

Transport and Highways Committee

Thursday, 19 March 2015 at 10:30

County Hall, County Hall, West Bridgford, Nottingham, NG2 7QP

AGENDA

- | | | |
|----|--|---------|
| 1 | Minutes of the last meeting held on 12 February 2015 | 3 - 6 |
| 2 | Apologies for Absence | |
| 3 | Declarations of Interests by Members and Officers:- (see note below)
(a) Disclosable Pecuniary Interests
(b) Private Interests (pecuniary and non-pecuniary) | |
| 4 | Transport & Travel Services-Potential for Shared Public Transport Services with City Council | 7 - 14 |
| 5 | Integrated Ticketing Plan - Outcome of Consultation and Next Steps | 15 - 20 |
| 6 | Performance Report - Transport & Travel Services | 21 - 34 |
| 7 | Integrated Transport & Highway Maintenance Capital Programmes 2015-16 | 35 - 58 |
| 8 | Noise Action Plans | 59 - 62 |
| 9 | Nottinghamshire Cycling Strategy Delivery Plan | 63 - 76 |
| 10 | Responses to Petitions Presented to the Chairman of the County Council on 15 January 2015 | 77 - 82 |
| 11 | Work Programme | 83 - 88 |

Notes

- (1) Councillors are advised to contact their Research Officer for details of any Group Meetings which are planned for this meeting.
- (2) Members of the public wishing to inspect "Background Papers" referred to in the reports on the agenda or Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act should contact:-

Customer Services Centre 0300 500 80 80

- (3) Persons making a declaration of interest should have regard to the Code of Conduct and the Council's Procedure Rules. Those declaring must indicate the nature of their interest and the reasons for the declaration.

Councillors or Officers requiring clarification on whether to make a declaration of interest are invited to contact David Forster (Tel. 0115 977 3552) or a colleague in Democratic Services prior to the meeting.

- (4) Councillors are reminded that Committee and Sub-Committee papers, with the exception of those which contain Exempt or Confidential Information, may be recycled.
- (5) This agenda and its associated reports are available to view online via an online calendar - <http://www.nottinghamshire.gov.uk/dms/Meetings.aspx>

Meeting Transport and Highways Committee

Date 12 February 2015 (commencing at 10.30 am)

Membership

Persons absent are marked with an 'A'

COUNCILLORS

Kevin Greaves (Chairman)
Steve Calvert (Vice-Chairman)

Reg Adair
Roy Allan
Richard Butler
Stephen Garner

Colleen Harwood
Richard Jackson
John Peck
Yvonne Woodhead

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE

Pete Barker	- Planning Policy and Corporate Services
Tim Gregory	- Corporate Director, Environment and Resources
Neil Hodgson	- Group Manager, Highways
Mark Hudson	- Group Manager, Travel and Transport Services
Jas Hundal	- Service Director, Environment and Resources
Pete Mathieson	- Travel and Transport Services
Andy Wallace	- Flood Risk Manager
Andrew Warrington	- Service Director, Highways

COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

The Clerk to the Committee reported orally that Councillor Reg Adair and Councillor Yvonne Woodhead had been appointed to the Committee in place of Councillor Andrew Brown and Councillor Michael Payne respectively for this meeting only.

MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

That the minutes of the last meeting held on 8 January 2015 were taken as read and were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillor Steve Carr.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

With the consent of the Committee the Chairman changed the order of business to bring forward Agenda Item 7.

THE NOTTINGHAMSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL (WESTGATE AND HALLOUGHTON ROAD, SOUTHWELL) (PROPOSED NO RIGHT TURN BAN AND NO WAITING AT ANY TIME RESTRICTIONS) ORDERS 2015 (3215 AND 3216)

It was confirmed that the effect of the Orders would be to ban the right turn.

RESOLVED 2015/009

That the Nottinghamshire County Council (Westgate and Halloughton Road, Southwell) (Proposed Right Turn Ban and No Waiting at Any Time Restrictions) Orders 2015 (3215 and 3216) be made as advertised and objectors advised accordingly.

NOTTINGHAMSHIRE CONCESSIONARY TRAVEL SCHEME 2015 / 2016

RESOLVED 2015/010

:

- 1) That the 2015 / 2016 Nottinghamshire Concessionary Travel Scheme and associated reimbursement arrangements outlined in the report be approved.
- 2) That the publication of the final scheme notice on 3 March 2015 be approved.

CHANGES TO NORTH EAST BASSETLAW BUS SERVICES

RESOLVED 2015/011

That Committee approve the proposals in paragraph 7.

STRATEGIC PASSENGER TRANSPORT FRAMEWORK – LOCAL BUS SERVICES

RESOLVED 2015/012

- 1) That the outcome of the stakeholder consultation exercise and adopts the revised SPTF from March 2015 be noted.
- 2) That the progress with monitoring the Council's Strategic Passenger Transport Framework be noted.
- 3) That the review of local bus service provision in Summer 2015 be approved.

THE NOTTINGHAMSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL (A610 NUTHALL BYPASS, NUTHALL AND THE CITY OF NOTTINGHAM) (50 MPH SPEED LIMIT) ORDER 2015 (5184)

RESOLVED 2015/013

That the Nottinghamshire County Council (A610 Nuthall Bypass, Nuthall and the City of Nottingham) (50mph Speed Limit) Order 2015 (5184) be made as advertised and objectors advised accordingly.

THE NOTTINGHAMSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL (KIRKBY IN ASHFIELD & SELSTON AREA) (PROHIBITION OF WAITING AND NO STOPPING ON ENTRANCE CLEARWAY) TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER 2015 (4145)

RESOLVED 2015/014

That the Nottinghamshire County Council (Kirkby in Ashfield & Selston Area) (Prohibition of Waiting and No Stopping on Entrance Clearway) Traffic Regulation Order 2015 (4145) be made as advertised with amendment and objectors advised accordingly.

Amendment is:

Vernon Road – change approx. 6.5 metres of no waiting at any time restrictions (double yellow lines) to 'No Waiting Monday to Friday, 8am to 4.30pm' (single yellow line) as shown on plan H/DAS/TRO4145/7/A (Vernon Road, Kirkby in Ashfield).

THE NOTTINGHAMSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL (SHERWOOD RISE AREA, MANSFIELD) (BUS PROHIBITION AND ENVIRONMENTAL WEIGHT LIMIT) TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER 2014 (2166)

RESOLVED 2015/015

That the Nottinghamshire County Council (Sherwood Rise Area, Mansfield) (Bus Prohibition and Environmental Weight Limit) Traffic Regulation Order 2014 (2166) be made as advertised and the objector advised accordingly.

CHARGES FOR HIGHWAYS SERVICES 2015/16

RESOLVED 2015/016

- 1) That the proposed charges for highways services, documents and data for the financial year commencing 1 April 2015 be approved.
- 2) That all charges for highways services continue to be reviewed annually and also as may be required consequent on any change in circumstances.

FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT UPDATE FEBRUARY 2015

RESOLVED 2015/017

That the update on flood risk management be noted.

PERFORMANCE REPORT – HIGHWAYS

RESOLVED 2015/018

That the contents of the report be noted.

WORK PROGRAMME

Representatives from the Highways Agency would be attending the Committee meeting on either 23rd April or 21st May.

Committee congratulated Andy Warrington on his new post and thanked him for all his hard work in the past, and also congratulated Neil Hodgson on his new post.

RESOLVED 2015/019

That the Work Programme be noted.

The meeting closed at 11.40am

Chairman

19 March 2015**Agenda Item: 4****REPORT OF THE SERVICE DIRECTOR, TRANSPORT, PROPERTY &
ENVIRONMENT****TRANSPORT & TRAVEL SERVICES (TTS): POTENTIAL FOR SHARED
PUBLIC TRANSPORT SERVICES PROVISION WITH THE CITY COUNCIL****Purpose of the Report**

1. To inform the Committee of a study jointly commissioned by Nottinghamshire County Council and Nottingham City Council into the potential for shared services provision for public transport functions.
2. To seek approval for the creation of a temporary Project Officer post, jointly funded by both authorities to manage and develop the shared services project from April 2015 to March 2016.

Information and Advice

3. The Redefining Your Council strategy is a new approach to make sure the Council can deliver the Strategic Plan. The strategy requires a fundamental review of services and the best model for delivery to ensure frontline services are safeguarded. The Transformation Programme identified transport as an area for review and the work undertaken in this review will determine the best delivery model in order to achieve value for money. This is an ideal opportunity to showcase the best delivery model to provide better services also providing a platform to collaborate with other partner organisations.
4. By way of background, in October 2014 the County Council and the City Council jointly commissioned *itp* consultants to consider the potential for shared services, with a particular focus on the following:
 - (i) How a shared service can deliver the current level of service for both Councils with fewer staff or a better level of service with the same staff?
 - (ii) How joint procurement can deliver efficiencies through economies of scale?
 - (iii) How a shared back office can deliver cost savings?
 - (iv) If significant benefits are identified what is the best model and appropriate governance arrangements for shared services.
5. The delivery of the following public transport functions were considered as part of the study commissioned from *itp*:
 - Public Transport Policy
 - Independent Travel Training
 - External funding bids
 - Fares and ticketing (including smart ticketing)
 - Transport facilities management

- Transport information and bus service registrations
 - Bus quality partnerships
 - Concessionary fare scheme management
 - Business travel administration
 - Passenger transport technology development
6. Local bus service management and commissioning functions was not considered in this review as the outcome of other 'option for change' work streams will determine the shape of this provision later in 2015/16. This will therefore be considered in the second phase of shared service provision, which will also encompass changes arising from a Combined Authority and devolution powers for the N2 area.

Shared Service Report Findings

7. The report (an executive summary is attached as Appendix A) established that the County and City staffing and delivery structures are very different and therefore quite difficult to compare like for like without far deeper analysis.
8. That shared services for some functions can mean the work is additional to existing provision e.g. for information and concessionary fare administration and therefore restricts opportunities for staffing efficiencies and savings but further work would need to be done to streamline it.
9. There is clear potential for shared service provision for the development of integrated and smart ticketing in the County. This would bring immediate benefits and savings.
10. That there is potential for shared services for all other key functions in paragraph 5 to deliver efficiencies and savings and better outcomes for public transport users in the County and City and that officers should commence work on delivery through shadowing and/or co-location.
11. There are further opportunities for shared service provision in commissioning and procurement to realise economies of scale and buying power as well as shared back office systems to reduce on-going costs.

Report Recommendations

12. The report recommends a phased approach as follows:

Phase 1: Now to April 2016

- County and City to provide a dedicated post to manage the development of the shared services opportunities. This may lead to the formation of a fully Integrated Public Transport Unit provided under a partnership agreement. Further reports are to be submitted to the Committee at key stages of the project in this regard.
- To introduce shadow-working to inform the shared services development, deliver immediate efficiencies, build trust and form closer working relationships in preparation for potential integration.

Phase 2: April 2016 onwards

- Explore the potential for the inclusion of local bus services in the shared service provision.

Phase 3: Ongoing

- Further development will be determined by the Combined Authority and Devolution discussions between the County and the City (N2). A full project plan will be developed to establish the actual timeline, project outcomes and benefits

13. The Senior Leadership at the City Council (Members and Officers) have discussed the potential outcomes of this report including the possibility of a fully Integrated Public Transport Unit and have given their full support to the shared services agenda and proposals contained in this report to take the initiative forward.

