

THIRD CAMBRIDGESHIRE LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN (LTP3): PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESULTS AND GOVERNMENT CONSULTATION ON FUNDING FORMULA

To: **Cabinet**

Date: **28 September 2010**

From: **Acting Executive Director, Environment Services**

Electoral division(s): **All**

Forward Plan ref: **NA** *Key decision:* **No**

Purpose: **To seek Cabinets view on:**

- i) **The consultation on the objectives and priorities for LTP3 that took place between January and July 2010.**
- ii) **Government announcements of relevance to the Local Transport Plan process**
- iii) **Consideration of whether LTP objectives should be prioritised.**
- iv) **The forward programme for LTP3 development to April 2011.**
- v) **A first draft of a proposed response to the Department for Transport's (DfT's) 24 August consultation on the funding formula for Integrated Transport and Maintenance Block capital funding allocations.**

Recommendation: **That Cabinet:**

- i) **notes the results of the public and stakeholder consultation on LTP3 objectives and priorities.**
- ii) **In the light of the consultation, to approve the proposal for the County Council's Strategic Objectives to form the overarching objectives of LTP3, instead of the previous Government's Delivering a Sustainable Transport System (DaSTS) objectives.**
- iii) **In the context of the consultation results and the emerging policy objectives of the new Government, approves the prioritisation of objectives.**
- iv) **Comments on the proposed draft response to Government's 24 August consultation on the formulae that are used to calculate Integrated**

Transport Block and Maintenance Block capital allocations to transport authorities and delegates to the Cabinet Member for Growth, Infrastructure and strategic Planning in consultation with the Acting Executive Director, Environment Services, the authority to make any minor changes prior to submission to Government.

<i>Officer contact:</i>		<i>Member contact</i>	
Name:	Graham Hughes	Name:	Councillor Roy Pegram
Post:	Service Director: Growth and Infrastructure	Portfolio:	Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning
Email:	graham.hughes@cambridgeshire.gov.uk	Email:	Roy.peggram@cambridgeshire.gov.uk
Tel:	01223 715664	Tel:	07979 960140

1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1. The County Council is required by the Transport Act 2000 and the Local Transport Act 2008 to produce a third Local Transport Plan (LTP3) for the period from April 2011. The new plan must be in place by 31st March 2011. Recent announcements by the Coalition Government have confirmed that these requirements remain in place.

2. CONSULTATION ON THE THIRD CAMBRIDGESHIRE LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN

- 2.1. To inform the development of LTP3, public and stakeholder consultation was undertaken, initially between January and April 2010 through extensive leaflet delivery. Redelivery of leaflets took place in late June / early July in areas where delivery had not been comprehensive, at no cost to the Council. The consultation consisted of roadshows across the County, postal and online questionnaires, letters to stakeholders, and stakeholder presentations and meetings. The focus of the consultation was to gain views on the proposed LTP3 objectives and on the priority that should be placed on different types of initiatives for improving transport.
- 2.2. 1,237 responses were received, with the majority from the leaflet campaign (85%) and the remaining 15% via the online questionnaire on the County Council's website. The overall response rate of 0.5% is low, but is consistent with previous experience of countywide consultation on Local Transport Plans.

Results

- 2.3. The headline results from the public consultation are shown in Tables 1 and 2.

Table 1 Priority order of objectives

Priority order	Very Important or Important
Improve Quality of Life	85%
Contribute to Better Safety	83%
Support Economic Growth	73%
Tackle Climate Change	66%
Promote Equality of Opportunity	59%

Table 2 Prioritisation of transport measures

Priority order	Ranked 1st or 2nd
Improve Public Transport	75%
Improve Safety	65%
Improve Cycling	53%
Improve Roads	46%
Improve Walking	45%
Promote Travel Awareness	44%

- 2.4. Most stakeholders considered that all the identified objectives for LTP3 are important and did not specify a preference between them. However, a number of voluntary groups considered promoting equality of opportunity to be a more important objective while a wider spectrum of the groups (i.e. public sector, businesses and voluntary groups) identified economic growth and tackling climate change as the most important objectives. Cambridgeshire NHS and Natural England highlighted encouraging active and sustainable travel as an additional important objective that LTP3 should include, while a number of Cambridge-based organisations highlighted improving air quality as important.
- 2.5. Overall, stakeholders who responded identified improvements to public transport infrastructure and improving roads as the most important transport improvements for LTP3.

