

	<p>Environment Committee</p> <p>10 November 2015</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Title</p>	<p>Local Implementation Plan Scheme Prioritisation Tool</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Report of</p>	<p>Commissioning Director - Environment</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Wards</p>	<p>All</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Status</p>	<p>Public</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Urgent</p>	<p>No</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Key</p>	<p>No</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Enclosures</p>	<p>Appendix A – Proposed LIP Prioritisation Tool for 2016/17 schemes</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Officer Contact Details</p>	<p>Richard Chalmers, Richard.chalmers@capita.co.uk , 020 8359 3555</p>

Summary

This report identifies and seeks agreement for a Prioritisation Tool for assessing proposals for the 'Traffic Management and Roads Safety', 'School Travel Plans' and 'Parking Reviews' elements of the 2016/17 LIP, and future year works programmes.

Recommendations

1. That the Environment Committee agrees the prioritisation method outlined at Appendix A for addressing scheme requests to be approved from 2016/17 LIP and future year work programmes.

1. WHY THIS REPORT IS NEEDED

1.1 Prioritisation for LIP scheme requests

- 1.2 TfL provide core funding for the implementation of the LIP schemes provided by TfL through a “Corridors, Neighbourhoods and Supporting Measures” programme for addressing a range of transport issues. These include holistic or area-based interventions including bus priority and accessibility, cycling, walking, safety measures, 20 mph zones and limits, freight, regeneration, environment, accessibility and controlled parking zones. This programme also includes expenditure on cycle parking, cycle training, shared space, car clubs, reduction of clutter, installation of electric vehicle charging points, school and workplace travel plans, behavioural change, education, training and publicity.
- 1.3 Some of the more general areas of the programme, notably ‘Traffic Management and Accident Reduction’, ‘School Travel Plan’ and ‘Parking Reviews’ will be subject to requests for schemes above the levels that can be delivered in full. A means of prioritising these, so that development is focussed on those that will best address borough priorities and provide the greatest benefit has been developed.
- 1.4 A prioritisation system is identified at Appendix A and will apply to the range of requests focusing on the policy objectives and targets. It incorporates readily available information regarding traffic, road users and facilities in the area to identify the schemes that should be prioritised for development.
- 1.5 For ‘Traffic Management and Accident Reduction’ schemes scores have been assigned to: LIP transport objectives, corporate plan objectives, LIP targets, initial estimate of the accident reduction benefits, a score if congestion reduction would be expected, and scores related to the road/traffic characteristics (speed and volume of traffic) and facilities in the vicinity (e.g. schools, health facilities, parks etc).
- 1.6 A modified version to prioritise for implementation of developed schemes using the fuller information would then be available in relation to casualty reduction and congestion reduction is also included.
- 1.7 It is expected that each year approximately 40% of the available funding would address development / design of new schemes and 60% be used to implement schemes that had been designed in previous year(s).
- 1.8 For ‘School Travel Plan’ schemes a points based prioritisation similar to that identified in the January 2015 Environment Committee report on ‘Highways Planned Improvement Programme 2015/16’ is intended at the initial stage. Schemes developed in year would then be prioritised against other schemes that had been developed to this stage for implementation.
- 1.9 For ‘Parking’ schemes a similar scoring system and process to the ‘Traffic Management and Accident Reduction’ schemes will be adopted although

there will also be focus on the objectives of the Council's Parking Policy which was agreed in November 2014.

- 1.10 Furthermore as many requests are received for parking measures such as Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs), where residents struggle to park near their properties, additional emphasis has been placed in the Parking scheme scoring on requests received by the community for action.

2. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 It has been identified that a means of prioritising schemes and requests is required so Planned Highways Improvement work is focussed on schemes that will best address borough priorities and provide the greatest benefit.

3. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND NOT RECOMMENDED

- 3.1 Retention of a method of prioritisation based on an assessment of monetised benefits could be used, but this would be unwieldy as a means of assessing the benefits of the many requests received from members of the public. Carrying out sufficient investigation on these to permit this type of assessment to be carried out would incur costs that would impact on programme delivery. The scoring systems identified for schemes allow relatively straightforward scoring based on policy objectives and make allowance for community concerns, while retaining a focus on the main priorities for the particular work areas.
- 3.2 A single system to address all scheme types has been considered, but a workable solution not found given the constraints of the current three year delivery plan as it stands. Such prioritisation may be appropriate for the next three year delivery plan cycle.

