

PART 1 - PUBLIC

Decision Maker: Environment Portfolio Holder

Date: For Pre-decision Scrutiny by the Environment PDS Committee on
1st March 2011

Decision Type: Non-Urgent Executive Key

Title: TFL FUNDED WORK PROGRAMME FOR 2011/12 - 2013/14:
REVISION FOLLOWING THE COMPREHENSIVE SPENDING
REVIEW

Contact Officer: Iain Forbes, Head of Transport Strategy
Tel: 020 8461 7595 E-mail: iain.forbes@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Nigel Davies, Director of Environmental Services

Ward: All

1. Reason for report

- 1.1 On 28th September 2010, the Environment PDS Committee agreed recommended programmes of TfL-funded expenditure for the period 2011/12 to 2013/14. These programmes were approved by the Environment Portfolio Holder on 13th October 2010 and were used in the preparation of the Council's Draft LIP, which was submitted to TfL in December 2010.
 - 1.2 Following the Government's Comprehensive Spending Review, TfL have reduced borough funding over this 3-year period.
 - 1.3 This report recommends a revised programme of formula-funded schemes for the period 2011/12 to 2013/14, to be used as a basis for the preparation of the Council's Final LIP, which is due to be submitted in spring 2011.
-

2. **RECOMMENDATION(S)**

- 2.1 That the three year programme of formula funded schemes for years 2011/12 to 2013/14 contained in Appendix 1 be approved for submission to Transport for London as part of the Council's Final LIP.

Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing policy.
 2. BBB Priority: Quality Environment.
-

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: Estimated cost £2.949M in 2011/12, £2.829M in 2012/13 and £2.424M in 2013/14.
 2. Ongoing costs: Recurring cost.
 3. Budget head/performance centre: Capital Programme - TfL funded schemes
 4. Total current budget for this head: £3.266m plus £100k for Local Transport priority schemes
 5. Source of funding: Transport for London formula allocation for 2010/11
-

Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional): 22 FTEs funded by TfL
 2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours:
-

Legal

1. Legal Requirement: Statutory requirement. The Council is under a legal obligation to submit a LIP to the Mayor. However, the Council is not legally required to spend any or all of the funds allocated under the formula.
 2. Call-in: Call-in is applicable
-

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): All residents, businesses and visitors.
-

Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? No.
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments: N/A

3. COMMENTARY

- 3.1 At its meeting on 28th September 2010, the Environment PDS Committee considered a report (ES10119) which set out recommendations for a detailed programme of TfL-funded expenditure for 2011/12, and indicative programmes for 2012/13 and 2013/14. These programmes were subsequently agreed by the Environment Portfolio Holder on 13th October 2010.
- 3.2 Subsequently, at its meeting on 29th November 2010, the Committee considered a report (ES10173) on the Draft Local Implementation Plan (LIP), which incorporated the agreed funding programmes. The Draft LIP was agreed by the Environment Portfolio Holder on 8th December 2010, and it was subsequently submitted to Transport for London by the due date of 20th December 2010.
- 3.3 On 4th November 2010, following the Government's Comprehensive Spending Review, TfL issued a letter setting out progressively reduced borough funding for the period 2011/12 to 2013/14. This is summarised in the table below.

TfL Formula Funding	2011/12 £M	2012/13 £M	2013/14 £M
Original announcement	3.076	3.082	3.082
Nov. 2010 announcement	2.949	2.829	2.425
Difference	0.127	0.253	0.657