Proposals

14. The City Council Head of Transport Services is being seconded to the Department for Transport (DfT) for a year to work on future bus policy. It is proposed that a dedicated Project Officer post, jointly-funded by both Councils manages the development of shared services with a view towards shared service provision in April 2016, which aligns with other possible changes across the County and City Councils. The work will be undertaken from April 2015 to March 2016 and be led by the TTS Team Manager for Commissioning & Policy who will also jointly manage both the County and City Council teams whilst the Head of Transport is seconded to the DfT.

15. The proposal for a jointly-funded post ensures that the development of shared services is balanced and would ensure the best outcome for both the City and County to maximise efficiencies and savings in service provision. It will help both Councils to meet their required budget savings commitments and minimise the impact of budget reductions on the travelling public and service delivery.

16. It is proposed that shadow working in the areas identified below as quick wins commences after Committee approval as follows:

- Integrated ticketing to utilise City expertise to support the critical phase of smartcard and ticketing developments in Mansfield
- Independent Travel Training (ITT)
- Back office systems: information, data and asset management
- Concessionary Travel Scheme Management

Other Options Considered

17. To do nothing and continue with the current separate arrangements will not realise the potential for efficiencies, saving and better outcomes for public transport users.

Environment and Sustainability

18. Public transport is key to congestion management; a reduction in car use improves air quality and reduces CO2 emissions.

Statutory and Policy Implications

19. This report has been compiled after consideration of implications in respect of crime and disorder, finance, human resources, human rights, the NHS Constitution (Public Health only), the public sector equality duty, safeguarding of children and vulnerable adults, service users, sustainability and the environment and ways of working and where such implications are

material they are described below. Appropriate consultation has been undertaken and advice sought on these issues as required.

Financial Implications

20. The cost for the Shared Services Project Officer (£33,326) will be jointly-funded with the City, 50% of which will fall on the County Council and this is to be funded from existing budgets for Transport & Travel Services.

Implications for Service Users

21. Public transport helps tackle congestion and improve accessibility to employment, training, health and other key facilities. Improvements in service delivery, such as integrated ticketing will improve the public transport offer for users.

Human Resource Implications

22. The Project Officer post is for a 12 month temporary appointment commencing in April 2015. The TTS Team Manager's post will be reassessed to determine the grade for the extended responsibilities.

RECOMMENDATION/S

- 1) Note the recommendations of the Shared Services report.
- 2) Approve the jointly-funded 12 month temporary Project Officer post for the Shared Services Project.

Mark Hudson
Group Manager
Transport & Travel Services

For any enquiries about this report please contact:

Pete Mathieson
Team Manager
Commissioning & Policy
Transport & Travel Services

Constitutional Comments (SLB 26/02/2015)

23. Transport and Highways Committee is the appropriate body to consider the content of this report. Changes to staffing structures are subject to the Council's Employment Procedure Rules.

Financial Comments (TMR 26/02/2015)

24. The financial implications are set out in paragraph 20.

HR Comments (JP 10/03/15)

25. The HR implications are contained in the body of the report.

Background Papers

Except for previously published documents, which will be available elsewhere, the documents listed here will be available for inspection in accordance with Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972.

- Integrated Ticketing Plan - Transport & Highway Committee 11 September 2014
- Review of the potential for improved efficiency through shared services in the areas of passenger transport infrastructure, promotion and concessionary travel – final report.

Electoral Divisions and Members Affected

All

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents the results of a review of the potential for improved efficiency through shared service delivery between Nottinghamshire County and Nottingham City Councils. The review covered three specific service areas: **public transport infrastructure provision and operation**; **public transport promotion and information**; and **concessionary travel**. It was based on review and analysis of information provided by key officers in the two authorities on how they currently operate, and looked at three main areas for potential efficiency improvements:

- ❑ Shared service staff teams
- ❑ Joint procurement
- ❑ Sharing of IT systems

Shared service staff teams

The review found that the potential efficiency benefit to be gained from a **general merger** of the teams of people delivering the three service functions in the two authorities was not clear *from the available data*. This is primarily because in many areas the workload appears to be largely additive in nature, without any obvious significant saving in management or administration overhead tasks from merging of teams.

However, the review showed that there is clearly potential for efficiency gains through closer working of staff in **certain areas**, which could be implemented immediately (Phase 1):

- ❑ Development of integrated ticketing and smart card systems is an area where there is a clear case for closer working, which could potentially involve co-location of a County officer to work (at least part-time) within the City smart card and integrated ticketing team to benefit from the City's expertise in this area.
- ❑ Defining a single concessionary travel scheme that covers both local authority areas would yield efficiency benefits, allowing scheme administration and operator reimbursement to be undertaken by one authority's staff under a service level agreement. The logical choice would be for those functions for a combined scheme to sit within the County Council team, as that is the larger scale current operation with the better supporting system incorporating an additional level of fraud protection.

It also recommended that the potential for closer working across a wider range of areas is **investigated further through some additional collaborative working or staff sharing** between the two authorities over a period of 12 months (Phase 1a). This would enable each authority to see in greater detail how the other works, enabling any other efficiency areas or service improvements that may come from shared staff teams to be identified with greater confidence. Better-informed decisions could then be taken on whether and how to realise those efficiencies (Phase 2).

Joint procurement

The review identified the following areas where joint procurement could provide benefits in terms of reduced costs or better public services:

- ❑ There is some scope for efficiency gains through use of joint contracts to provide and maintain bus stops and shelters. Further investigation is needed of the terms of the separate

contracts currently in place with both Councils, followed by 'market sounding' discussions with each of the current contractors.

- There is some potential for efficiency improvement through combining the HOPS functions for concessionary travel (and other) smartcards, when the current City Council contract arrangements expire. To take this forward, further exploration of the current HOPS market would be needed and development of a deal that is advantageous to both authorities.

Sharing of IT systems

Sharing of existing IT systems offers some potential for efficiency improvement and cost-sharing:

- The efficiency of asset management tasks in the City could potentially benefit from using the Novus FX software that the County has installed, provided the City Council was convinced that any efficiency benefits (in what is seen as a relatively minor task) would outweigh any cost involved. The terms of the software licence would need to be checked to ensure that adding City Council users is permissible.
- Dealing with the authorities' statutory duties on bus service registrations and data provision, and producing timetable information, are also areas where sharing of the County's Novus FX system should potentially offer some efficiency gains to the City Council. As with asset management, to justify 'buying in' to the County's system, the City Council would need to see any staff time savings as 'cashable' by allowing redeployment of staff on to other essential tasks.

19 March 2015**Agenda Item: 5****REPORT OF THE SERVICE DIRECTOR, TRANSPORT, PROPERTY &
ENVIRONMENT****INTEGRATED TICKETING PLAN – OUTCOME OF CONSULTATION AND
NEXT STEPS****Purpose of the Report**

1. To advise the Committee of the outcome of the Integrated Ticketing Strategy and Delivery Plan consultation .
2. To advise the Committee to adopt the Integrated Ticketing Strategy and Delivery Plan.
3. To set out progress with the delivery of integrated ticketing in Nottinghamshire.

Information and Advice

4. On 11 September 2014 Transport and Highways Committee approved the report 'Integrated Ticketing Plan' and gave approval for the commencement of formal consultation. The report also approved for work to commence on a bus exemplar project including smart ticketing, and seek support from the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) for the Scheme.
5. The formal consultation ran from September to December, and resulted in 176 individual responses. A summary of outcomes of the consultation is given below:
 - 95% support the Integrated Ticketing Strategy and Delivery Plan for Nottinghamshire
 - 95% of respondents are regular public transport users (bus , rail , tram)
 - 53% already use a pre-paid ticket
 - Gender: 53% male and 47% female
 - Age: 4.4% aged under 25 years; 31.9% aged between 26 and 45 years; 50.4% aged between 46 and 65 ; 13.3% over 65 years.
 - 23% have a long term health problem or disability
6. Other questions requested descriptive responses, and a summary of the responses is given below:

When using a bus do you purchase a ticket on the bus?

- 52.7% of respondees still purchase tickets on the bus rather than use pre-paid tickets bought off-bus.
- Respondents mentioned a number of ticket types including single, return, daily, weekly, 10 journey, Kangaroo and Megarider paper tickets
- Respondents did state that the type of ticket purchased depends on which transport service is being used and whether it is cheaper to pay on the service for a short journey or use a pass, implying a 'pay as you go' pass which offers journeys at a discount, but potentially still more expensive than the cash fare available through an alternative operator.

Do you support the principle of further integrated ticketing for public transport in Nottinghamshire?

- 95% of respondees support the proposals, including 2 Parish Councils and 1 Town Council.
- Other comments referred to the need for more attractive ticketing products for students who have to pay high fares in rural areas
- One respondent requested the extension of the Kangaroo ticket boundary to include Hucknall

Do you support the draft "Integrated Ticketing Strategy and Delivery Plan" for Nottinghamshire?

- 92% of responses supported the proposal.
- Responses highlighted the need for the strategy delivery plan to include an electronic purse facility for ticket purchase, to ensure smaller operators are included and for rural areas to be included in any scheme

Do you have any comments about the "Scheme design, timeline, promotion and governance"?

- To incorporate the needs of users who need to use public transport at "random intervals"
- To consider carefully prices for education passes and season tickets
- A number of respondents mentioned the 'Oyster' style card used in London as a model for delivery
- Concerns were expressed about scheme complexity

Other comments included "*sooner is better*", "*The simplest scheme needs to go ahead that is mindful of the easiest and most advanced technologies*" and "*anything that make transport cheaper*" and "*It is long overdue Nottinghamshire needs this*"

Do you have any comments on the integrated ticketing scheme boundaries and the types of tickets available?

- Detailed comments were received about specific boundaries, and areas for inclusion in the scheme, especially rural areas, and areas around Greater Nottingham not currently covered by the Kangaroo ticket.

Do you have any comments on the "Smart Ticketing Options"?

- Responses to this question included a number of useful suggestions about particular ticket types including a number expressing a preference for electronic purse payment options, and building on the product types offered by commercial operators.

- Other comments including consideration of payment options using debit/credit 'contactless' cards functionality as recently introduced in London.

Please give any other feedback on the development of an integrated ticketing scheme.

- Comments included reference to successful schemes in place elsewhere i.e. London, and including examples of how any future development of integrated ticketing could benefit specific journey options. One correspondent commented *"Far better than the current system - it can't come soon enough."*
7. In conclusion the consultation has resulted in general support for the future development of integrated ticketing in Nottinghamshire. The responses received will help inform the design of integrated ticketing solutions across Nottinghamshire which will need to be smart, simple to use and value for money for all users inclusive of those currently at school or college in the County.

Progress with the Delivery of Integrated Ticketing in Nottinghamshire

8. As reported to Committee in September 2014 discussions have been held with all the main operators who have all supported the development of an Integrated Ticketing Strategy and Delivery Plan, subject to the appropriate legal agreements.
9. The public consultation exercise has endorsed the operator position. Furthermore the County Council has been approached by TrentBarton and Stagecoach to support the implementation of a smart ticket for use on the Pronto service between Chesterfield and Nottingham via Mansfield. This could provide the building block for a wider smart integrated ticket for the whole Mansfield area as outlined in Phase 3 of the delivery plan. Discussions are ongoing and it is anticipated that delivery of this enhancement will be achieved in Spring/Summer 2015.
10. The County Council is working with the 'Kangaroo' partners to address some kangaroo scheme boundary anomalies such as Hucknall not being in the current arrangements.
11. The full Integrated Ticketing Strategy and Plan is included as an appendix in the draft Integrated Passenger Transport Strategy.
12. Work will commence with County Council's partners to prepare a full implementation plan and timeline for the introduction of integrated ticketing across the County together with the business case and cost implications.
13. A further progress report on the Integrated Ticketing Strategy and Delivery plan will be produced in autumn 2015.

