

LOCAL HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT (LHI) SCHEMES 2018/19

To: **Highways & Community Infrastructure Committee**

Meeting Date: **13th March 2018**

From: **Graham Hughes, Executive Director: Place and Economy**

Electoral division(s): **All**

Forward Plan ref: **N/A**

Key decision: **No**

Purpose: **To inform Committee of the outcome of the prioritisation of 2018/19 LHI applications by the Member Panels in each District area.**

Recommendation: **To approve the prioritised list of schemes for each District area, included in appendix A of this report.**

<i>Officer contact:</i>	<i>Member contacts:</i>
Name: Richard Lumley Post: Assistant Director Highways Email: Richard.Lumley@cambridgeshire.gov.uk Tel: (01223) 703839	Name: Cllr Mathew Shuter/Cllr Bill Hunt Post: Chairman/Vice Chairman Email: Mathew.shuter@cambridgeshire.gov.uk William-hunt@hotmail.co.uk Tel: (01223) 706398

1.0 BACKGROUND

- 1.1 For 2018/19 the approved budget to facilitate a programme of Local Highway Improvements (LHI) is £607,000, as approved by the Highway & Community Infrastructure committee (H&CI) and the Environment & Economy (E&E) Committee in December 2017.
- 1.2 The LHI initiative invites community groups to submit an application for funding of up to £10,000, subject to them providing at least 10% of the total cost of the scheme. The schemes are community driven, giving local people a real influence over bringing forward highway improvements in their community that would not normally be prioritised by the Council.
- 1.3 Where applications involve ongoing operational costs such as the cost of power supplies for measures such as zebra crossings, the applicant is expected to meet these costs, or, for some non-standard highway features or equipment, become responsible for the asset itself.

2. MAIN ISSUES

- 2.1 This year officers have completed feasibility studies with applicants in advance of the panel meetings, in a bid to provide a more consistent stage of development for applications. This has proved challenging within the timescales and resources that were available this year, but the benefit of this new stage in the process has still been evident at panel meetings.
- 2.2 The panel assessment meetings remain a member led process, where applicants are invited to present their proposal. Member Panels have been set up to assess the priorities for funding for each of the above budgets, with political group leaders appointing members based on current political proportionality, with the exception of the City Panel, which is agreed by the Cambridge Joint Area Committee.
- 2.3 Panel members have been asked to consider and score applications which will determine how the budget should be allocated. The panels adopted a scoring system assessing four categories; persistent problem, road safety, community improvement and added value. Each category was scored out of 5 and the average across all panel members was then used to rank applications. Panel members were not permitted to score applications in their own division.
- 2.4 The rationale for proposing which applications are delivered is based upon the scoring system and available budget per District area. The scoring criteria is as follows:

Score 0 Fails to deliver any improvement

Score 1 Delivers negligible improvement/ aims of the LHI Initiative

Score 2 Delivers limited improvement/ aims of the LHI Initiative

Score 3 Delivers some improvement/ aims of the LHI Initiative

Score 4 Delivers substantial improvement/ aims of the LHI Initiative

Score 5 Delivers exceptional improvement/ aims of the LHI Initiative

- 2.5 It is recommended that no application scoring less than 1 should be implemented, as the scoring indicates that the project delivers negligible improvements/aims of the LHI Initiative.
- 2.6 It is then recommended that projects be approved for delivery, working down from the highest score to the lowest, until the budget for the District area is fully allocated.
- 2.7 Should any applications subsequently prove unfeasible, or the actual cost be less than expected, further applications may be allocated funding later in the year.
- 2.8 All estimated project costs now also incorporate the estimated cost of time spent by officers designing, managing and delivering it. The actual cost of the new feasibility stage, which has recently been completed, has been top sliced from east district area budget before being allocated to applications.
- 2.9 This recharge of both the feasibility and officer project delivery costs was agreed by H&CI in July 2017, to better reflect the actual cost to the authority of delivering the LHI Initiative. The total recharge is estimated to be £200k and will deliver the corresponding saving identified in the Business Plan for 2018/19.
- 2.10 The LHI budget has been allocated to each district area based on population and for 2018/19 is therefore as follows:

District	Initial Budget	Feasibility	Remaining Available Budget
East Cambridgeshire	£79,174	£7,192	£72,150
Fenland	£96,768	£8,790	£88,183
Huntingdonshire	£167,146	£12,145	£155,249
South Cambridgeshire	£140,752	£10,102	£130,823
Cambridge City	£123,160	£10,226	£113,246
TOTAL	£607,000	£48,455	£558,545

- 2.13 The prioritised list of schemes for each district area can be found in **Appendix A** of this report. Each list also highlights the point at which the budget for each district area is fully allocated to schemes, indicated by a red dashed line.

3. ALIGNMENT WITH CORPORATE PRIORITIES

3.1 Developing the local economy for the benefit of all

Investing in local communities, particularly the issues that are often of greatest local concern, promotes community development and provides benefits to all local residents.

3.2 Helping people live healthy and independent lives

Facilitating the use of sustainable forms of transport and improving and promoting safe movement within communities provides a positive contribution to this priority.

3.3 Supporting and protecting vulnerable people

Many of the schemes that are brought forward have outcomes that improve road safety, particularly for vulnerable users, such as the young, elderly or particular user types, such as pedestrians and cyclists.

4. SIGNIFICANT IMPLICATIONS

4.1 Resource Implications

The required resources have been made available to deliver the programme of projects, which will be funded from across the Transport Delivery Plan capital budget.

The implications of this are included in the main body of the report.

4.2 Statutory, Risk and Legal Implications

There are no significant implications within this category.

4.3 Equality and Diversity Implications

The LHI initiative empowers community groups to bring forward improvements that would not ordinarily be prioritised by the Council. This gives local people a real influence over bringing forward improvements that benefit their local community.

4.4 Engagement and Consultation Implications

Further engagement and consultation will take place on each project as it is developed, in conjunction with the applicant.

4.5 Localism and Local Member Involvement

The LHI initiative gives local people a real influence over highway improvements in their community. The Council will work closely with the successful applicants and local community to help deliver the improvements that have been identified. The Local Member will be a key part of this process and will be involved throughout the development and delivery of each scheme.

4.6 Public Health Implications

The majority of schemes aim to improve road safety, which may subsequently contribute to reducing the risk of accident injuries on the network.

Source Documents	Location
Prioritised list of LHI schemes by District area for delivery in 2018/19	Appendix A
Individual LHI Panel Member scoresheets	Witchford Highways Depot Stirling Way, Witchford, Ely CB6 3NR

Implications	Officer Clearance
Have the resource implications been cleared by Finance?	Yes Name of Financial Officer: Sarah Heywood
Has the impact on Statutory, Legal and Risk implications been cleared by LGSS Law?	Yes Name of Legal Officer: Debbie Carter-Hughes
Are there any Equality and Diversity implications?	Yes Name of Officer: Tamar Oviatt-Ham
Have any engagement and communication implications been cleared by Communications?	Yes Name of Officer: Sarah Silk
Are there any Localism and Local Member involvement issues?	Yes Name of Officer: Tamar Oviatt-Ham
Have any Public Health implications been cleared by Public Health	Yes Name of Officer: Stuart Keeble