- 3.4 Despite the revised figures being issued before the required LIP submission deadline of 20th December 2010, it was not possible, given the complexity and advanced stage of development of the Draft LIP, to incorporate the new funding levels in the draft. This was accepted by TfL. However, it has been made clear that boroughs are expected to reflect the lower funding levels when they submit their Final LIPs in spring 2011.
- 3.5 It is largely for boroughs to determine how the formula-allocated money will be spent. Schemes or programmes have to be demonstrably in line with the Mayor's transport objectives, and to meet other requirements which are largely concerned with the proper use of funds. The allocation is not a grant, and funds must be drawn down as work is completed.
- 3.6 While it is necessary at this time to take a view on a reduced spending profile, and to submit this information to TfL in the Final LIP, it is important to note that the suggested profiles for 2012/13 and 2013/14 remain indicative within the limits set by TfL. Officers will continue to bring forward proposals for the following year's spending in early autumn each year, and it will be possible to reconsider programmes and priorities at that time.
- 3.7 The proposed revised programme is shown at **Appendix 1**, and the changes from the previously agreed programme are shown at **Appendix 2**.

Notes on the proposed programmes

- 3.8 In the main, the programme headings used in this report (and shown in the Appendices) are those which were used for the programmes agreed in September 2010. The only exceptions are the programmes covering recreational walking and walking in green spaces, which have been merged to provide flexibility. The paragraphs which follow seek to explain how the recommended revisions to the programme meet the reduced levels of TfL funding.
- 3.9 Many of the individual schemes implemented by the Council are developed and implemented over a timescale which typically covers one or two financial years. Only larger, more complex schemes and ongoing programmes are planned over a longer timescale. Thus there is no detailed three-year programme of schemes.

- 3.10 Many of the programmes shown in Appendix 1 only include full details for 2011/12, and show a sum for “undetermined schemes” in the succeeding two years. This does not mean that there is no useful work to be done in future years; rather, it is simply that the process of indentifying potential schemes and sifting them for desirability, practicality, effectiveness and cost will be a rolling year-on-year process.
- 3.11 In developing the recommendations in this report, officers have taken into account the following general principles:
- Maintain as far as possible the range of services provided;
 - Provide flexibility to allow funding to be effectively targeted within programmes; and
 - Maintain an emphasis on programmes which have a by-product of helping to maintain existing assets.
- 3.12 The approval of the programmes recommended in this report does not imply the approval of any physical scheme for implementation. All such schemes will be subject to consultation and Member approval in the usual way.
- 3.13 For the sake of simplicity, the paragraphs which follow refer to the programme years as follows:
Year 1 - 2011/12
Year 2 - 2012/13
Year 3 - 2013/14.
“As before” and “originally” refer to the programmes agreed in September 2010.

Congestion Relief - Multi-Year Schemes

- 3.14 The “congestion relief” heading combines projects to improve conditions on bus routes with the development of projects to tackle road network pinch points. A review of scheme costs on the named larger schemes has increased the cost allocated to Year 3 from £240k to £290k.

Congestion Relief

- 3.15 This programme proposes lists of schemes for Years 1 and 2, but no details for Year 3. Proposed expenditure in Year 1 is retained at £57k, Year 2 is reduced from £95k to £75k, and Year 3 from £95k to £50k.

Network Infrastructure

- 3.16 Continuing discussions with TfL about funding for the replacement of Chislehurst Bridge have resulted in an agreement which restricts the Council’s support for this project in Years 1 and 2 to £100k a year. It is now recommended that the sum for bus route resurfacing be set at £200k per year over the three years of the budget. Proposed expenditure in Year 1 is retained at £300k, Year 2 is increased from £250k to £300k, and Year 3 (when there is no bridge contribution) is reduced from £250k to £200k.

Congestion / Casualty Reduction

- 3.17 This programme contains schemes which offer elements of both congestion relief and casualty reduction. There are detailed proposals for Years 1 and 2, but no detail for Year 3. Year 1 expenditure remains unchanged at £106k, with Years 2 and 3 reduced from £125k to £100k in each case.

Casualty Reduction

- 3.18 As the number of accidents and casualties reduces, it is becoming less possible to identify common causal elements at individual sites where there are still clusters of accidents. Experience indicates that, when proposals are brought forward to the detailed stage, they are often less costly than originally allowed for. It is therefore proposed to retain the budget at £175k in Year 1, but to reduce it from £175k to £150k in Year 2 and to £125k in Year 3. As

before, there are also two non-recurring studies which increase the expenditure proposed for Year 1 to £250k.