Bus Exemplar Project

14. The report to Transport & Highways Committee in September 2014 approved the development of a bus exemplar project including smart integrated ticketing for consideration by the LEP for inclusion in a future Growth Fund bid.
15. Discussions have commenced with the other D2N2 Authorities to prepare the exemplar project and a further report will be brought to Committee later this year.

Other Options Considered

16. To do nothing and continue with the current arrangements where operators offer their own commercially driven ticketing products. These offer the potential for attractive discounts on journeys with the specific operator. They do not encourage the use of public transport for individuals whose journey might involve a transfer between different operators or more than one mode of transport, resulting in possible financial hardship and social isolation.
17. To not seek the support of the LEP to include a bus exemplar project in a future growth fund bid, will be a missed opportunity for the County Council to improve the public transport offer which stimulates regeneration, improves access to work and training and helps tackle congestion and Co2 emissions.

Statutory and Policy Implications

18. This report has been compiled after consideration of implications in respect of finance, the public sector equality duty, human resources, crime and disorder, human rights, the safeguarding of children, sustainability and the environment and those using the service and where such implications are material they are described below. Appropriate consultation has been undertaken and advice sought on these issues as required.

Sustainability and Environment

19. The provision of a multi-operator ticket will encourage more people to use public transport thus reducing car use and congestion.

Financial Implications

20. The implementation costs (estimated to be £30,000) for Phase 1 and 2 of the plan can be funded from the existing Local Transport Plan funding.

Implications for Service Users

21. The provision of multi operator integrated tickets will improve the customer experience for users and make the service more affordable.

RECOMMENDATION

- 1) To note the outcome of the Integrated Ticketing Strategy and Delivery Plan consultation and approve the adoption of the Integrated Ticketing Strategy and Delivery Plan.
- 2) A further report be made updating on progress with the Integrated Ticketing Strategy Delivery Plan and exemplar project in Autumn 2015.

Mark Hudson
Group Manager
Transport & Travel Services

For any enquiries about this report please contact:
Pete Mathieson, Team Manager, Commissioning & Policy

Constitutional Comments (SMG 10/03/2015)

22. The proposals in this report fall within the remit of this Committee.

Financial Comments (TMR 13/01/2015)

23. The financial implications are set out in paragraph 20.

Background Papers

Except for previously published documents, which will be available elsewhere, the documents listed here will be available for inspection in accordance with Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972.

- Department for Transport - 'Building Better Bus Services: Multi-Operator Ticketing' - March 2013
- Building Better Bus Services: Department For Transport (DfT) Guidance On Implementing Integrated Ticketing Schemes and the Local Sustainable Transport Fund (2015-16)' - Transport and Highway Committee 31 October 2013.
- Integrated Ticketing Plan - Transport and Highway Committee 11 September 2014.

Electoral Divisions and Members Affected

All

19 March 2015**Agenda Item: 6****REPORT OF THE SERVICE DIRECTOR FOR TRANSPORT, PROPERTY AND
ENVIRONMENT****PERFORMANCE REPORT – TRANSPORT AND TRAVEL SERVICES****Purpose of the Report**

1. This report provides a summary of the performance of Transport and Travel Services.

Information and Advice

2. This report highlights some excellent outcomes for this service area. Nottinghamshire is recognised nationally as being top of the County Council league tables for the provision of public transport and bus infrastructure information.
3. The people of Nottinghamshire are expressing higher satisfaction levels than in many other parts of the country in term of accessing key services and leisure opportunities. This contributes to a better quality of life and a stronger economy.
4. As part of the Budget consultation 2015/16, Transport and Travel Services have a number of options for change to generate £2m in budget savings. The efficiency savings will be delivered through a range of options, including shared service, service configuration and better use of technology.

Performance Analysis

5. **Summary of recent performance and ongoing activity**
 - A new bus network for NE Bassetlaw will commence from May 2015. Consultation was held in autumn 2014 and these comments have formed part of the development of the new network. Savings of £79k achieved through this revised network will contribute to the overall 2015/16 budget saving proposal for Transport and Travel Services.
 - In August 2014 a new revised supported bus services network was introduced across the County, which delivered savings of £1.8m. Through continuous service reviews on these new services and ongoing consultation with stakeholders, these services will continue to be reviewed and performance monitored.

- In August 2014, in line with the revised Nottinghamshire network, Fleet Services integrated a number of local bus runs with ASCH day centre runs, this has resulted in over £300k of efficiency savings.
- Implementation of the SPTF (Strategic Passenger Transport Framework) in March 2015 will provide a tool to effectively monitor and review the supported local bus services in Nottinghamshire. This will enable contracts to be ranked using both financial and operational data and will be an important tool in future network reviews and enhanced decision making.
- The Beeston Statutory Bus Quality Partnership (SBQP) is currently out for consultation and depending on the outcome will be implemented in July 2015. The new Beeston bus/tram interchange is scheduled to be operational from early May this year.
- The Mansfield SQBP is on-going with all the relevant stakeholders complying with the standards required. This has seen a 2% rise in bus patronage in the Mansfield area.
- Work on Worksop bus station continues to be on track for official opening in late summer 2015.
- RTPI – further real time displays are being installed along the A38 corridor, which is funded by ERDF. Further displays funded by LTP and better bus areas are being installed in the greater Nottingham conurbations.
- A bid for £300k to the DFT Total Transport Fund has been submitted and the results should be known during March this year. The bid will consider how we can work with NHS and other parties to improve travel options.
- Consultation has taken place on the ‘integrated ticketing strategy’ as reported elsewhere on the agenda.
- Discussions are underway with ‘Click travel’ to develop an online solution for booking train, accommodation and flights for the County Council, with a target implementation date of April 2015. This will enable bookings to be made on line and reduce costs by taking away the paper based process.
- Discussions are underway with Hertz and Enterprise cars to develop a pilot proposal for the provision of pool cars operated by the County Council and how the provision will reduce grey fleet (business) mileage costs. A further report will be brought to committee.
- An on line application process is currently being developed to provide the facility to apply, renew and replace concessionary travel passes. Implementation will be phased from June 2015.
- The VOSA authorised test facility has increased from two to five days operation per week resulting in additional business and income at the Bilsthorpe fleet maintenance facility.

National Highways and Transport Survey 2014

6. The national Highways and Transport 2014 survey is undertaken on an annual basis, in the 2014 survey, 78 authorities participated with over 70,000 completed questionnaires with a response rate of 23%. This provides Nottinghamshire with a comparison of data across 25 County Councils on a range of 20 survey questions relevant to this service area. Nottinghamshire is ranked no 1 for 45% of these (see details in Appendix 1), overall Nottinghamshire is ranked in the top 6 for 100% of the survey questions.

Appendix 1 shows the National Highways and Transport annual survey results; this is a satisfaction benchmarking survey carried out by MORI.

Transport and Travel Services Annual Local Performance indicators

7. **Appendix 2** shows the annual Local performance indicators currently being monitored by Transport and Travel Services. These indicators will be reported in the first quarter of 2015/16

Other Options Considered

8. None – this is an information report.

Reasons for Recommendations

9. None – This is an information report

Statutory and Policy Implications

10. This report has been compiled after consideration of implications in respect of finance, equal opportunities, human resources, crime and disorder, human rights, the safeguarding of children, sustainability and the environment and those using the service and where such implications are material they are described below. Appropriate consultation has been undertaken and advice sought on these issues as required.

Financial Implications

11. The monitoring of service performance will ensure that the spend on passenger transport services and facilities will be used efficiently and effectively.

Implications for Service Users

12. The continued monitoring and management of performance will ensure that the required quality standards are maintained and appropriate transport services are provided to meet the needs of the people of Nottinghamshire.

Recommendation

- 1) That Committee notes the contents of the report.

Mark Hudson
Group Manager
Transport & Travel Services

For any enquiries about this report please contact:

Lisa McLennaghan
Business Development Officer
Transport & Travel Services

Background Papers

None

Electoral Divisions

All

The NHT Public Satisfaction Benchmarking Survey 2014

Nottinghamshire's position within the top 10 County Councils out of 25 County Councils compared

Table 1 Information to help public plan journeys (PTBI 18)

Authority	Satisfaction score	Rank 2014	Rank 2013
Nottinghamshire	63.9	1	1
Oxfordshire	61.2	2	6
Derbyshire	61.1	3	2
Hampshire	59.5	4	13
Surrey	59.2	5	5
Devon	59.1	6	8
West Sussex	58.5	7	4
Dorset	58.4	8	9
Suffolk	58.3	9	17
Northumberland	57.9	10	7

Table 2 Ease of finding the right information (PTBI 16)

Authority	Satisfaction score	Rank 2014	Rank 2013
Nottinghamshire	59.1	1	1
Derbyshire	58.1	2	4
Devon	57.0	3	7
West Sussex	56.2	4	3
Oxfordshire	55.8	5	2
Hampshire	55.3	6	14
Dorset	55.3	7	6
Gloucestershire	53.7	8	22
Buckinghamshire	53.5	9	15
Suffolk	53.3	10	13

Table 3 Information about accessible buses (PTBI 17)

Authority	Satisfaction score	Rank 2014	Rank 2013
Nottinghamshire	55.0	1	6
Derbyshire	54.9	2	2
Oxfordshire	53.8	3	4
Devon	53.7	4	5
Gloucestershire	53.0	5	25
West Sussex	52.5	6	1
Dorset	52.5	7	12
Hampshire	51.5	8	15
Norfolk	51.2	9	13
Lincolnshire	51.1	10	24

Table 4 Reliability of electronic displays (PTBI 19)

Authority	Satisfaction score	Rank 2014	Rank 2013
Nottinghamshire	62.7	1	1
West Sussex	58.7	2	2
Dorset	58.6	3	4
Cambridgeshire	58.6	4	5
Oxfordshire	58.2	5	3
Buckinghamshire	55.8	6	7
Derbyshire	53.2	7	16
Hampshire	53.0	8	15
Norfolk	52.7	9	11
Surrey	52.7	10	6

Table 5 Provision of public transport information (PTBI 20)

Authority	Satisfaction score	Rank 2014	Rank 2013
Nottinghamshire	62.9	1	1
West Sussex	60.0	2	3
Oxfordshire	59.9	3	2
Derbyshire	59.2	4	5
Devon	58.2	5	4
Dorset	57.5	6	7
Gloucestershire	56.0	7	15
East Sussex	55.6	8	
Hampshire	54.9	9	14
Surrey	54.9	10	11

Table 6 How easy buses are to get on/off (PTBI 05)

Authority	Satisfaction score	Rank 2014	Rank 2013
Nottinghamshire	78.1	1	2
West Sussex	77.0	2	3
Derbyshire	76.8	3	4
Devon	76.3	4	6
Oxfordshire	76.1	5	1
Gloucestershire	73.9	6	15
East Sussex	73.3	7	
Surrey	73.2	8	23
Norfolk	72.9	9	2
Dorset	72.5	10	11

Table 7 Number of bus stops (PTBI 02)

Authority	Satisfaction score	Rank 2014	Rank 2013
Nottinghamshire	74.6	1	2
Derbyshire	74.1	2	3
Oxfordshire	73.9	3	1
Devon	72.5	4	5
West Sussex	72.3	5	4
East Sussex	71.9	6	
Norfolk	70.5	7	12
Gloucestershire	70.5	8	7
Dorset	69.8	9	13
Leicestershire	69.8	10	9

Table 8 Quality and cleanliness of buses (PTBI 08)

Authority	Satisfaction score	Rank 2014	Rank 2013
Nottinghamshire	70.8	1	3
Oxfordshire	69.4	2	1
Devon	68.1	3	6
Derbyshire	68.3	4	2
West Sussex	67.5	5	4
North Yorkshire	66.6	6	5
Dorset	66.6	7	13
Hertfordshire	66.3	8	12
Hampshire	65.7	9	8
East Sussex	65.5	10	

