



WOKING JOINT COMMITTEE

DATE: 24 JUNE 2015
LEAD OFFICER: ANDREW MILNE, AREA HIGHWAYS MANAGER (NW)
SUBJECT: HIGHWAYS UPDATE
AREA: WOKING

SUMMARY OF ISSUES:

To report progress made with the delivery of proposed highways and developer funded schemes, and revenue funded works for the 2015/16 financial year.

To report on relevant topical highways matters.

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

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Woking Joint Committee is asked to:

- (i) Note the progress with ITS highways and developer funded schemes, and revenue funded works for the 2015/16 financial year
- (ii) Note progress with budget expenditure
- (iii) 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 works programme for 2015/16

- 2.1.1 The Committee 2015/16 capital budget for Woking was set at £292,162. In addition to this, £120,000 of developer funding has been identified to support scheme delivery, together with a carry forward of £57,000 from 2014/15 capital allocation. The Woking Joint Committee have also approved use of the £58,547 parking surplus monies to enable delivery of outstanding schemes from the 2014/15 programme, giving an overall capital budget of £527,547.
- 2.1.2 Table 1 below records the schemes agreed during the Woking Joint Committee held on 3 December 2014 for delivery in the 2015/16 financial year. Carryover schemes from the 2014/15 programme have also been included.
- 2.1.3 All costs shown are estimated, and it is suggested that should scheme costs vary from the estimates shown, that Committee support a flexible approach that enable the matching of schemes as best as can be achieved to the available budget.
- 2.1.4 It is noted that although the parking surplus monies have been earmarked in their entirety to support the capital programme, the Joint Committee stipulated that any residual funds for this should be set aside for parking control measures to control verge damage.

Scheme Name	Detail/Limits	Estimated cost (£)	Progress
A245 junction with Camphill Road reconfiguration assessment	Highest ranking scheme on our list of prioritised ITS improvements. Site has suffered from turning collisions and has been repeatedly raised as a road safety issue. Scheme is to assess options for reconfiguration and also consider improving pedestrian facilities. Design only.	15,000	In design.
Speed limit assessments/reductions	A320 Chertsey Road (Anthony's) – review of speed limit due to resident request and collision history (presently 10 th on list) A3046 Chobham Road near Common Close – raised in last formal Committee requesting review of speed limit (presently 18 th on list) Burdenshott Road – raised by residents and collision history –	40-50,000	Speed surveys completed. Assessment of data in progress. Separate report will be presented.

	<p>suggested review of speed limit (presently 3rd on list) Lock Lane/Wisley Lane, Pyrford – resident requests but no collision history. Present 60mph limit is not considered appropriate for location – need to review (presently 50th on list) Warbury Lane – to compliment revisions to width restrictions introduced in 2014/15 financial year. Review of speed limit (not ranked on list). Smartsheath Road – raised by local Member and Surrey Police. Review of speed limit.</p> <p>Design and construction as appropriate in 2015/16.</p>		
Signals review and crossing upgrades	<p>Programme of traffic signal timing reviews and pedestrian crossing upgrades led by Members to reduce congestion and support the local economy across the Borough. Programme size can be adjusted to available budget.</p>	Up to £50,000	Programme referred to Traffic Signals team for delivery.
Oyster Lane, Byfleet – Re-sign railway bridge	<p>This scheme is presently in 25th place on our prioritised ITS list. Signs were replaced on Runnymede side and on bridge structure to show both metric and imperial units. Woking signs are not consistent with this and need revising.</p>	10,000	In design.
Vale Farm Road – revoke part of 1 way system	<p>This scheme is presently in 36th place on our prioritised ITS list. Traffic from Wilbury Road often drives against the 1 way system. This is to regularise this situation and ease pressure on Vale Farm Road itself.</p>	15,000	In design.
Vicarage Road, Old Woking – pedestrian crossing near junction with Loop Road	<p>This scheme is presently in 19th place on our prioritised ITS list. Subject to funds being released by WBC, this crossing could be funded from developer monies. There is no pedestrian crossing in this vicinity, and this improvement would link two bus stops, is close to a footpath running into the Balfour Avenue Estate and the new Moor Lane development.</p>	120,000	In design.

