SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

KEVIN DEANUS, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS AND COMMUNITY RESILIENCE DECISIONS

SURREY
COUNTY COUNCIL

DATE: **29 NOVEMBER 2022**

LEAD OFFICER: **KATIE STEWART – EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR FOR ENVIRONMENT, TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE**

SUBJECT: **COUNTYWIDE INTEGRATED TRANSPORT SCHEMES PRIORITISATION PROCESS AND 2023/24 DELIVERY PROGRAMME**

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

PURPOSE OF REPORT:

The purpose of this report is to seek the approval of the prioritisation process for the Countywide Integrated Transport Schemes (ITS) budget, established by the Cabinet at its meeting on 22 February 2022.

The Cabinet Member is also asked to approve the schemes to be funded through this budget, for delivery in 2023/24.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. 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 2023/24 Countywide Integrated Transport Scheme budget set out in Annex B of the report; and

2. 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 for Highways.

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 now needs to be agreed so that schemes can be approved and progressed to the design and delivery stage.

DETAILS:

Background

2. Following approval on 8 February 2022 of the 23/24 budget the Countywide ITS budget was set at £2.95m. There is a forward budget projection for future years in the Medium-Term Financial Plan, although future budgets are subject to change.

3. The 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, which could be delivered in a much shorter timeframe than had been achievable previously.

4. Under these new proposals, Members had the ability to prioritise and promote one scheme for consideration within their division this year. As part of this process, all 81 County Councillors have nominated a scheme for prioritisation on to the Countywide ITS programme. Each scheme has been technically assessed on the viability and deliverability of the scheme.

5. The schemes and their associated technical assessment have been prioritised using the prioritisation process attached at Annex A. This has then been moderated to ensure a consistent approach countywide. This is subsequently used to support the recommendations on the schemes that are proposed to progress to design and delivery stages (Annex B).

6. 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), so that no community is left behind.

Prioritisation Process

7. At the Cabinet meeting on the 22 February 2022, it was requested that officers develop a prioritisation process for the budget, with steer through the Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee, to be brought to the Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Resilience in the Autumn. This is attached at Annex A.

8. Discussions with the Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee in September have been core to the development of the prioritisation process whose recommendations were taken on board to feed into the process.

9. The key element the Select Committee wanted to be included was more guidance on the budget costs of schemes. It was recognised that this is the first year of this new approach, and that feedback would be welcomed to help refine the guidance for future years. Budget cost estimates for schemes and works have been included in the new Members Pack.

10. Each County Councillor can nominate a scheme within their division for consideration in the Countywide ITS programme. The prioritisation process

scores each nominated scheme against the following criteria: Congestion, Accessibility, Safety, Environment, Economy, and Affordability & Deliverability.

11. The criteria takes into consideration how the proposed schemes support the Council to meet its strategic priorities relating to Greener Futures and Climate Change, and delivery of the Surrey Transport Plan, as well as recognising the importance of schemes that are important locally.

12. Schemes which can be delivered within the following financial year would have a higher priority. However, it is also recognised that some other higher priority schemes can take longer than one year to develop, design and deliver.

13. Additional funding opportunities are sought, wherever possible, to enable delivery of schemes that are a higher local priority and link to other strategic projects. As a general principle, seeking other funding opportunities leaves more of the Countywide ITS budget available to deliver further schemes.

14. The prioritisation scoring has been undertaken by Engineers with local knowledge and then moderated to ensure consistent scoring across the County. Each County Councillor will be offered detailed feedback on the prioritisation scoring for their proposed scheme.

15. The schemes prioritised to be progressed in 2023/24 are listed in Annex B.

16. Schemes put forward by County Councillors that are not in Annex B could be resubmitted for consideration for the 2024/25 financial year, or County Councillors may put forward an alternative scheme for 2024/25 instead.

Analysis and Commentary

17. 80 schemes were submitted by Divisional Members (one scheme is on a boundary between divisions and is a joint submission) to be considered for delivery through the Countywide ITS Fund.

18. Each of these schemes were technically assessed and scored against the criteria in the prioritisation process.

19. Following this exercise, the schemes listed in Annex B are being recommended within this report to be delivered through this budget as these scored the highest against the criteria, and ensure that no community is left behind, within the current budget set at Council of £2.95m.

Consultation and Publicity

20. The Cabinet approved the establishment of the budget at a meeting in public on 22 February 2022. Members were invited to submit a scheme for consideration by the Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Resilience.

21. 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.

22. There has been a webpage created on the Council's website providing an overview of the budget and the process. This will include the details of any schemes that have been approved and the reasons for this, linking to this meeting.

RISK MANAGEMENT AND IMPLICATIONS:

23. The establishment of this budget was due to the Council's focus on supporting Members to have more influence over the schemes considered for funding within their division, each of the schemes has been technically assessed on its viability and deliverability.

24. 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.

25. 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

26. The total budget estimated cost of the projects identified in Annex B falls within the budget agreed by Council on 8 February 2022 and the process as agreed by Cabinet on the 22 February 2022.

27. All projects have been assessed to ensure that they are deliverable and affordable within the relevant financial period.

SECTION 151 OFFICER COMMENTARY

28. The Section 151 Officer confirms that all material, financial and business issues and risks have been considered / addressed.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS – MONITORING OFFICER

29. The recommendation (2) 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.

30. 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 the Spring 2024. There will also be informal discussion in Spring 2023, as part of a lessons learnt approach to improving the process for 2024/25.

EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY

31. 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:

32. None.

PUBLIC HEALTH IMPLICATIONS

33. 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:

34. 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 in 2023/24.

35. 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 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.

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.