Table 9 Helpfulness of drivers (PTBI 09)

Authority	Satisfaction score	Rank 2014	Rank 2013
Nottinghamshire	73.6	1	1
Devon	71.5	2	3
Oxfordshire	71.5	3	5
West Sussex	70.3	4	5
Derbyshire	69.2	5	2
Hertfordshire	68.8	6	12
Dorset	68.2	7	8
East Sussex	68.2	8	
Lincolnshire	68.1	9	7
North Lincolnshire	67.9	10	4

Table 10 The Local Bus Service Overall (PTBI 06)

Authority	Satisfaction score	Rank 2014	Rank 2013
West Sussex	67.8	1	3
Nottinghamshire	67.2	2	1
Oxfordshire	66.7	3	2
Devon	65.1	4	4
East Sussex	63.9	5	
Derbyshire	63.5	6	6
Gloucestershire	61.8	7	7
Norfolk	61.3	8	8
Hertfordshire	59.3	9	10
Surrey	59.3	10	11

Table 11 The clarity of information (PTBI 14)

Authority	Satisfaction score	Rank 2014	Rank 2013
Derbyshire	62.1	1	5
Nottinghamshire	63.0	2	1
Dorset	60.6	3	7
Devon	60.3	4	3
Oxfordshire	60.2	5	2
West Sussex	59.3	6	4
Gloucestershire	58.8	7	20
Hampshire	58.2	8	13
Surrey	57.6	9	9
North Yorkshire	57.3	10	6

Table 12 The state of bus stops (PTBI 03)

Authority	Satisfaction score	Rank 2014	Rank 2013
West Sussex	68.7	1	4
Oxfordshire	68.2	2	1
Nottinghamshire	67.5	3	3
Devon	66.4	4	8
Derbyshire	65.3	5	9
Dorset	65.0	6	5
Surrey	64.0	7	12
Norfolk	64.0	8	7
Lincolnshire	63.6	9	14
Hampshire	63.6	10	11

Table 13 Personal safety on the bus (PTBI 10)

Authority	Satisfaction score	Rank 2014	Rank 2013
Oxfordshire	72.8	1	1
Devon	72.2	2	2
Nottinghamshire	71.8	3	3
Derbyshire	71.1	4	5
North Yorkshire	71.0	5	4
Dorset	70.8	6	8
West Sussex	70.2	7	6
Cambridgeshire	69.5	8	7
Gloucestershire	69.4	9	13
Norfolk	69.4	10	14

Table 14 Frequency of bus services (PTBI 01)

Authority	Satisfaction score	Rank 2014	Rank 2013
West Sussex	66.1	1	4
Oxfordshire	65.7	2	2
Nottinghamshire	64.3	3	1
Derbyshire	62.1	4	5
Devon	61.3	5	3
Norfolk	61.2	6	7
Gloucestershire	61.1	7	6
East Sussex	61.1	8	
Staffordshire	58.3	9	9
Leicestershire	58.1	10	10

Table 15 The accuracy of information (PTBI 15)

Authority	Satisfaction score	Rank 2014	Rank 2013
Derbyshire	63.1	1	7
Devon	62.6	2	2
Nottinghamshire	62.0	3	1
Gloucestershire	61.8	4	12
West Sussex	61.5	5	6
Oxfordshire	61.1	6	3
Dorset	61.0	7	5
Hampshire	59.9	8	14
Buckinghamshire	59.3	9	17
Lincolnshire	59.3	10	20

Table 16 Raised kerb at bus stops (PTBI 12)

Authority	Satisfaction score	Rank 2014	Rank 2013
Derbyshire	69.8	1	2
Lincolnshire	68.9	2	1
Devon	68.3	3	5
Nottinghamshire	67.8	4	4
Hampshire	66.2	5	10
Oxfordshire	65.7	6	6
North Yorkshire	65.5	7	3
West Sussex	65.2	8	11
Essex	65.2	9	12
Leicestershire	65.2	10	8

Table 17 The amount of information (PTBI 13)

Authority	Satisfaction score	Rank 2014	Rank 2013
West Sussex	61.2	1	4
Devon	61.1	2	3
Derbyshire	60.8	3	5
Nottinghamshire	60.5	4	1
Oxfordshire	60.2	5	2
Dorset	58.9	6	7
Gloucestershire	57.5	7	23
Hampshire	57.1	8	13
Buckinghamshire	56.8	9	15
North Yorkshire	56.8	10	6

Table 18 The Reliability of Community Transport (PTBI 26)

Authority	Satisfaction score	Rank 2014	Rank 2013
Devon	60.8	1	5
Derbyshire	60.4	2	3
East Sussex	58.9	3	
Cambridgeshire	58.9	4	19
Nottinghamshire	58.6	5	10
Gloucestershire	58.6	6	18
Suffolk	58.3	7	12
West Sussex	57.9	8	6
Dorset	57.7	9	23
Essex	57.5	10	24

Table 19 Whether buses arrive on time (PTBI 04)

Authority	Satisfaction score	Rank 2014	Rank 2013
Gloucestershire	65.1	1	5
Derbyshire	64.1	2	16
Hertfordshire	63.2	3	8
West Sussex	63.1	4	1
Devon	62.7	5	6
Nottinghamshire	62.5	6	3
Lincolnshire	62.0	7	7
Norfolk	60.8	8	9
North Yorkshire	60.2	9	2
Dorset	60.1	10	12

Table 20 Personal safety while waiting at the bus stop (PTBI 11)

Authority	Satisfaction score	Rank 2014	Rank 2013
Devon	71.4	1	3
Oxfordshire	69.5	2	2
North Yorkshire	68.9	3	1
Derbyshire	68.5	4	6
Dorset	68.4	5	4
Nottinghamshire	68.0	6	5
Wiltshire	66.9	7	10
Cambridgeshire	66.4	8	11
West Sussex	66.4	9	7
Hertfordshire	66.4	10	14

**Transport and Travel Services
Local Performance Annual Indicators**

	Indicator	Actual 2014
1	Number of bus stops with raised kerbs	1,850
2	Number of bus stops	5,715
3	Number of bus shelters	1,400
4	Bus shelters per 1000 head of population)	1.73
5	Percentage of rural households within 800m of bus service	94%
6	Percentage of bus shelter repairs completed on time	95%
7	Expenditure on bus services per head of population	£6.40
8	Number of DDA compliant Local Bus Service vehicles	81%
9	Total cost of SEN transport provision	£5,600
10	Ave cost per pupil of mainstream school transport	£525
11	Ave cost of in-house Adult Social Care Transport	£8.20
12	Percentage of infrequent bus services running on time	85%
13	Cost of concessionary travel per pass issued	£58
14	Concessionary travel pass take up	81.5%

The above indicators are annual indicators and the 2015 actuals will be reported in quarter 1 2015/16.

19 March 2015**Agenda Item: 7****REPORT OF SERVICE DIRECTOR HIGHWAYS****INTEGRATED TRANSPORT AND HIGHWAY MAINTENANCE CAPITAL
PROGRAMMES 2015/16****Purpose of the Report**

1. The purpose of this report is to seek Committee approval for the integrated transport and highway maintenance capital programmes to be implemented during 2015/16. The proposed schemes are detailed in the appendices to this report.
2. The programmes are based on the Council's current Medium Term Financial Strategy and have been updated to reflect the latest announcements from government on highway capital maintenance grants and the Council's budget decisions for 2015/16.

Information and Advice**Major transport schemes**

3. Major transport schemes have historically been large transport schemes costing more than £5m. D2N2 determined that from 2015/16 major transport schemes will be defined as schemes that cost at least £2.4m but it should be noted that a minimum local contribution of 20% of any scheme cost is required.
4. It was reported previously at 9 October 2014 Transport & Highways Committee that the County Council has secured funding from the Local Growth Fund (LGF) for the following schemes in the county:
 - Gedling Access Road major transport scheme (£10.8m LGF contribution starting in 2017/18)
 - A57/A60/B6024/St Anne's Drive, Worksop roundabout major transport scheme (£1.83m LGF contribution starting in 2015/16)
 - Newark Southern Link Road (£7m LGF contribution starting in 2015/16)
 - Harworth access links (£2.05m LGF contribution starting in 2015/16).
5. The 2015/16 County Council major transport programme also includes Worksop Bus Station, funded directly by the County Council in partnership with Bassetlaw District Council; a contribution to the A453 HA trunk road project; and the Hucknall Town Centre improvement scheme funded directly by the DfT. Progress on the schemes being delivered during 2015/16 is as follows:
 - a. A57/A60/B6024/St Anne's Drive, Worksop roundabout improvements: Scheme design is underway and it is currently anticipated that works will commence in late 2015/16

- b. Newark Southern Link Road: Funded through the Local Growth Fund (LGF) and developer funding, the scheme will be delivered by the developer who is working to develop and submit a satisfactory business case for approval
 - c. Harworth Access Links: Funded through the LGF and developer funding, the County Council is working in partnership with the Sheffield City Region (SCR) to finalise a business case to be submitted to both the D2N2 and SCR Local Enterprise Partnerships for approval
 - d. Worksop Bus Station: Following the granting of planning approval, the required highway works to facilitate the new bus station were completed in July 2014. Main construction works started in September 2014 with completion scheduled for August 2015
 - e. A453 improvements: The works to widen the A453 and improve its junctions with side roads are on-going. The project continues on schedule with the offline section partially opening in August 2014 and urban section partially opening March 2015 (partially opened to allow for traffic management arrangements during construction); and the rural section scheduled to open in May 2015
 - f. Hucknall Town Centre Improvement Scheme: Planning approval was granted in December 2013. The Compulsory Purchase Order for the Hucknall Town Centre Improvement Scheme was formally approved by the Secretary of State for Transport in November 2014 and the DfT confirmed funding for the project on 9th February 2015. The detailed design work for the scheme is ongoing with construction expected to commence in Summer 2015. The scheme is scheduled for completion in early 2017
 - g. NET tram extension: Whilst the County Council has not directly funded the construction of the NET tram extensions (due to open later in 2015), it has supported the scheme through complementary measures and contributions to the financial assistance package.
6. Details of the funding allocated in 2015/16 by the County Council towards the costs of major transport schemes is detailed below:

	2015/16	Total
• A57/A60/B6024/St Anne's Drive, Worksop roundabout	£1.60m	£3.20m
• Worksop Bus Station	£0.90m	£ 3.20m
• A453 improvement (NCC contribution to £150m trunk road scheme)	£5.00m	£20.00m
• Hucknall Town Centre Improvement (note the 2015/16 figure does not include sums required for land purchase)	£5.61m	£12.48m
• NET tram	£0.30m	

Integrated transport block

7. From 2015/16 onwards government has top-sliced the integrated transport block capital (cash) grant and allocated it to the Local Growth Fund. This means that from 2015/16 onwards the funding allocated by the DfT to all highway authorities in England for integrated transport schemes will be reduced. In addition to this, the formula and data used to calculate each individual authority's allocation has been reviewed from 2015/16. These two changes to the central government funding arrangements have resulted in Nottinghamshire's integrated transport block grant funding reducing by 47% from £7.406m in 2014/15 to £3.916m in 2015/16.

