

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL****CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS AND COMMUNITY  
RESILIENCE DECISIONS****DATE:** 26 SEPTEMBER 2023**LEAD OFFICER:** KATIE STEWART – EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR FOR ENVIRONMENT,  
TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE**SUBJECT:** COUNTYWIDE INTEGRATED TRANSPORT SCHEMES PRIORITISATION  
PROCESS AND 24/25 DELIVERY PROGRAMME**ORGANISATION STRATEGY** GROWING A SUSTAINABLE ECONOMY SO EVERYONE CAN BENEFIT,  
ENABLING A GREENER FUTURE, EMPOWERING COMMUNITIES  
**PRIORITY AREA:****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 2024/25.

**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 2024/25 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, 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 programme 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 were determined from those previously agreed at the local and joint committees to help expediate delivery. Alongside this, during 22/23, a new process was established to determine and agree schemes for delivery for the 2023/24 financial year onwards.
4. During the first application of the new process for the 23/24 schemes, all 81 County Councillors nominated a scheme for prioritisation, which were then technically assessed on the broad feasibility and deliverability of the scheme, scored and ranked in priority for consideration by the Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Resilience in November 2022. At this meeting 15 schemes were agreed for design and delivery in 2023/24, and all these schemes have now had a detailed design and are starting to be consulted upon.
5. We are now in the second 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 24/25. The actual budget available for 24/25 will be determined as part of the annual budget setting process.

### **Prioritisation Process & March 2023 review**

6. 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.
7. Several elements of the process and prioritisation were discussed by the Member Reference Group. The focus being 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.

8. 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.
9. 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.
10. In progressing the second round of this process, which is focused on looking at schemes for design and delivery in 2024/25 financial year, 79 County Councillors have nominated a scheme 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 2024/25 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 rural areas 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 2025/26 financial year, or County Councillors may put forward an alternative scheme, this is their choice.

### **Analysis and Commentary**

15. 78 schemes were submitted by Divisional Members to be considered for delivery through the Countywide ITS Fund (one scheme is a joint submission, and two 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 2024/25 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 22<sup>nd</sup> 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 nominated 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 to the Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee in Spring 2024. There will also be informal discussion in Spring 2024, as part of a lessons learnt approach to improving the process for 2025/26.

### **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 list of projects identified in Annex B is within a guide figure of £3.0m, which is based on the current countywide ITS budget. The actual budget is yet to be determined.
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 25/26 financial year to minimise disruption to traffic (especially if the scheme is located near to a school).

#### **SECTION 151 OFFICER COMMENTARY**

25. Significant progress has been made in recent years to improve the Council's financial resilience and the financial management capabilities across the organisation. Whilst this has built a stronger financial base from which to deliver our services, the increased cost of living, global financial uncertainty, high inflation 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 be forward looking in the medium term, as well as the delivery of the efficiencies to achieve a balanced budget position each year. In addition to these immediate challenges, the medium-term financial outlook beyond 2023/24 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.
26. While the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy and capital budget for future years are in development and subject to approval by Cabinet and Full Council, the proposals in this report are consistent with those current plans. As such, the Section 151 Officer supports the recommended approach.

#### **LEGAL IMPLICATIONS – MONITORING OFFICER**

27. 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**

28. All Members have been given the opportunity 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:**

29. None.

#### **PUBLIC HEALTH IMPLICATIONS**

30. 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:**

31. 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 and confirmation of the budget position, this will be programmed for delivery in 2024/25.
32. 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](mailto:zena.curry@surreycc.gov.uk)

#### **Consulted:**

- Cabinet in the development of the budget
- Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee on the prioritisation process.
- All Divisonal 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 – **To follow**

## **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 nominated 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 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.

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 a rural parish) 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 2024/25 Financial Year, once considered for agreement by the Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Resilience.

Each County Councillor whose 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 <del>schemes promoting sustainable school travel would have a higher score.</del>
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><b>Congestion</b></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 &amp; Inclusion</p> <p>Reduce community severance</p> <p>Encourage links between housing &amp; health-care and other public facilities</p>	Score from -3 to +3 Score	<p><b>Accessibility</b></p> <p>Links with LTP4/LCW/PH/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><b>Safety</b></p> <p>Links with Road Safety Team programmes</p>
Range -3 to +3	<p>Improves biodiversity</p> <p>Opportunity for sustainable travel -buses &amp; EV/non fossil fuel</p> <p>Encourage shift away from private cars</p> <p>Reduce traffic emissions to improve air quality</p> <p>Reduce HGV impact</p> <p>Infrastructure resilience</p>	Score from -3 to +3 Score	<p><b>Environment</b></p> <p>Links with Greener Futures, Build Back Greener &amp; Surrey Infrastructure Plan</p>
Range -3 to +3	<p>Impact on journeys to education &amp; training</p> <p>Impact on journeys to employment/town centres</p> <p>Impact on distribution routes</p> <p>Visual impact of scheme on Town/Village economic sustainability</p>	Score from -3 to +3 Score	<p><b>Economy</b></p> <p>Links with SCC Strategic Objectives - no one left behind</p>

County Councillors were contacted in October 2022

Process for each County Councillor to choose 1 ITS scheme to propose for prioritisation for delivery in 2024/25 onwards

1 ITS scheme proposed by end of March 2023

County Councillor emails [Councillors@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:Councillors@surreycc.gov.uk) with their preferred ITS scheme on the new Proforma, to put forward, with support from the SEO, if required

Stakeholder Engagement Officer (SEO) can support on simplified engagement with stakeholders and liaises with experts to advise on choice of 1 ITS scheme.

Technical Assessments carried out April - August

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

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 priorities.

All nominated schemes are prioritised against the agreed prioritisation process and reviewed by Cabinet Member to ensure no community is left behind.

Already identified schemes with a feasibility/scoping study completed.

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

October onwards – schemes progress for delivery from 2024/25 FY

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

Yes

No

Proposed Countywide ITS Programme from 2024/25  
**Based upon £3m**  
Countywide prioritised programme of schemes agreed by the Cabinet Member for Transport, Infrastructure and Growth.  
Programme that is affordable and deliverable and meets the agreed prioritisation criteria with stronger links to policies and strategies including Greener Futures and Healthy Surrey.

**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](mailto: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 [Councillors@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:Councillors@surreycc.gov.uk) with their preferred ITS schemes.

Report Annually to CEH Select committee

End Page 17

Annex B – To follow.