Casualty Reduction – mass action

- 3.19 This budget will continue to be focused on providing skid resistant surfacing, with sites identified following an examination of accident records and tests of the road surface. There is a further benefit, in that other road surface problems at these sites are able to be remedied at the same time. The original budget was £320k in year 1 and £300k in Years 2 and 3. The proposals are to reduce the budget to £290k in Year 2 and £250k in Year 3.

Cycle training and promotion

- 3.20 This popular service trains parents and children to use their bicycles safely, reducing potential accidents and improving travel choice. This budget is proposed to be retained at the original level of £230k in Years 1 and 2, but reduced to £195k in Year 3.

Support for Bromley Town Centre AAP

- 3.21 Year 1 will focus on completing the variable message signing (VMS) scheme for car parks, and updating the existing traffic model. Possible expansion of the VMS scheme to include “free text” advance warning signs will now only go ahead if it is possible to fund it from s106 payments. Work to promote “10 in 10” modal shift in Year 1 will focus on working with town centre businesses to put their discussions on a self-sustaining basis, with limited direct support from Council officers in Years 2 and 3. Years 2 and 3 will focus on active development of proposals for a permanent park and ride scheme. Proposed funding remains at £205k in Year 1, but reduces from £175k to £100k in Year 2 and £95k in Year 3.

Parking – assess, review and update

- 3.22 This budget allows for the review of existing parking schemes, the investigation of emerging parking problems and the implementation of solutions. The budget in Year 1 is focused on the potential extension of the heavily-used Lennard Road car park adjacent to New Beckenham station. This project continues into Year 2. Years 2 and 3 also have provision for undetermined schemes. It is proposed that this budget remains unchanged at £80k in Year 1 and £70k in Year 2, but with a reduction from £70k to £60k in Year 3.

Parking – town centres

- 3.23 This budget provides for more comprehensive, area-wide reviews of parking and deliveries. In 2011/12 the review will focus on Beckenham. This budget is proposed to be reduced from £250k to £225k in Year 1, retained at £200k in Year 2, and reduced from £200k to £150k in Year 3.

Decluttering - enhance the local environment

- 3.24 While some larger projects include a comprehensive review of signs, posts, barriers and other street furniture, this programme is intended to enable “quick win” projects focused on local high streets and shopping parades to improve the street scene, improve the clarity of signs and reduce needless obstructions. The proposals reduce expenditure in Year 3 from £50k to £40k.

Cycling & Walking Schemes

- 3.25 These schemes are grouped together because schemes can often offer benefits to both groups of users. Only Year 1 is shown as having named schemes, with Years 2 and 3 shown as being largely undetermined, except for the continuation of funding for cycle parking and cycle route maintenance. The budget for Years 1 and 2 remains unchanged at £345k and £350k respectively, but reduces from £350k to £300k in Year 3.

Walking – green spaces and recreational walking

- 3.26 For some years, the programme has supported the encouragement of recreational walking and also the improvement of “A to B” walking routes through green spaces. It will be necessary to review the best way this support can be delivered, and the merging of two separate former programmes will help in targeting reduced resources more effectively. The budget for this programme will reduce from £120k in Year 1 to £100k in Year 2 and £80k in Year 3.

Locally Determined Minor Schemes

- 3.27 This budget was originally set at £100k in each of Years 1, 2 and 3. It was intended to enable implementation of low to medium cost local schemes arising from Member and resident requests, which would not necessarily be programmed under the other categories listed. No commitments have been made against this budget in Year 1 until the scale of TfL funding reductions was known, and it is now intended to remove this budget line from all three years.
- 3.28 It should be noted that this is not the same sum as the £100k allocated by TfL to each borough for “Local Transport Priorities”. This sum will remain available to the Council each year and is not being reduced. Since it is a fixed sum and is not part of formula funding, it is not discussed further in this report.