8. The proposed 2015/16 sub-block allocations are shown in paragraph 16. A balanced range of integrated transport measures has been developed that contributes to delivering corporate priorities; national transport priorities; and the local transport goals and objectives. The sub-block allocations have been reviewed following the national funding reductions, resulting in large percentage reductions to the capacity and local centre improvement sub-blocks. These blocks should be eligible for Local Growth Funds due to their links to the economy. Given the reduction in funding, the allocation between the integrated transport sub-blocks reflects the need to be able to lever in addition funds, where match is often required, and to also take advantage of external funding opportunities to supplement the programme – with significant sums available for bus (section 106), cycling and health (section 106) and capacity improvements (external) during 2015/16. The proposed packages of measures (and the programme detailed in the appendices) reflect corporate commitments; a balance of member, public and stakeholder requests and priorities; evidence of need and value for money; delivery of the County Council's vision and transport objectives; and the ability to draw in external funding. The proposed integrated transport programme therefore reflects the above with significant funding allocated to the:
- Access to local facilities sub-block (e.g. footway improvements and new crossings to help people get to work, healthcare, shops etc.) in order to retain capacity to address existing community concerns and the most acute pressures associated with new developments, as well as match fund external funding sources such as Local Growth Fund, developer contributions and the EU structural and investment funding which require 50% match funding
 - Speed management sub-block to deliver the County Council's commitment to introduce 20mph speed limits outside schools (currently 2/3rds complete)
 - Local safety schemes sub-block to address the most acute road accident problems.
9. The Department for Transport maintenance settlement for 2015/16 is higher than anticipated which has allowed a re-allocation of £2m of committed highways capital funding (as reported in paragraph 44 of the 2015/16 County Council Budget Report). In addition to the £1m savings this allows and £500k allocated to County Capital funding (primarily to help fund Worksop Bus Station), an additional £500k has been allocated to integrated transport measures.
10. The integrated transport block and highway capital maintenance block budget allocations were determined at the 26th February 2015 County Council meeting and the allocation for integrated transport is detailed below:
- | | |
|---------------------------------|----------------|
| • Integrated Transport Measures | £4.416m |
| • Additional Road Safety | <u>£0.350m</u> |
| Total | £4.766m |
11. The detailed integrated transport programme (including the £350k additional road safety funding) is set out in Appendix 1 of this report.

Capital maintenance block

12. The highway capital maintenance block is used to carry out planned structural maintenance across a range of highways assets. Maintenance works are allocated across the seven districts in Nottinghamshire based on network/asset size and taking into account the condition of the highways assets. Prioritisation of the maintenance works programme

involves analysis of technical condition survey data, supplemented with local knowledge/judgement, customer enquiry information, inspection history, reactive maintenance costs, utility works and any other relevant information. This analysis is being stream-lined through the ongoing development of the highway asset management system. The proposed detailed highways capital maintenance programme is set out in appendix 2 of this report.

13. The highway capital maintenance block budget allocations for 2015/16 determined at the 26th February 2015 County Council meeting is detailed below:

• Highway capital maintenance	£14.920m
• Street lighting renewal/Energy saving	£ 2.364m
• Flood alleviation	<u>£ 1.076m</u>
Total	£18.360m

14. The survey of the street lighting stock is ongoing, necessitating the replacement of severely deteriorated columns as they are identified. The street lighting programme contains an element to cover such replacement.

15. A Challenge Fund bid has recently been submitted to the Department for Transport (DfT). This new fund is available for the next six years, with the first bid covering the three year period 2015/16 to 2017/18. The Nottinghamshire bid targets the unclassified main distributor road network (particularly those with local attractors such as schools, doctors' surgeries, local shops etc.) and takes the form of a whole street approach whereby all elements of the highway are maintained for the associated street section. The value of the bid is £13.86m over the three year period and the DfT are expected to announce the successful bids in early Spring 2015.

Detailed allocations

16. The proposed capital spending levels for different integrated transport and highway maintenance sub-blocks based on the provisional 2015/16 allocations are set out in the table below, along with details of the 2014/15 allocations for comparative purposes.

2014/15 actual allocations and proposed 2015/16 allocations

Major schemes	2014/15 (£m)	2015/16 (£m)
A453 Improvement	5.000	5.000
Worksop Bus Station	2.460	0.900
Hucknall Town Centre Improvement	3.480	5.610
A57/A60/B6024/St Anne's Drive, Worksop roundabout	-	1.600
Integrated Transport Measures		
Access to local facilities (e.g. footway improvements and new crossings)	1.100	1.006
Bus improvements (e.g. bus stop infrastructure and bus stop clearways)	0.720	0.400
Capacity improvements (e.g. traffic signal and junction improvements to reduce congestion)	1.100	0.100
Cycling and health (e.g. multi user routes and cycling improvements)	0.666	0.450
Environmental weight limits (e.g. HGV weight limits and HGV route signing)	0.050	0.065
Local centre improvements (e.g. environmental improvements to improve	0.200	0

vitality)		
Traffic monitoring and advanced development and design of future schemes	0.420	0.420
Parking (e.g. review of parking in town centres, and delivery and review of new residents' parking schemes)	0.100	0.050
Public transport interchanges (e.g. bus station and rail station improvements)	0.150	0
Rail improvements (e.g. small scale improvements to services and stations as well as feasibility studies on large scale improvements)	0.100	0.050
Safety improvements (e.g. local safety schemes and safer routes to school)	0.950	0.725
Smarter choices (e.g. measures to help people access work by bus or walking and support for businesses developing travel plans)	0.200	0.150
Speed management (e.g. addressing local speed concerns, 20mph speed limits and interactive signs)	1.200	1.000
Total integrated transport measures	6.956	4.416
Additional road safety	0.350	0.350
Highway Maintenance		
Carriageway maintenance (A, B & C, Unclassified roads)	6.795	6.645
Surface dressing (including pre-patching)	2.500	3.300
Footway maintenance	1.050	1.030
Bridges (including condition assessments)	1.200	1.265
Traffic signal renewal	0.350	0.350
Safety fencing	0.300	0.350
Structural drainage	0.500	0.500
Flood alleviation	0.600	1.076
Street lighting renewal and improvement	1.000	1.300
Street lighting energy saving (including Salix Grant Funding)	1.572	1.364
Network structural patching	1.174	1.180
Maintenance of integrated transport assets	0.200	0.000
Total capital maintenance allocation	17.241	18.360

17. The integrated transport and highway capital maintenance programmes, detailing the proposed schemes to be delivered during 2015/16 are attached as appendices 1 and 2 respectively to this report. These programmes take account of comments raised and additional schemes suggested following approval of the provisional programme at October Committee. Each of the schemes is still subject to the necessary consultation, statutory undertakings and other issues arising from feasibility studies, detailed scheme investigation, design and consultation.
18. Work is ongoing to identify, secure and maximise external funding opportunities for integrated transport measure improvements (such as developer contributions) and the attached appendices also include the schemes utilising external funding. To date a total of £914,000 external funding has been identified for potential use on schemes to be delivered during 2015/16. £664,000 of the £914,000 has already been secured (including £250,000 for the Kirkby in Ashfield town centre improvement scheme). The remaining £250,000 funding is dependent on development occurring and/or successful pending applications for the funding.

Other Options Considered

19. Other options considered are set out within this report. Whilst the highway capital programmes are detailed within the appendices to this report, scheme development work is underway for future years' programmes as well as feasibility work on schemes which have been included as reserve schemes in the 2015/16 financial year's programme. Reserve schemes could potentially be delivered during the 2015/16 financial year should other schemes become undeliverable or if other funding sources become available enabling schemes to be brought forward.

Reason/s for Recommendation/s

20. The capital programmes detailed within this report and its appendices have been developed to help ensure delivery of County Council priorities, national priorities and local transport goals and objectives. The packages of measures and the programmes detailed in the appendices have been developed to reflect a balance of member, public and stakeholder requests and priorities, evidence of need (including technical analysis), value for money (including the co-ordination of works) and delivery of the County Council's vision and transport objectives.

Statutory and Policy Implications

21. This report has been compiled after consideration of implications in respect of crime and disorder, finance, human resources, human rights, the NHS Constitution (Public Health only), the public sector equality duty, safeguarding of children and vulnerable adults, service users, sustainability and the environment and ways of working and where such implications are material they are described below. Appropriate consultation has been undertaken and advice sought on these issues as required.

RECOMMENDATION/S

- 1) It is recommended that Committee:
 - a) approve the proposed integrated transport block programme for implementation as contained in this report and detailed in Appendix 1
 - b) approve the proposed highway capital maintenance programme for implementation as contained in this report and detailed in Appendix 2.

Neil Hodgson
Interim Service Director Highways

For any enquiries about this report please contact:
Sean Parks – Local Transport Plan manager

Constitutional Comments (27/02/2015 – SJE)

22. This decision falls within the Terms of Reference of the Transport & Highways Committee to whom responsibility for the exercise of the Authority's functions relating to the planning, management and maintenance of highways has been delegated.

Financial Comments (06/03/2015 - GB)

23. The main Department for Transport allocations and County Council funding required to fund the Transport and Highways capital programme is approved within the current capital programme. Recent notification of additional external funding, particularly with respect to the Local Growth Fund, is required to be reported through the usual approval process.

Background Papers and Published Documents

- Integrated transport and highway maintenance capital programmes 2015/16 Transport & Highways Committee report – 1 October 2014
- Nottinghamshire Local Transport Plan Strategy 2011/12-2025/26
- Nottinghamshire Local Transport Plan Implementation Plan 2011/12-2014/15
- Nottinghamshire Local Transport Plan Evidence Base 2010

Electoral Division(s) and Member(s) Affected

- All

2015/16 Integrated transport capital programme

Sub-block/scheme	Area	Scheme budget (£000)	Programmed for delivery
Access to local facilities			
Belle Isle Road (across Gilbert Street), Hucknall - dropped kerbs	Ashfield	≤£10k	Quarter 1
Dalestorth Street - Skegby Road, Sutton - access improvements [carry over from 2014/15]	Ashfield	£25k-£50k	Quarter 2
Derbyshire Lane (across Belle Isle Road), Hucknall - dropped kerbs	Ashfield	≤£10k	Quarter 1
Parkway (west of Windsor Avenue), Sutton in Ashfield - dropped kerbs	Ashfield	≤£10k	Quarter 1
Hardy Street, Worksop - pedestrian improvements	Bassetlaw	£25k-£50k	Quarter 1
Railway station approaches, Retford - pedestrian improvements	Bassetlaw	£25k-£50k	Quarter 3
ROW Rampton village centre - paths improvement	Bassetlaw	£25k-£50k	To be programmed
Clifford Avenue (across Central Avenue), Beeston - dropped kerbs	Broxtowe	≤£10k	Quarter 1
Pasture Road, Stapleford - new pedestrian crossing	Broxtowe	£50k-£100k	Quarter 2
Great Northern Way, Netherfield - new pedestrian crossing	Gedling	≤£10k	Quarter 1
Princess Close, Gedling - dropped kerbs	Gedling	≤£10k	Quarter 1
Station Road, Carlton - pedestrian crossing and footway	Gedling	£50k-£100k	Quarter 4
Exchange Row / Market House Place, Mansfield - dropped kerb	Mansfield	≤£10k	Quarter 2
B6030 / B6034 junction, Edwinstowe - dropped kerbs and footway [subject to completion of feasibility study]	Newark & Sherwood	£10k-£25k	To be programmed
Church Street, Southwell - pedestrian crossing improvements	Newark & Sherwood	≤£10k	Quarter 1
Main Street, Farnsfield - pedestrian crossing	Newark & Sherwood	£25k-£50k	Quarter 2
ROW Lincoln Road recreation ground - paths improvement	Newark & Sherwood	£10k-£25k	To be programmed
Bolton Close, West Bridgford - dropped kerbs	Rushcliffe	≤£10k	Quarter 1
Gotham Road (north of Lantern Lane), East Leake - new pedestrian crossing	Rushcliffe	£50k-£100k	Quarter 2
Kegworth Road, Gotham - improvements to pedestrian refuge	Rushcliffe	≤£10k	Quarter 3
<u>New schemes added to the programme since draft approval</u>			
Kilton Hill/High Hoe Road/Kilton Road, Worksop - pedestrian crossing (scheme dependent on securing external funding)	Bassetlaw	£50k-£100k	To be programmed
Meadow Lane, Chilwell - pedestrian refuge [subject to final costs of moving utilities]	Broxtowe	£25k-£50k	To be programmed
Crookdole Lane, Calverton - zebra crossing	Gedling	£25k-£50k	To be programmed
Chesterfield Road (at Rosemary Street), Mansfield - pedestrian facilities at signals	Mansfield	£50k-£100k	To be programmed
Camelot Street area, Ruddington - dropped kerbs (scheme dependent on securing external funding)	Rushcliffe	≤£10k	To be programmed
Clifton Road, Ruddington - new footway	Rushcliffe	£25k-£50k	To be programmed
<u>Schemes removed from the programme since draft approval</u>			
A38 / Alfreton Road, Sutton in Ashfield - pedestrian phase at signals (<i>high cost of scheme means it offers poor value for money</i>)	Ashfield		
Highways fees to deliver the above schemes		£100k-£200k	
<u>Reserve schemes</u>			
Sutton Road, Huthwaite - crossing [subject to completion of feasibility study]	Ashfield	£25k-£50k	
Sub-block allocation		£1,006.0	
External funding		£210.0	
Sub-block total		£1,216.0	

