

TRANSPORT DELIVERY PLAN 2017/18 TO 2019/20

To: Highway and Community Infrastructure Committee

Meeting Date 21 February 2017

From: Executive Director - Economy, Transport and Environment

Electoral division(s): All

Forward Plan ref: N/a *Key decision:* No

Purpose: To present the County Council's three year Transport Delivery Plan for the period 2017/18 to 2019/20

Recommendation:

- a) That Committee approves the publication of the Transport Delivery Plan 2017/18 to 2019/20 as set out in Appendix A.
- b) That the Authority submits a joint bid with Peterborough City Council for Challenge Fund monies, based upon repairing drought damaged roads within the fen soils area, and that any requisite match funding is provided via prudential borrowing, in accordance with paragraph 2.7 of this report.

<i>Officer contact:</i>	
Name:	Mike Atkins
Post:	Highways Asset Manager
Email:	Mike.atkins@cambridgeshire.gov.uk
Tel:	01223 715560

1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1 This report presents the County Council's Transport Delivery Plan (TDP) for the period 2017/18 to 2019/20.
- 1.2 The TDP provides the forward programme for all capital highway maintenance and improvement schemes for the relevant period.

2.0 MAIN ISSUES

- 2.1 The County Council's Highway Asset Management Strategy promotes a long term, preventative approach to prioritising highway maintenance and is predicated upon a condition based approach to scheme identification. The strategy optimises the use of the resources available to the Authority via the application of whole life costing and life-cycle planning principles. The TDP is a key component of the implementation of the Strategy.
- 2.2 The Department for Transport (DfT) has implemented a funding mechanism which incentivises authorities to develop, implement and maintain highway asset management strategies and policies. The amount of funding that the Council will receive from the DfT in 2017-18 via this Incentive Fund will be dependent upon the extent to which the Authority has implemented highway asset management. The Council could lose up to £500,000 of this funding in 2017-18 if it fails to adequately and demonstrably implement a robust asset management approach. This TDP helps evidence the Authority's implementation of such a long-term approach.
- 2.3 The contents of the TDP are based upon the capital maintenance funding allocations to be made to the Council from Central Government and the assumption the Authority will be placed in the top tier (Band 3) for funding via the incentive Fund for year 2017-18.
- 2.4 Following devolution and the creation of a Combined Authority, it is anticipated that the Authority will automatically receive funding commensurate with being in Band 3 of the Incentive Fund assessment. However, the Authority will still be expected to demonstrate to the DfT that it is appropriately implementing the asset management approach. The final two years of this TDP are based upon the Authority receiving this Band 3 funding.
- 2.5 As part of its roads funding announcement on 13th January 2017, the DfT announced that £75 million is to be made available to local authorities via the Highways Maintenance Challenge Fund in year 2017/18. This fund is to enable authorities to bid for major maintenance projects that are otherwise difficult to fund through the normal Needs Based Formula funding they receive.
- 2.6 This £75 million will be distributed to authorities via a bidding round, with authorities required to submit bids to the DfT by the end of February 2017. Each authority may make no more than one bid in 2017/18, but joint bids with other authorities are permitted. The size of schemes funded in 2017/18 is likely to be around £5 million each and it is unlikely that there will be schemes above £10 million in value.