Each County Councillor has 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 value not being great than £350,000 or there being identified alternative sources of funding), once eleven schemes have been identified, then the next highest scoring scheme 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 in the 2023/24 Financial Year, once considered for agreement by the Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Resilience.

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		Increased congestion is not necessarily a negative score as could change behaviour torwards 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 reliabiliy	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	-3 to +3	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 aleviation schemes would be a positive score.

Accessibility

A1	Increase the number of walking trips	accessibility		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	-3 to +3	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		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 fro 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	-7 to +7	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 outways 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 priroity 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		A scheme that incorporated improved biodiversity through planting an/or enviornmentally enhancing drainage features would score higher. This includes oportunities 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	-3 to +3	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 distributer 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		Co-ordination and links to projects promoted by the Road Safety Team, or other schemes promoting sustainable school travel would have a higher score.
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	-3 to +3	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		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	-10 to +10	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 sc
AD5	Project links with other projects in locality	affordability & deliverability		A link with another project would be a positive score

Category	Score	Range	Criteria
Congestion Linking to LTP4 Priorities	Score from –3 to +3 Score	Range –3 to +3	Vehicle Journey Time impact Improve bus time reliability Limit private vehicular traffic growth Use technology to aid management of congestion Separated cycle facility - to beat congestion
Accessibility Links with LTP4/LCwIP/Healthy Surrey	Score from –3 to +3 Score	Range –3 to +3	Increase the number of walking trips Increase the number of cycling trips Increase the number of public transport trips Support Equality, Diversity & Inclusion Reduce community severance Encourage links between housing & health-care and other public facilities
Safety Links with Road Safety Team programmes	Score from –7 to +7 Score	Range –7 to +7	Reduce KSI Reduce slight casualties Reduce vehicle speeds Support safe routes to school Improve street lighting Reduce the KSI and Slight injuries to pedestrians and cyclists
Environment Links with Greener Futures, Build Back Greener & Surrey Infrastructure Plan	Score from –3 to +3 Score	Range –3 to +3	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
Economy Links with SCC Strategic Objectives - no one left behind	Score form –3 to +3 Score	Range –3 to +3	Impact on journeys to education & training Impact on journeys to empoyment/town centres Impact on distribution routes Visual impact of scheme on Town/Village economic sustainability

County Councillors are contacted in June

1 ITS scheme proposed by 4th September, latest please

Technical Assessments carried out June - November

Nov/Dec then progress for delivery 2023/24

Process for each County Councillor to choose 1 ITS scheme to propose for prioritisation for delivery in 2023/24 onwards

County Councillor emails Councillors@surreycc.gov.uk with their preferred ITS schemes and chooses 1 to put forward with support from the SEO, if required

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

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

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

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

Already identified ITS schemes with some assessing information available.

Already identified schemes with a feasibility/scoping study completed.

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 2023/24

£2.95m

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.

Report Annually to CEH Select committee

End

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 Councillors@surreycc.gov.uk with their preferred ITS schemes.

Annex B

Draft Prioritised Countywide ITS programme

Integrated Transport Scheme	County Councillor	Location	Budget Estimate* (£000)	Prioritisation score
A3050 Oatlands Drive, Walton on Thames. Pedestrian crossing to improve access to recreation ground and new footway/cycleway to Grotto Road.	Tony Samuels	Elmbridge	200	66
D25 Benner Lane, West End. School Safety Scheme outside Holy Trinity Church of England Primary School.	Rebecca Jennings-Evans	Surrey Heath	150	64
A22 Godstone Road, Whyteleafe. Pedestrian crossing improvements.	Jeffrey Grey	Tandridge	75	61
Hersham Road, Walton-on Thames. Traffic calming/20mph speed limit.	John O'Reilly	Elmbridge	200	61
A325 Portsmouth Road, Camberley. Signal Controlled Crossing.	Edward Hawkins	Surrey Heath	200	57
Longdown Lane/ College Road, Epsom Downs. Pedestrian crossing.	Steven McCormick	Epsom & Ewell	250	57
The Chase, Guildford. Crossing facility improvements.	Angela Goodwin	Guildford	200	56
A22 Eastbourne Road, Blindley Heath. Push button crossing	Chris Farr	Tandridge	250	56
A287 Frensham Road/Lodge Hill Road, Farnham. Zebra Crossing upgrade.	Michaela Martin	Waverley	200	55
Cadbury Road, Sunbury. Pedestrian crossing improvements at junction.	Sunbury & Ashford Common	Spelthorne	300	55
Wapshott Road/Bowes Road/St Paul's Road, Egham. Traffic Management Scheme	Robert King	Runnymede	200	55
Meath Green, Horley. Traffic Calming to support 20mph	Andy Lynch	Reigate & Banstead	200	55
Aldershot Road, Guildford Upgrading Zebra to Puffin Crossing outside Primary School	Fiona White	Guildford	200	54
Grange Road/Ottways Lane, Ashtead. Traffic Calming to support 20mph speed limit outside schools.	Chris Townsend	Mole Valley	150	53
Chertsey Road, The Byfleets. Liveable Neighbourhood/point closure	Amanda Boote	Woking	40	51
Countywide safety audits, signs, lines, road markings, TRO amendments, speed surveys to complete previous years capital schemes and that may come up throughout the year		Countywide	135	
Total projected budget for 2023/24			2,950	

* Budget Estimate is an expected cost envelope for the expected scope of the proposed scheme.
It is intended to be used for budget allocation purposes and is not an indication of the actual cost of projects.

Schemes highlighted in green will be progressed in the 2023/24 Financial year
Proposed schemes that are not on this list can either be resubmitted, or an alternative scheme nominated instead, to be considered for prioritisation for 2024/25.

This page is intentionally left blank