Sub-block/scheme	Area	Scheme budget (£000)	Programmed for delivery
Bus improvements			
Sutton in Ashfield and Kirkby in Ashfield- raised kerb programme	Ashfield	£10k-£25k	Quarter 2

2015/16 Integrated transport capital programme

Mansfield to Sutton - AVL TLP	Ashfield/Mansfield	≤£10k	Quarter 1
Retford and Worksop - real time displays	Bassetlaw	£50k-£100k	To be programmed
Worksop - SQBP route improvements	Bassetlaw	£25k-£50k	Quarter 2
Bus stop clearways and TROs	Countywide	£10k-£25k	To be programmed
Reactive programme	Countywide	£50k-£100k	To be programmed
Mansfield - bus stop improvements	Mansfield	≤£10k	To be programmed
Mansfield - raised kerb programme	Mansfield	£10k-£25k	To be programmed
Mansfield - shelter improvements	Mansfield	£10k-£25k	To be programmed
Clifton Road near Camelot Street, Ruddington - bus stop improvements	Rushcliffe	£10k-£25k	Quarter 1
Plumtree Road near Bakers Close, Cotgrave - bus stop improvements	Rushcliffe	£10k-£25k	Quarter 1
West Bridgford - enforcement camera programme	Rushcliffe	≤£10k	Quarter 3
<u>New schemes added to the programme since draft approval</u>			
Hardy Street, Worksop - removal of existing bus infrastructure when new bus station opens	Bassetlaw	£10k-£25k	To be programmed
Calverton - bus stop improvements	Gedling	£50k-£100k	Quarter 2
Calverton Road, Arnold - real-time, shelter and kerb bus stop improvements	Gedling	£25k-£50k	To be programmed
Valley Road, Carlton - real-time, shelter and kerb bus stop improvements	Gedling	£10k-£25k	To be programmed
Kirklington Road, Rainworth - real-time, shelter and kerb bus stop improvements (scheme dependent on securing external funding)	Newark & Sherwood	£25k-£50k	To be programmed
Low Street, Collingham - real-time, shelter and kerb bus stop improvements (scheme dependent on securing external funding)	Newark & Sherwood	≤£10k	To be programmed
Mansfield Road, Edwinstowe - real-time, shelter and kerb bus stop improvements (scheme dependent on securing external funding)	Newark & Sherwood	£10k-£25k	To be programmed
<u>Schemes removed from the programme since draft approval (and reason for removal)</u>			
Mansfield - enforcement camera programme (further feasibility shows scheme not required)	Mansfield		
Highways fees to deliver the above schemes		£25k-£50k	
Passenger transport fees to deliver the above schemes		£50k-£100k	
Sub-block allocation		£400.0	
External funding		£244.0	
Sub-block total		£644.0	

Sub-block/scheme	Area	Scheme budget (£000)	Programmed for delivery
Capacity improvements			
<u>New schemes added to the programme since draft approval</u>			
Kirkby town centre improvements	Ashfield	> £250k	Quarter 2
Noise action plan - noise remediation (locations to be determined)	Countywide	£10k-£25k	To be programmed
B686 Burton Road/Station Road/Cavendish Road, Carlton - contribution to improvement	Gedling	£25k-£50k	To be programmed
New Mill Lane/Leeming Lane North (A60), Mansfield Woodhouse - right-turn filter on to A60	Mansfield	≤£10k	To be programmed
Highways fees to deliver the above schemes		≤£10k	
Sub-block allocation		£100.0	
External funding		£250.0	
Sub-block total		£350.0	

2015/16 Integrated transport capital programme

Sub-block/scheme	Area	Scheme budget (£000)	Programmed for delivery
Cycling and health			
Cycle signing/parking (locations to be determined)	Countywide	≤£10k	To be programmed
Rights of Way signing improvements	Countywide	≤£10k	To be programmed
Rights of Way upgrades	Countywide	£10k-£25k	To be programmed
Big Barn Lane, Mansfield - signed cycle route [subject to completion of feasibility study]	Mansfield	≤£10k	Quarter 1
B6030 Sherwood Pines to Mill Lane - cycle way	Newark & Sherwood	£25k-£50k	Quarter 2
A60 Loughborough Road, West Bridgford - toucan crossing (scheme dependent on securing external funding)	Rushcliffe	£50k-£100k	To be programmed
Clifton Road, Ruddington - cycle route (scheme dependent on securing external funding)	Rushcliffe	£100k-£150k	Quarter 3
Northwold Ave/Collington Way, West Bridgford - cycle route	Rushcliffe	£25k-£50k	Quarter 2
<u>New schemes added to the programme since draft approval</u>			
NCN Route 6, Hucknall - cycle route improvements	Ashfield	£25k-£50k	To be programmed
Bridleway 14 and 16, Trowell and Cossall - surfacing	Broxtowe	≤£10k	To be programmed
Acton Road/ High Street Avenue, Arnold - cycle route access	Gedling	≤£10k	Quarter 1
Footpath 11, Balderton - completion of link to NCN 64	Newark & Sherwood	£10k-£25k	To be programmed
West Bridgford - area wide 20 mph speed limit	Rushcliffe	£25k-£50k	To be programmed
A606 Melton Road, West Bridgford - conversion of footway to shared use footway/cycleway	Rushcliffe	£10k-£25k	To be programmed
<u>Schemes removed from the programme since draft approval</u> (and reason for removal)			
Southwell Lane to Penny Emma Way, Kirkby - multi-user route (high cost of scheme means it offers poor value for money)	Ashfield		
Stapleford to Ilkeston - cycle route (scheme not feasible)	Broxtowe		
St Albans Road, Arnold - cycle route access (replaced with alternative route on Acton Road)	Gedling		
Highways fees to deliver the above schemes		£50k-£100k	
	Sub-block allocation	£450.0	
	External funding	£210.0	
	Sub-block total	£660.0	

Sub-block/scheme	Area	Scheme budget (£000)	Programmed for delivery
Environmental weight limits			
Advance EWL warning signs	Countywide	£10k-£25k	Quarter 1
Blidworth - EWL extension	Newark & Sherwood	£10k-£25k	Quarter 3
<u>New schemes added to the programme since draft approval:</u>			
Thievesdale Lane, Worksop - unsuitable for HGVs signage	Bassetlaw	≤£10k	To be programmed
Highways fees to deliver the above schemes		£10k-£25k	
<u>Reserve schemes</u>			
Lilac Grove, Beeston - new weight restriction	Broxtowe	≤£10k	
	Sub-block allocation	£65.0	
	External funding	£0.0	

Sub-block total **£65.0**

Sub-block/scheme	Area	Scheme budget (£000)	Programmed for delivery
Monitoring, development and design			
Development of future year's ITM programmes	Countywide	£100k-£150k	Quarter 4
Advanced design of future schemes	Countywide	£100k-£150k	Quarter 4
Technical surveys	Countywide	£10k-£25k	Quarter 4
Traffic monitoring	Countywide	£100k-£150k	Quarter 4
Sub-block allocation		£420.0	
External funding		£0.0	
Sub-block total		£420.0	

Sub-block/scheme	Area	Scheme budget (£000)	Programmed for delivery
Parking			
NET - waiting restrictions	Broxtowe / Rushcliffe Mansfield	£10k-£25k	To be programmed
Stanley Road, Mansfield - amendments to existing scheme		≤£10k	To be programmed
Highways fees to deliver the above schemes		£10k-£25k	
Reserve schemes			
Dovecote Lane near Victoria PH, Beeston - amendments to parking restrictions	Broxtowe	≤£10k	
Grosvenor Road, Eastwood - alterations to existing scheme	Broxtowe	≤£10k	
Lower & Middle Orchard Streets, Stapleford - new residents' parking scheme [subject to survey]	Broxtowe	≤£10k	
Epperstone Road, West Bridgford - new residents' parking scheme [subject to survey]	Broxtowe	≤£10k	
Sub-block allocation		£50.0	
External funding		£0.0	
Sub-block total		£50.0	

Sub-block/scheme	Area	Scheme budget (£000)	Programmed for delivery
Rail improvements			
Nottingham to Leeds journey time upgrade	Countywide	£25k-£50k	Quarter 4
Collingham yellow lines	Newark & Sherwood	≤£10k	Quarter 4
Ollerton feasibility study	Newark & Sherwood	≤£10k	Quarter 4
Sub-block allocation		£50.0	
External funding		£0.0	
Sub-block total		£50.0	