Freight

- 3.29 The Council has been working in partnership with a number of south London boroughs to develop a number of freight-related initiatives. This work was formerly funded directly by TfL. At the time of writing, it is still not clear how new sub-regional arrangements will operate after 31st March 2011. The original budget showed £10k in each of Years 1, 2 and 3 as a contribution to possible continuing freight projects. This funding is now limited to Year 1, and is not continued in Years 2 and 3.

Light against crime

- 3.30 This programme is intended to fund small lighting schemes where crime or fear of crime could be reduced. The funding in Year 3 is reduced from £50k to £30k.

Scheme Development

- 3.31 Scheme development funding allows the review of the effectiveness of previous schemes, the investigation of issues and the pre-feasibility investigation of potential new schemes. In turn this improves the focus and deliverability of the individual schemes included in each year’s implementation programme, and leads to more efficient use of funds. In order to ensure the most effective use of reduced budgets, it is proposed to maintain and slightly increase the allocated resources. The proposed budget remains at £25k in Year 1, but increases from £30k to £40k in both Years 2 and 3.

School travel planning activities

- 3.32 All schools in Bromley have existing travel plans. It is important that the plans remain up-to-date, and that staff and new generations of pupils remain engaged. The benefits of school travel plan include improved pupil health through increased walking and cycling, and helping to reduce peak hour traffic. The proposed funding is retained at £295k in Year 1, reduced to £294k in Year 2 (an adjustment to enable totals to match) and reduced to £230k in Year 3.

Road Safety Education

- 3.33 For the third year running, Bromley has had record low numbers of fatal and serious road accident casualties. This programme is focused on changing the attitudes and behaviour of young people, before and after they become drivers. The proposed budget sees a nominal reduction from £185k to £183k in Year 1 (to enable totals to match), and a further reduction to £180k in Years 2 and 3.

Travel awareness

3.34 Workplace travel planning support has formerly been made available across south-east London via the Seltrans partnership. There remains a need within Bromley to be able to assess and approve travel plans submitted as part of the Development Control Process, and also to work with organisations in Bromley who have existing travel plans. It was originally proposed to maintain this support across Years 1, 2 and 3. The current proposals are to retain funding at £25k in Year 1, but to reduce it from £30k to £10k in each of Years 2 and 3. Work in Year 1 will focus on working with existing organisations to put their plans on a self-sustaining basis.

4. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

4.1 The recommendations of this report are in line with existing Council policy.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1 The revised TfL formula allocation to Bromley for 2011/12 totals £2.949M. This figure excludes the allocation of £100k for Local Transport Priorities, which is a fixed sum, separate from formula funding, awarded to every borough. This £100k remains unallocated to specific projects, and reports regarding its use will be brought forward as necessary.

5.2 It should be noted that £769k of the £2.949M will be used to fund 22 FTEs (22 fully funded and 2 part-funded). These FTEs are used to deliver ongoing TfL-funded services, including design, consultation and monitoring of physical projects and the delivery of staff-intensive services such as cycle training and road safety education.

6. PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS

6.1 In addition to the FTEs referred to in paragraph 5.2 above, and subject to the outcome of staff consultation, it is currently proposed to transfer 4 or 5 permanent posts to annually renewed contracts. At this stage, it is envisaged that the changing nature of projects and the current staff skill set will enable these posts to be funded through savings arising from the reduced use of external consultants.

6.2 It is not envisaged that staffing requirements will change during 2011/12 (Year 1). Should the nature of the workload result in reduced staffing requirements during Years 2 or 3, this would be achieved by not renewing annual contracts.

Non-Applicable Sections:	Legal implications
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	Guidance on Developing the Second Local implementation Plans, GLA 2010 Letter from TfL dated 4 th November 2010