3. GOVERNMENT ANNOUNCEMENTS AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE LTP

- 3.1 On 9 August 2010, the Department for Transport (DfT) wrote to Local Authorities outlining the contents of a speech made by Norman Baker MP on 20 July, setting out the continued relevance of Local Transport Plans, and reminding authorities that the statutory duty to have a new plan in place by April 2011 remained.
- 3.2 The letter also clarified a number of aspects of the LTP3 Guidance in light of the change of Government: In particular:
- How local authorities review LTPs once in place is a matter for local determination;
 - As Government is currently considering its stance on local government performance management, it is for local authorities to decide what performance indicators they include in LTPs;
 - The need to include key overarching policies, namely ones which help grow the economy and help tackle carbon emissions, while not neglecting other important priorities, including road safety, affordability, accessibility, and people's health and wellbeing - for example, through more cycling and walking.

Objectives and prioritisation

- 3.3 The County Council consulted on the previous government's DaSTS (Delivering a Sustainable Transport System) goals as over-arching objectives. It is now proposed to use the County Council's strategic objectives as the over-arching objectives of LTP3, while also referring to the goals of Cambridgeshire Together. This is because current indications are that the DaSTS process will be developed no further and more locally derived objectives are appropriate. The consultation results as they relate to the objectives of LTP3 remain valid, however, as there is a great degree of alignment across the four sets of goals and objectives (LTP3 Guidance, new Government, County Council, Cambridgeshire Together) as shown in Table 3.
- 3.4 Cabinet is asked to comment on the proposal to use the County Council's Strategic objectives instead of the DaSTS objectives as the overarching objectives of LTP3.

Table 3 Comparison of objectives

LTP3 Guidance (DaSTS)	New Government key overarching policies	CCC strategic objectives	Cambridgeshire Together goals
Contribute to better safety, security & health	Road Safety	Supporting & protecting vulnerable people	Safer & stronger communities
Promote equality of opportunity	Affordability	Enabling people to thrive, achieve their potential & improve their quality of life	Equality & Inclusion
Improve quality of life	Accessibility		
	Health and wellbeing		
Support economic growth	Grow the economy	Managing & delivering the growth & development of Cambridgeshire's communities	Economic prosperity
			Managing Growth
Tackle climate change	Tackle carbon emissions	Tackling climate change	Environmental sustainability

Prioritisation of Local Transport Plan objectives

- 3.5 Table 4 summarises the relative priority put on the consultation objectives by the public and stakeholders. There are varying but generally good levels of support for all objectives.
- 3.6 The drafting of the LTP could prioritise these objectives or leave them all as equal. As there was a good level of support for all objectives consulted upon and as these read well across to the County Council Strategic Objectives, it is suggested that the high level objectives should not be prioritised. Given the priority given to safety in the consultation, it is also suggested that this be flagged up as a priority. Cabinet's view is sought on this.