2015/16 Integrated transport capital programme

Sub-block/scheme	Area	Scheme budget (£000)	Programmed for delivery
Safety improvements			
A38 Pinxton Lane - traffic signal modifications	Ashfield	£10k-£25k	Quarter 1
A611 Coxmoor Crossroads - signs at ATS banned right turn	Ashfield	≤£10k	Quarter 2
Alfreton Road, Selston - chevrons	Ashfield	≤£10k	Quarter 1
Chesterfield Road, Huthwaite (bend N Woodend Inn PH - signing and lining improvements	Ashfield	≤£10k	Quarter 1
Chesterfield Road, Huthwaite (bends at Newtonwood Lane) - improved signs	Ashfield	≤£10k	Quarter 1
Storth Ave / Croft Ave, Hucknall - signing and lining improvements	Ashfield	≤£10k	Quarter 2
A614/A638 Hawks Nest - lining improvements	Bassetlaw	≤£10k	Quarter 2
A638 length north and south of Amcott Way - speed management	Bassetlaw	> £250k	Quarter 2
B6079 Retford Road, Worksop - chevrons, warning signing and lining improvements	Bassetlaw	≤£10k	Quarter 2
Cheapside / Low Town Street, Worksop - build out at gateway	Bassetlaw	£10k-£25k	Quarter 2
Kilton Road, Worksop - street lighting upgrade	Bassetlaw	≤£10k	To be programmed
Park Street / Bramcote Road, Beeston - signing and lining improvements	Broxtowe	≤£10k	Quarter 2
A60 Mansfield Road / Forest Lane, Papplewick - traffic signal modifications	Gedling	≤£10k	Quarter 1
Collyer Road, Calverton - street lighting upgrade	Gedling	£25k-£50k	Quarter 2
Jubilee Way South/Tesco & Cuckoo Birch PH - signing, lining and high friction surfacing	Mansfield	£10k-£25k	Quarter 2
Ley Lane, Mansfield Woodhouse - street lighting upgrade	Mansfield	£10k-£25k	Quarter 2
Priory Square, Mansfield Woodhouse - street lighting upgrade	Mansfield	≤£10k	Quarter 2
Windmill Lane approach to Brunts School, Mansfield - signing improvements	Mansfield	≤£10k	Quarter 1
A6075 Whinney Lane mini-roundabout, Ollerton - signing improvements	Newark & Sherwood	≤£10k	Quarter 2
A612 Thurgarton (bend south of High Cross) - marker posts	Newark & Sherwood	≤£10k	Quarter 1
A616 Wellow Rd, Ollerton - street lighting upgrade	Newark & Sherwood	£10k-£25k	To be programmed
A617 Kirklington (bend adjacent to 'Top o' the Hill' - chevrons and warning sign	Newark & Sherwood	≤£10k	Quarter 2
B6386 Southwell Road (at Hollybeck Nurseries), Oxtun - signing and lining improvements	Newark & Sherwood	≤£10k	Quarter 1
Baulker Lane, Blidworth - two bends chevrons and warning sign	Newark & Sherwood	≤£10k	Quarter 2
Grange Lane, Staunton in the Vale - chevrons and warning sign	Newark & Sherwood	≤£10k	To be programmed
South Avenue /Little John Drive area, Rainworth - signing and lining improvements	Newark & Sherwood	≤£10k	Quarter 2
A60 Loughborough Road/Asda, West Bridgford - traffic signal modifications	Rushcliffe	£10k-£25k	Quarter 2
C51 West Leake Lane (bend adjacent to Winking Hill) - stick chevrons	Rushcliffe	≤£10k	Quarter 1
C51 West Leake Lane (bend at EON) - surface dressing and lining improvements	Rushcliffe	≤£10k	Quarter 1
Kegworth Road/Station Road/The Green, Kingston - signing and lining improvements	Rushcliffe	≤£10k	Quarter 3
Main Road, Plumtree - street lighting upgrade	Rushcliffe	£10k-£25k	To be programmed
Nottingham Road, Woodborough - stick chevrons	Rushcliffe	≤£10k	To be programmed
Rushcliffe (including Melton Rd, Upper Broughton) - contribution to two resurfacing schemes	Rushcliffe	≤£10k	To be programmed
Shelford Road / Oatfield Lane, Newton - signing and lining improvements	Rushcliffe	≤£10k	Quarter 1
Wilford Road vicinity Clifton Road, Ruddington - street lighting upgrade	Rushcliffe	£10k-£25k	Quarter 3
<u>New schemes added to the programme since draft approval</u>			
Old London Road bridge over Chesterfield Canal Barnby Moor	Bassetlaw	£100k-£150k	To be programmed
A612 Gonalston - amendment to white lining (contribution to maintenance scheme)	Newark & Sherwood	≤£10k	To be programmed
A6075 Kirton - street lighting upgrade	Newark & Sherwood	£10k-£25k	To be programmed
<u>Schemes removed from the programme since draft approval</u> (and reason for removal)			
Lammas Road/Carsic Lane - lane narrowing at junction (scheme to be delivered as part of 2015/16 maintenance scheme)	Ashfield		
Pump Hollow Road, Mansfield - street lighting upgrade (scheme already completed as part of street lighting scheme)	Mansfield		

2015/16 Integrated transport capital programme

Sandlands Way ASDA entrance, Mansfield - signs, lines and high friction surfacing (<i>scheme does not meet required rate of return</i>) A617 Kelham Road (S of Kelham Bridge) - high friction surfacing (<i>delivered as part of 2014/15 maintenance scheme</i>) Southwell Rd, Osmanthorpe - chevrons (<i>scheme delivered in 2014/15</i>) Staythorpe Rd Staythorpe (S of level crossing) - stick chevrons (<i>scheme being delivered in 2014/15</i>) Highways fees to deliver the above schemes <u>Reserve schemes:</u> High Street, Arnold - pedestrian improvements	Mansfield Newark & Sherwood Newark & Sherwood Newark & Sherwood	£100k-£150k	
	Gedling	≤£10k	
Sub-block allocation		£725.0	
External funding		£0.0	
Sub-block total		£350.0	
		£1,075.0	

Sub-block/scheme	Area	Scheme budget (£000)	Programmed for delivery
Smarter choices			
LSTF match funding	Countywide	£25k-£50k	Quarter 4
Personalised travel planning along NET routes	Broxtowe / Rushcliffe	£25k-£50k	Quarter 4
Trent Bridge Air Quality Management Area - workplace travel planning	Rushcliffe	£25k-£50k	Quarter 4
Rushcliffe Business Park, Ruddington - workplace travel planning	Rushcliffe	≤£10k	Quarter 4
Sub-block allocation		£150.0	
External funding		£0.0	
Sub-block total		£150.0	

2015/16 Integrated transport capital programme

Sub-block/scheme	Area	Scheme budget (£000)	Programmed for delivery
Speed management			
20mph speed limits outside schools - see list of schools below	Countywide	> £250k	Quarter 3
<u>Interactive speed signs</u> (each sign costs approximately £7,500)			
Annesley Lane, Selston (NE of Sherwood Way)	Ashfield	≤£10k	Quarter 3
A614 Bawtry Road (N of A1 and brook)	Bassetlaw	≤£10k	Quarter 3
A634 Sheffield Road, Blyth (West of Park Drive)	Bassetlaw	≤£10k	Quarter 3
B1164 Eldon Street, Tuxford (N of Eldon Green)	Bassetlaw	≤£10k	Quarter 3
Woodthorpe Drive, Woodthorpe (E of Grange Road)	Gedling	≤£10k	Quarter 3
C1 Southwell Road East, Rainworth (E of Cambridge Road)	Newark	≤£10k	Quarter 3
Landmere Lane, West Bridgford (NW of Bressingham Drive)	Rushcliffe	≤£10k	Quarter 3
Trevor Road, West Bridgford (S of Burleigh Road)	Rushcliffe	≤£10k	Quarter 3
<u>New interactive speed signs added to the programme since draft approval</u>			
B600 Alfreton Road (SW of Beech Road), Underwood	Ashfield	≤£10k	Quarter 3
Thievesdale Lane (W of Blyth Road), Worksop	Bassetlaw	≤£10k	To be programmed
Newark Road (N of old railway line), Ollerton	Newark	≤£10k	Quarter 3
A60 Loughborough Road (N of school or N of lane to Wysall), Bunny	Rushcliffe	≤£10k	Quarter 3
A606 Melton Road (NW of Browns Lane), Stanton on the Wolds	Rushcliffe	≤£10k	Quarter 3
<u>New speed limit reductions added to the programme since draft approval</u>			
B6014 Wild Hill/Fackley Road, Teversal - speed limit reduction to 50mph from county boundary & speed limit reduction to 30mph through village	Ashfield	≤£10k	To be programmed
Sturton Road, North Leverton - extension of 30mph limit	Bassetlaw	≤£10k	To be programmed
A6075 Boughton to Tuxford - speed limit reduction to 50mph & extension of 30mph through Kirton	Bassetlaw/Newark & Sherwood	≤£10k	To be programmed
Nottingham Road, Trowell - extension of 30mph limit & speed limit reduction to 50mph	Broxtowe	≤£10k	To be programmed
B6386 Oxtown Road, Calverton - speed limit reduction to 50mph	Gedling	≤£10k	To be programmed
New Mill Lane, Mansfield - 40mph buffer zone	Mansfield	≤£10k	To be programmed
B6166 Farndon Road, Newark - extension of 30mph limit	Newark & Sherwood	≤£10k	To be programmed
A606 Melton Road, Tollerton Lane to A46 - speed limit reduction to 50mph (retaining 40mph through Stanton on the Wolds)	Rushcliffe	≤£10k	To be programmed
<u>Schemes removed from the programme since draft approval</u> (and reason for removal)			
B6011 Linby Lane, Linby (NE of Quarry Lane) - interactive speed sign (location already has interactive speed sign)	Gedling		
Burntstump, Papplewick - reduced speed limit (considered to offer poor value compared to other requests)	Gedling		
Highways fees to deliver the above schemes		£150k-£200k	
Sub-block allocation		£1,000.0	
External funding		£0.0	
Sub-block total		£1,000.0	

ITM budget settlement (2014/15 budget book)	£4,416.0
External funding	£914.0
PROGRAMME TOTAL (available integrated transport budget plus external funding)	£5,330.0

2015/16 Integrated transport capital programme

20mph speed limits outside schools 2015/16 programme

All schools that have not had a 20mph speed limit installed outside it by the end of 2014/15 will be included in the 2015/16 programme. This is likely to include the following schools.

Hillocks Primary and Nursery School, Sutton in Ashfield	Ashfield
The Sutton Community Academy, Sutton in Ashfield	Ashfield
Bracken Lane Primary & Nursery School, Retford	Bassetlaw
Cuckney CofE Primary School, Cuckney	Bassetlaw
Elizabethan Academy, Retford	Bassetlaw
Elkesley Primary & Nursery School, Elkesley	Bassetlaw
Gamston CofE Primary School, Gamston, Retford	Bassetlaw
Haggonfields Primary School, Rhodesia, Worksop	Bassetlaw
Langold Dyscarr Community Primary School, Langold	Bassetlaw
Misson Primary, Misson	Bassetlaw
Ordsall Primary School, Retford	Bassetlaw
Ranby CE Primary School, Ranby	Bassetlaw
Ranskill Primary School, Ranskill	Bassetlaw
Sir Edmund Hillary Primary School, Worksop	Bassetlaw
St Mary & St Martin Primary School, Blyth	Bassetlaw
St. Anne's CofE Primary School, Worksop	Bassetlaw
St. Augustine's Infant & Nursery, Worksop	Bassetlaw
St. Augustine's Junior School, Worksop	Bassetlaw
St. Matthew's CofE Primary School, Normanton on Trent	Bassetlaw
Sutton-Cum-Lound CofE Primary School, Sutton-Cum-Lound	Bassetlaw
Thrumpton Primary School, Retford	Bassetlaw
Brinsley Primary School, Brinsley	Broxtowe
Trowell CofE School, Trowell	Broxtowe
Abbey Gates Primary, Ravenshead	Gedling
Burton Joyce Primary, Burton Joyce	Gedling
Hawthorne Primary, Bestwood Village	Gedling
Lambley Primary, Lambley	Gedling
Ravenshead CofE Primary School, Ravenshead	Gedling
Seeley CofE Primary, Burnstump Hill	Gedling
Woodborough Woods Primary, Woodborough	Gedling
Berry Hill Primary, Mansfield	Mansfield
Birklands Primary and Nursery, Warsop	Mansfield
Church Vale Primary and Nursery, Church Warsop	Mansfield
Crescent Primary and Nursery, Mansfield	Mansfield
Eastlands Junior School, Meden Vale	Mansfield
Forest Town Primary & Nursery, Forest Town	Mansfield
Garibaldi Maths & Computing College, Forest Town	Mansfield
Heatherley Primary School, Forest Town	Mansfield
Heathlands Primary & Nursery, Rainworth	Mansfield
Hetts Lane Infant & Nursery, Warsop	Mansfield
High Oakham Primary School, Mansfield	Mansfield
Holly Primary School, Forest Town	Mansfield
John T Rice Infant & Nursery, Forest Town	Mansfield
King Edward School, Littleworth	Mansfield
Leas Park Junior School, Mansfield Woodhouse	Mansfield
Meden School 'A Torch Academy', Warsop	Mansfield

