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS:

- 6.1 It is an objective of Surrey Highways to treat all users of the public highway equally and with understanding. Appropriate and proportionate consultation is carried out with residents, and bodies representing particular user groups, to ensure that the interests of all highway users are considered.

7. LOCALISM:

- 7.1 Through the views and needs expressed by local communities, and accommodating where possible the involvement of local communities in looking after the public highway, localism is routinely considered as part of the consultation and bidding processes for highway-related works. Specific details regarding localism are included in individual reports as appropriate.

8. OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

- 8.1 Other implications, such as the contribution that a well-managed highway network can give to reducing crime and disorder, are considered in relation to individual schemes, and specific details are included in individual reports as appropriate.

Area assessed:	Direct Implications:
Crime and Disorder	No significant implications arising from this report.
Sustainability (including Climate Change and Carbon Emissions)	No significant implications arising from this report.
Corporate Parenting/Looked After	No significant implications arising

Children	from this report.
Safeguarding responsibilities for vulnerable children and adults	No significant implications arising from this report.
Public Health	No significant implications arising from this report.

9. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 9.1 The Committee is asked to note the progress with all schemes and budgets.
- 9.2 The Committee is asked to approve the contingency plans as presented.
- 9.3 It is recommended that a further Highways Update is presented at the next meeting of this Committee.

10. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

- 10.1 Officers will continue to progress delivery of all schemes and ensure effective use of all budgets.

Contact Officer:

Andrew Milne, Area Highways Manager (NW) – 03456 009 009

Consulted:

-

Annexes:

-

Sources/background papers:

-

This page is intentionally left blank