Table 4 Summary of support for proposed objectives

Consultation (DaSTS) objective	CCC strategic objectives	Public	Stakeholders
Contribute to better safety, security & health	Supporting & protecting vulnerable people	83%	Support
Promote equality of opportunity	Enabling people to thrive, achieve their potential & improve their quality of life	59%	Strong support from third sector
Improve quality of life		85%	Support
Support economic growth	Managing & delivering the growth & development of Cambridgeshire's communities	73%	Wide support
Tackle climate change	Tackling climate change	66%	Wide support

- 3.7 Now that the consultation is complete, the main body of the LTP needs to be written taking account of a steer given on the key points at this meeting. The outline timetable for the future development of LTP3 is set out in Table 5 below. In parallel with these formal meetings, there will be detailed work with our partners to develop the plan.
- 3.8 The LTP will need to be written in such a way as to be flexible to potentially significant changes in funding allocations which may emerge following its completion and as such, focus on outcomes linked to objectives. It will also need to reflect the priorities of the emergent Local Enterprise Partnership proposal in terms of jobs creation and the links to growth and infrastructure provision.

Table 5 Plan development process and timescales

Date	Activity
28 September	Report consultation results to Cabinet
20 October	Comprehensive Spending Review
2 November	Draft LTP to Growth and Environment PDG
11 November	Draft LTP to Joint Transport and Planning Lead Members
Early December	Local government finance settlement
18 January	LTP to Growth and Environment Policy Development Group
22 February	LTP endorsed by Cabinet
29 March	LTP adopted by Full Council
31 March	LTP submitted to government

4 GOVERNMENT CONSULTATION ON FUNDING FORMULA FOR INTEGRATED TRANSPORT AND MAINTENANCE

- 4.1 The core capital funding for the programmes of works in the Local Transport Plan comes from government in the Integrated Transport Block for new schemes, and in the Maintenance Block for maintenance of road, footway, bridges and other highway structures and facilities.
- 4.2 On 24 August the DfT launched a consultation on the formulae that are used to calculate the allocations to individual authorities. The consultation can be viewed at <http://www.dft.gov.uk/consultations/open/2010-32/>.
- 4.3 A first draft of a proposed response to the consultation questions is appended to this report. Cabinet is asked to comment on the proposed response and to delegate to the Cabinet Member for Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning in consultation with the Acting Executive Director, Environment Services the authority to make any minor changes prior to submission on 6th October.

5. SIGNIFICANT IMPLICATIONS

5.1 Resources and Performance

The following bullet points set out details of significant implications identified by officers:

- The LTP is the major source of maintenance and general transport funding. The allocations have already been cut in year and any further cut will impact significantly upon our ability to deliver improved transport conditions.
- Government allocations for Integrated Transport and Maintenance for 2011/12 are unlikely to be known prior to the Local Government Finance Settlement in December. It will be challenging to plan for the detail of the LTP3 programme given this timescale.
- The report notes that Government will no longer formally review Local Transport Plans, and that this is a matter for Local Authorities. This will ease the burden on the council and is beneficial as long as it does not affect the funding potentially available.

5.2 Statutory Requirements and Partnership Working

The following bullet points set out details of significant implications identified by officers:

- Public and stakeholder consultation to inform the development of LTP3 has been undertaken, as required by the LTP3 Guidance from the Department for Transport, which in turn reflects the requirements of the Transport Act 2000 and the Local Transport Act 2008. This has demonstrated stakeholder and public priorities.
- Officers have worked closely with partner organisations both in formulating the consultation material and in carrying out the consultation. Many partner

organisations also took part in the stakeholder consultation and we will continue to work in partnership with them to develop the LTP.

5.3 Climate Change

Section 4 of this report sets out potential changes to the formula for the Integrated Transport Block. The consultation states in relation to Integrated Transport Block funding, that “...*the Department can see the benefits of a future formula that is focussed on the twin goals of carbon reduction and supporting the economy.*” Tackling Climate Change / Carbon Emissions is one of the government’s key overarching objectives, and one of the County Council Strategic objectives. As such it forms one of the objectives of LTP3.

5.4 Access and Inclusion

The following bullet points set out details of significant implications identified by officers:

- Section 2 of this report sets out the results of the large-scale public consultation on LTP3 objectives and priorities. All sections of the community have had the opportunity to comment although as is often the case, few of the responses come from the hard to reach groups.
- The objectives and improvements consulted on will have an impact on transport and accessibility as they are taken forward in the development of LTP3 and the implementation of the programme within it.