ITEM 10

Weybarton, Byfleet	Capital maintenance (LSR)	0	Funded through Project Horizon
Maitland Close, West Byfleet	Capital maintenance (LSR)	12,115	Awaiting delivery date
Cavenham Close, Woking	Capital maintenance (LSR)	14,660	Scheme completed.
Woodmancote Gardens, West Byfleet	Capital maintenance (LSR)	10,863	Awaiting delivery date.
Knowle Gardens, West byfleet	Capital maintenance (LSR)	10,563	Awaiting delivery date.
Elveden Close , Pyrford	Capital maintenance (LSR)	16,868	Awaiting delivery date.
Palmerston Close, Horsell	Capital maintenance (LSR)	0	Funded through 2014/15 P400 programme. Scheme completed.
Mayhurst Avenue, Maybury	Capital maintenance (LSR)	16,022	Awaiting delivery date.
Pembroke Road safety scheme (carried forward from 2014/15 programme)		60,000	Delivery programmed for mid August.
Blackhorse Road safety scheme (carried forward from 2014/15 programme)		108,400	Delivery date to be confirmed – conflict with utility works.
Estimated allowance for contractor OHP		20,000	
Total		529,491	

Table 1 – Capital works programme for 2015/16

2.1.5 **Contingency planning** - In the event of any ITS schemes not being deliverable, or being unable to proceed for other reasons, it is proposed that a standby list of LSR works is used on a contingency basis to ensure that budgets are effectively utilised.

2.2 Revenue maintenance allocations and expenditure 2015/16

2.3.1 The revenue budget made available to the Woking Joint Committee has been reduced from £220,420 to £141,650. This is a significant reduction and may impact on our ability to deliver some revenue related service requests.

Item	Allocation (£)	Spend to date (£)
Drainage / ditching	50,000	36,393
Carriageway and footway patching	50,000	22,238
Vegetation works	30,000	304
Signs and markings	11,650	63
Low cost measures	0	0
Kier OHP	*	6,274 * (included in allocation figures)
Total	£141,650	£58,999 committed

Table 2 – 2015/16 Revenue Maintenance Expenditure

2.4 COMMUNITY ENHANCEMENT FUND

2.4.1 The total 2015/16 Community Enhancement allocation for Woking remains unchanged at £35,000. Committee have previously determined to divide this fund equally between County Councillor Committee Members.

2.4.2 A summary of spend progress is shown in Table 3 below.

Member	Allocation (£)	Spend to date (£)
Liz Bowes	5,000	2,127
Ben Carasco	5,000	1,072
Will Forster	5,000	0
Saj Hussain	5,000	0
Richard Wilson	5,000	0
Colin Kemp	5,000	0
Linda Kemeny	5,000	0
Total	35,000	3,199

Table 3 – Community Enhancement Fund spend progress

2.5 Other highways related matters

2.5.1 Customer enquiry responses

The mild weather in the first quarter of 2015 has meant the slight downward trend in enquiry numbers has continued since 2014. For January to March, 35,467 enquiries were received at an average of 11,822 per month, in comparison to 12,400 for 2014.

For Woking specifically, 1,741 enquiries have been received since January, of which 674 were directed to the local area office for action, and 95% of which have been resolved. This response rate is above the countywide average of 93%.

For the first quarter, 110 stage 1 complaints were received of which 15 were for the North West Area, including Woking. The main reasons for these complaints relate to the impact of roadworks, and service delivery.

The Service has recently undergone its annual Customer Service Excellence (CSE) review. This recognised the improvements that have been made and has recommended retention of the award. We recognise that there is still further work to do, but CSE is a continuous improvement tool and we are using this to drive up performance levels and improve the quality of the customer experience.

Examples of improvements made over the last year include the introduction of the new enquiry management system, and changes to the County Council roadworks web page. An improvement project is also underway to improve communication of information relating to the main resurfacing programme (Project Horizon).

To increase our understanding of customer satisfaction we have arranged for customer service questions to be included in the annual National Highways & Transport survey. This will provide a new opportunity for benchmarking the service we provide and input to future business planning. A Member survey will run in parallel to this, giving councillors the opportunity to have their say. More information will be provided through the CSE Member Reference Group.

3. OPTIONS:

- 3.1 Options, where applicable, are 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.

6. RISK MANAGEMENT:

- 6.1 Risks have been considered and managed through such measures as contingency planning.

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. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS:

- 8.1 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.

9. OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

- 9.1 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 Children	No significant implications arising 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.

10. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 10.1 The Committee is asked to note the progress with all schemes and budgets.
- 10.2 It is recommended that a further Highways Update report is presented at the next meeting of this Committee.

11. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

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

Contact Officer:

Andrew Milne, Area Highways Manager NW

ITEM 10

Consulted:

As identified in report.

Borough Portfolio Holder

N/A

County Council Cabinet Member

John Furey

Annexes:

None

Sources/background papers:

-