4. POST DECISION IMPLEMENTATION

- 4.1 Scheme requests will be prioritised in line with the agreed process to inform a detailed programme for 2016/17 once TfL approval for the individual elements is received. This programme will be reported to the Environment Committee before the start of the 2016/17 financial year.

5. IMPLICATIONS OF DECISION

5.1 Corporate Priorities and Performance

- 5.1.1 This report addresses the Corporate Plan strategic objective that the council, working with local, regional and national partners, will strive to ensure that Barnet is a place where services are delivered efficiently to get value for money for the taxpayer. It identifies prioritisation schemes aimed at ensuring work is focused on those proposals that address agreed priorities and provide good value for money.
- 5.1.2 Schemes directly address the corporate plan delivery objective of "a clean and attractive environment, with well-maintained roads and pavements, flowing

traffic, and traffic management schemes.” They also help address the objectives “Barnet’s children and young people will receive a great start in life”; “Barnet will be amongst the safest places in London” and “a responsible approach to regeneration, with thousands of new homes built and job opportunities created”, through delivery of school travel proposals, road safety education and training and engineering schemes and work to support regeneration and town centre proposals.

5.1.3 School Travel Planning activities and activities that encourage walking and cycling in general help to deliver the active travel and recreation opportunities identified in the Health and Wellbeing Strategy for children and the population generally. Injuries and deaths from road traffic accidents also have an impact on health and health services.

5.1.4 The Joint Strategic Needs assessment identifies that pollution levels are higher along arterial routes, particularly the North Circular, M1, A1 and A5. This has health impacts related to air quality. It also identifies that the majority of people visiting town centres in Barnet do so by foot, bicycle or public transport. Encouraging this, particularly in less healthy areas, could drive good lifestyle behaviours and reduced demand for health and social care services.

5.2 **Resources (Finance & Value for Money, Procurement, Staffing, IT, Property, Sustainability)**

5.2.1 Barnet has received £4.5m of core funding for the implementation of the LIP from TfL. The funding is to be used to manage a number of programmes such as the “Corridors, Neighbourhoods and Supporting Measures” programme for addressing a range of transport issues, and separate maintenance programmes for Principal Roads and Bridges based on condition and a borough discretionary budget of £100k for use for any transport purpose.

5.3 **Social Value**

The Public Services (Social Value) Act 2013 requires people who commission public services to think about how they can also secure wider social, economic and environmental benefits. This report does not relate to procurement of services contracts.

5.4 **Legal and Constitutional References**

5.4.1 Greater London Authority Act 1999 (GLA Act) Part IV Chapter I governs the preparation of a Transport Strategy by the Mayor of London and preparation of a Local Implementation Plan by each borough containing proposals for the implementation of the Strategy in its area.

5.4.2 Section 159 of the GLA Act allows TfL to provide financial assistance to support provision of transport facilities or services within Greater London.

5.4.3 The Constitution section 15 Responsibility for Functions (Annex A - Membership and Terms of Reference of committees and partnership boards) provides that the Environment Committee has specific responsibilities for commissioning Transport and traffic management including agreement of London Transport Strategy-Local Implementation Plan

5.5 Risk Management

5.5.1 A programme of work that is not based on clear criteria would risk not delivering the Council's priorities, potential reputational damage and may in some circumstances be open to legal challenge. Development of a programme based on relevant criteria mitigates this.

5.6 Equalities and Diversity

5.6.1 A prioritisation system for proposals based on objective criteria will help ensure that the programme is developed fairly.

5.6.2 The LIP includes programmes of road safety education initiatives and small scale traffic management and safety schemes that will tend to benefit groups currently disproportionately affected by road traffic collisions. This can include young people and older people, males, and some minority ethnic groups. Provision for 20mph proposals especially near schools is expected to particularly benefit children.

5.6.3 Detailed impacts of specific major proposals will receive further consideration as they are developed and implemented.

5.7 Consultation and Engagement

5.7.1 Public consultation was undertaken in relation to development of the original LIP and future statutory and non-statutory consultation will apply to implementation of various proposals contained within it.

5.8 Insight

5.8.1 The full LIP sets out the data informing the transport priorities used, and injury accident data, data from other public sources and survey data informs the prioritisation proposed.

6. BACKGROUND PAPERS

6.1 On 27 January 2015 the Environment Committee approved a Highways Planned Improvement Programme for the 2015/16 financial year related chiefly to schemes funded using LIP funding, and a Highways Planned Maintenance programme that included Principal Road renewal schemes. These reports, appendices and decisions can be found at: <http://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=695&MIId=7881&Ver=4> (items 9 & 10)