5.5 Engagement and Consultation

Section 2 of this report sets out the results of the large-scale public consultation on LTP3 objectives and priorities.

6. RECOMMENDATION/DECISION REQUIRED

6.1 Recommendations to Cabinet are as stated on the cover sheet to this report.

Background papers: none

APPENDIX Initial officer thoughts on the questions raised by DfT in their “Consultation on Local Transport Funding”

1. The only change that the Department is considering in either of the two formulae in advance of this year’s Local Government Finance Settlement is the option to disregard road condition in the maintenance block formula. What are consultees’ views on this approach?

Cambridgeshire has over the period of the first and second Local Transport Plans invested capital funds from its own resources over and above the Maintenance Block allocation into road and network maintenance works.

The Council would therefore welcome the removal of road condition from the formula. Its inclusion penalises authorities like Cambridgeshire, rather than authorities that consciously make decisions to allocate Maintenance Block funding elsewhere. The current formula effectively makes Government responsible for the implications of local decisions not to invest.

If the aim is to achieve a consistent road condition nationally, ring-fencing of Maintenance Block funding together with inclusion of road condition in the formula might be effective, although it would not address inefficient maintenance practice, and could be seen as contrary to the localism agenda.

Notwithstanding these specific comments, the Council would generally support simplifying the formulae for the allocation of funds.

2. What are consultees’ views on possible longer term changes to the formulae, in particular on the comments above on potential developments to the IT Block?
3. Do consultees agree that there should be a data refresh?

It seems appropriate to have a formula based on the overarching strategic objectives of government, and if those objectives change or evolve, review and update the formula. It is also appropriate for the most up-to-date information to be used wherever possible and practicable. However, as ever, the devil is in the detail.

Cambridgeshire has had concerns that growth has not been included in the formula approach, and that delay in refreshing data have effectively penalised the County as the population increased, with the associated increase in demand on the transport network, and increase in the length of the network that we manage.

Initiatives such as the Growth Areas Delivery Grant, Growth Areas Fund, Community Infrastructure Fund and Housing Growth Fund have been valuable in addressing part of this shortfall. Nonetheless there remains an infrastructure deficit, and these funds do not typically provide for ongoing maintenance of the infrastructure that is delivered.

It is therefore important that the issues that have been raised in questions 2 and 3 are considered in the wider context of the overall funding package for transport and growth.

4. Do consultees have any comments on the refreshed data as set out in Annex G?

The data has been checked and appears robust and accurate. (Demographic information is still being checked at the time of writing).

5. Do consultees wish to see transitional arrangements to mitigate the impact of the data refresh, and if so, what should these be?

It is difficult to make a judgement on this with the Comprehensive Spending Review looming, and without knowledge of the level of change to allocations that might result. If changes significantly exacerbate reductions in funding that would come out of the CSR if the formulas had remained unchanged, then a transition would be appropriate and necessary.

6. Do consultees agree with the Department's approach for merging funding for structures on the Primary Route Network and for detrunked roads within the maintenance block formula from 2011/12?

Yes. This would be simpler, and would remove the need for local authorities to resource the development of bids for funding.

7. Would local authorities prefer to receive funding as grant or supported borrowing, and what are consultees' views on the priorities for paying out grant if there is a mix of grant and supported borrowing?

Grant.

8. What are consultees' views on the option to allocate the IT and maintenance blocks solely to Integrated Transport Authorities in the six Metropolitan Areas?

Not relevant to Cambridgeshire.

9. Should Metropolitan Areas and other areas producing Joint Local Transport Plans be allowed to retain the flexibility to vire IT Block funding between authorities as permitted in the last funding settlement?

Not relevant to Cambridgeshire.

10. Do consultees have any other issues they would like to raise about the calculation or distribution of the integrated transport or highways maintenance blocks, including on the overall size of the blocks relative to other capital funding and relative to each other?