- 2.7 As part of any bid the Authority might submit, it is likely that the County Council would have to commit to providing some funding alongside that provided from the DfT. Whilst detailed guidance is awaited from the DfT, the previous tranche of this funding required bids to have a minimum of 10% of the scheme cost funded by authorities. Successful bids typically had in excess of 20% of the scheme cost funded from the authority submitting the bid. The Authority has previously set aside an additional £90 million via prudential borrowing for investment in highways maintenance. Should the bid be successful, it is proposed that match funding be provided from this source.
- 2.8 It is proposed that the County Council and Peterborough City Council (PCC) submit a joint bid based upon repairing drought damaged roads within the fen soils area. Fen soils are susceptible to shrinkage and subsidence, causing ongoing maintenance issues for many roads within the north of the county.
- 2.9 The proposed bid would be predicated upon undertaking deeper treatments to the affected fen roads. Such deeper treatments will be more capable of withstanding subsoil movements and will last longer than the type of thinner treatments currently undertaken. Existing funding levels preclude extensive deeper treatments; hence the need for additional funding via the Challenge Fund. Timely investment in deeper treatments would accord with the Authority's asset management approach and represent the minimum whole life cost option, obviating the need for repeated thinner treatments.
- 2.10 The TDP allows flexibility in the delivery of the programme, with the capacity to move projects between years if necessary, under circumstances that meet the Asset Management Strategy's requirements.
- 2.11 The TDP amalgamates the Council's entire capital transport programme, including Section 106 Developer funded schemes and Major Infrastructure Schemes (including the City Deal for greater Cambridge) in a single document. It will also contain the proposed list of schemes to be delivered via the Local Highway Improvement (LHI) programme for the period 2017/18 to 2019/20.
- 2.12 The schemes within the TDP which are promoted via the City Deal for Greater Cambridgeshire are provided for information and to aid co-ordination. These schemes are separately identified within the TDP and HCI Committee is not asked to approve these schemes, as they are subject to the City Deal governance arrangements.
- 2.13 Since the TDP contains all of the schemes mentioned above, it enables co-ordination of maintenance works, improvement schemes and third party works within the highway. This co-ordination helps make savings in our contractors' mobilisation costs and means that traffic management measures can be shared between schemes. The enhanced forward visibility of work provided by this three year programme also means that our contractors are better placed to engage the supply chain, meaning that better prices can be obtained, with subsequent savings to the County Council.
- 2.14 A further benefit of co-ordination of all works in the highway is that disruption to the travelling public is minimised. This results in overall savings to the county's economy as less time (and hence money) is wasted in travel delays. The minimisation of disruption, together with the provision of a safe and

serviceable highway network in the long term, is likely to increase customer satisfaction and enhance the Council's reputation for sound management of the county's highways.

3. ALIGNMENT WITH CORPORATE PRIORITIES

3.1 Developing the local economy for the benefit of all

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

- The forward planning of highway maintenance treatments will help ensure that the County's highway infrastructure is able to support the development of the local economy in the long term.
- Co-ordination of all capital works in the highway will help minimise disruption on the County's highways. This will help minimise losses to the local economy associated with congestion.

3.2 Helping people live healthy and independent lives

The following bullet point sets out details of implications identified by officers:

- The schemes within the TDP support the provision and maintenance of highway infrastructure for all users, thus helping ensure that safe and serviceable facilities are available for walking, cycling and other non-motorised forms of transport.

3.3 Supporting and protecting vulnerable people

There are no significant implications for this priority.

4. SIGNIFICANT IMPLICATIONS

- Resource Implications: Paragraphs 2.2 to 2.4 of the report set out the implications of the Incentive Fund and the assumptions made within the TDP.
- Statutory, Legal and Risk: There are no significant implications within this category.
- Equality and Diversity: There are no significant implications within this category.
- Engagement and Communications: The TDP provides a forward plan for communications with the public and stakeholders of the schemes we will be carrying out. The Plan might also be required to substantiate to Central Government the Authority's assessment for Incentive Funding.
- Localism and Local Member Involvement: As explained above this TDP provides a forward plan for communications with and for members, the public and stakeholders of the schemes we will be carrying out. It can be used with organisations, such as Local Parish Councils and residents'

associations to give a general overview of what is planned and when to help look for local issues early in the process.

- **Public Health:** There are no significant implications within this category. The TDP includes schemes that facilitate active travel modes and safety schemes, which promote public health. The Public Health service will have been consulted on schemes included in the Transport Investment Plan (TIP) through Local Transport Plan consultations and consultation on Planning Applications and proposed mitigation. It is also anticipated that the Public Health service would be consulted further on the TIP schemes when individual schemes are developed further for delivery.

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: Fiona McMillan
Are there any Equality and Diversity implications? No Implications	Yes Name of Officer: Tamar Oviatt-Ham
Have any engagement and communication implications been cleared by Communications?	Yes Name of Officer: Mark Miller
Are there any Localism and Local Member involvement issues? Yes	Yes Name of Officer: Tamar Oviatt-Ham
Have any Public Health implications been cleared by Public Health	Yes Name of Officer: Tess Campbell