2015/16 Integrated transport capital programme

Netherfield Infant & Nursery School, Meden Vale	Mansfield
Nettleworth Infant & Nursery School, Mansfield Woodhouse	Mansfield
Newlands Junior School, Forest Town	Mansfield
Peafield Lane Primary & Nursery, Mansfield Woodhouse	Mansfield

20mph speed limits outside schools (continued)	
Queen Elizabeth's Academy, Mansfield	Mansfield
Sherwood Junior School, Warsop	Mansfield
St Edmunds CofE Primary & Nursery, Mansfield Woodhouse	Mansfield
St Patrick's Catholic Primary, Mansfield	Mansfield
The Brunts Academy, Mansfield	Mansfield
The Manor Academy, Mansfield Woodhouse	Mansfield
The Samworth Church Academy, Mansfield	Mansfield
Wynndale Academy, Mansfield	Mansfield
Yeoman Park School, Mansfield Woodhouse	Mansfield
All Saints Anglican Methodist Primary School, Elston, Newark	Newark & Sherwood
Bishop Alexander Primary and Nursery School, Newark	Newark & Sherwood
Bleasby CofE Primary School, Bleasby	Newark & Sherwood
Blidworth Oaks Primary and Nursery School, Blidworth	Newark & Sherwood
Coddington CofE Primary and Nursery, Coddington	Newark & Sherwood
Crompton View Primary School, Bilsthorpe	Newark & Sherwood
Farnsfield St. Michael's CE Primary, Farnsfield	Newark & Sherwood
Gunthorpe CofE Primary School, Gunthorpe	Newark & Sherwood
Halam CofE Primary School, Halam, Newark	Newark & Sherwood
Holy Trinity RC Primary and Nursery School, Newark	Newark & Sherwood
John Blow Primary School, Collingham	Newark & Sherwood
Joseph Whittaker School, Rainworth	Newark & Sherwood
King Edwin Primary and Nursery, Edwinstowe	Newark & Sherwood
Kirklington Primary School, Kirklington	Newark & Sherwood
Lake View Primary and Nursery School, Rainworth	Newark & Sherwood
Lowdham CofE School, Lowdham	Newark & Sherwood
Manners Sutton Primary School, Averham	Newark & Sherwood
Muskham Primary School, North Muskham	Newark & Sherwood

20mph speed limits outside schools (continued)	
Norwell CofE Primary School, Norwell	Newark & Sherwood
Python Hill Primary School, Rainworth	Newark & Sherwood
Samuel Barlow Primary and Nursery, Clipstone	Newark & Sherwood
St. Mary's CofE Primary School, Edwinstowe	Newark & Sherwood
St. Peter's CofE Primary School, Farndon	Newark & Sherwood
Sutton-on-Trent Primary School, Sutton-on-Trent	Newark & Sherwood
Walesby CofE Primary School, Walesby	Newark & Sherwood
Winthorpe Primary School, Winthorpe	Newark & Sherwood
Archbishop Cranmer CofE Primary, Aslockton	Rushcliffe
Bunny CofE Primary School, Bunny	Rushcliffe
Carnarvon Primary School, Bingham	Rushcliffe
Cotgrave CofE Primary School, Cotgrave	Rushcliffe
Cropwell Bishop Primary School, Cropwell Bishop	Rushcliffe
Crossdale Drive Primary School, Keyworth	Rushcliffe
Gotham Primary School, Gotham	Rushcliffe
Kinoulton Primary School, Kinoulton	Rushcliffe
Langar CofE Primary School, Langar	Rushcliffe

2015/16 Integrated transport capital programme

Normanton on Soar Primary School, Normanton on Soar	Rushcliffe
Orston Primary School, Orston	Rushcliffe
Robert Miles Infant School, Bingham	Rushcliffe
Robert Miles Junior School, Bingham	Rushcliffe
St Peter's CofE Junior School, Ruddington	Rushcliffe
St Peter's CofE Primary School, East Bridgford	Rushcliffe
Sutton Bonington Primary School, Sutton Bonington	Rushcliffe
The South Wolds Academy, Keyworth	Rushcliffe
Tollerton Primary School, Tollerton	Rushcliffe
Toot Hill School, Bingham	Rushcliffe
Willoughby Primary School, Willoughby on the Wolds	Rushcliffe
Willow Brook Primary School, Keyworth	Rushcliffe

2015/16 Capital maintenance programme

Sub-block/scheme	Area	Scheme budget (£000)	Programmed for delivery
Bridges			
B1164 South of Palmer Lane, Sutton	Ashfield	≤ £50k	Quarter 1
A60 Wigthorpe culvert	Bassetlaw	≤ £50k	Quarter 1
Lower Bagthorpe, Bagthorpe	Bassetlaw	≤ £50k	Quarter 1
Clarborough Gantries	Bassetlaw	≤ £50k	Quarter 2
A60 Bridge Street subway, Mansfield	Mansfield	£50-250k	Quarter 2
A638 Culvert South of Eaton Hall, Eaton	Bassetlaw	£50-250k	To be programmed
B600 High Park crossing, Greasley	Broxtowe	≤ £50k	Quarter 1
Footbridge over Ford, Rufford	Newark & Sherwood	≤ £50k	Quarter 1
School Lane Footbridge, Caunton	Newark & Sherwood	≤ £50k	Quarter 1
Pasture Lane, Sutton Bonnington	Rushcliffe	≤ £50k	Quarter 2
Stone Bridge, East Leake	Rushcliffe	≤ £50k	Quarter 2
Minor Bridge Painting	Countywide	≤ £50k	Quarter 2
General repair work	Countywide	£50-250k	Quarter 1, 2, 3, 4
Minor concrete repairs	Countywide	≤ £50k	Quarter 2
Diver underwater repairs	Countywide	≤ £50k	Quarter 2
Bridges and Culverts miscellaneous work	Countywide	≤ £50k	N/A
Principal inspections & Emergency Repairs	Countywide	£50-250k	N/A
RoW Bridge Inspection & Maintenance	Countywide	£50-250k	N/A
Sub-block total		£1,265	

Sub-block/scheme	Area	Scheme budget (£000)	Programmed for delivery
Carriageway Maintenance - Principal classified road network (A roads)			
A611 Wood Lane Island, Hucknall	Ashfield	£50-250k	Quarter 2
A60 Carlton Road, Worksop	Bassetlaw	≤ £50k	Quarter 2
A631 Flood Road, Beckingham	Bassetlaw	≤ £50k	To be programmed
A6005 Queens Road, Beeston	Broxtowe	£50-250k	Quarter 3
A614 Ollerton Road, Burntstump	Gedling	£50-250k	Quarter 1
A60 Nottingham Road, Mansfield	Mansfield	£50-250k	Quarter 1
A60 Mansfield Road, Spion Kop	Mansfield	£50-250k	Quarter 1
A6075 Tuxford Road, Kirton	Newark & Sherwood	£50-250k	To be programmed
A60 Loughborough Road, Ruddington	Rushcliffe	£50-250k	Quarter 2
Sub-block total		£1,130	

Sub-block/scheme	Area	Scheme budget (£000)	Programmed for delivery
Carriageway Maintenance - Non-principal classified road network (B & C roads)			
B6022 Station Road, Sutton in Ashfield	Ashfield	≤ £50k	Quarter 1
B600 Alferton Road, Selston	Ashfield	≤ £50k	Quarter 3
B6023 Llamas Road, Sutton in Ashfield	Ashfield	£50-250k	Quarter 1
B6027 Common Road, Huthwaite	Ashfield	£50-250k	Quarter 3
B6040 Gateford Road, Worksop (1)	Bassetlaw	£50-250k	Quarter 2
C156 Sandy Lane, Worksop	Bassetlaw	≤ £50k	Quarter 2
B6040 Gateford Road, Worksop (2)	Bassetlaw	≤ £50k	Quarter 2
B6040 Victoria Square, Worksop	Bassetlaw	£50-250k	Quarter 2
C205 Market Place, Worksop	Bassetlaw	≤ £50k	Quarter 4
C205 Park Street, Worksop	Bassetlaw	£50-250k	Quarter 4
C205 Sparken Hill, Worksop	Bassetlaw	≤ £50k	Quarter 4
C5 Town Street, Sutton-cum-Lound	Bassetlaw	£50-250k	Quarter 2
C5 Sutton Lane, Sutton-cum-Lound	Bassetlaw	≤ £50k	Quarter 2
B6010 Nottingham Road, Newthorpe	Broxtowe	£50-250k	Quarter 1
C159 Town Street, Bramcote	Broxtowe	£50-250k	Quarter 2
C169 Westdale Lane East, Carlton	Gedling	£50-250k	Quarter 2
B6030 Clipstone Road East, Forest Town (1)	Mansfield	£50-250k	Quarter 2
B6030 Clipstone Road East, Forest Town (2)	Mansfield	£50-250k	Quarter 2
C25 Lower Kirklington Road, Southwell	Newark & Sherwood	£50-250k	Quarter 3
C3 Bowbridge Road, Newark	Newark & Sherwood	£50-250k	Quarter 2
B6030 Mansfield Road, Kings Clipstone	Newark & Sherwood	£50-250k	To be programmed
C6 Netherfield Lane, Perlethorpe	Newark & Sherwood	£50-250k	Quarter 2
C70 Cross Hill, Laxton	Newark & Sherwood	≤ £50k	Quarter 2
C93 Potter Hill, Collingham	Newark & Sherwood	£50-250k	Quarter 1
C74 Plumtree Road, Bakers Hollow, Cotgrave	Rushcliffe	£50-250k	Quarter 1
C115 Bingham Road, Radcliffe on Trent	Rushcliffe	£50-250k	Quarter 1
C4 Gotham Road, East Leake	Rushcliffe	£50-250k	Quarter 3
C60 Wymeswold Road, Wysall	Rushcliffe	£50-250k	Quarter 1
C28 Langar	Rushcliffe	£50-250k	Quarter 2
Sub-block total		£2,870	

2015/16 Capital maintenance programme

Sub-block/scheme	Area	Scheme budget (£000)	Programmed for delivery
Carriageway Maintenance - Unclassified road network			
Duke Street / King Street, Huthwaite	Ashfield	≤ £50k	Quarter 3
Wagstaff Lane, Westwood	Ashfield	£50-250k	Quarter 3
Farndale Road, Sutton in Ashfield	Ashfield	≤ £50k	Quarter 3
Sherwood Way, Selston	Ashfield	≤ £50k	Quarter 3
Elder Street, Skegby	Ashfield	£50-250k	Quarter 3
Unwin Street, Huthwaite	Ashfield	≤ £50k	Quarter 3
Kingsway, Worksop	Bassetlaw	£50-250k	Quarter 2
South Parade, Worksop	Bassetlaw	≤ £50k	Quarter 2
Sunfield Avenue, Worksop	Bassetlaw	≤ £50k	Quarter 2
Sunnybank, Worksop	Bassetlaw	≤ £50k	Quarter 2
The Oval, Worksop	Bassetlaw	≤ £50k	Quarter 2
West Street, Misson	Bassetlaw	≤ £50k	Quarter 3
West Street / East Street Harworth	Bassetlaw	≤ £50k	To be programmed
Whitaker Close, Retford	Bassetlaw	≤ £50k	To be programmed
North Carr Road, West Stockwith	Bassetlaw	≤ £50k	Quarter 3
Smeath Lane, Claborough	Bassetlaw	≤ £50k	Quarter 1
Jubilee Street, Kimberley	Broxtowe	≤ £50k	Quarter 3
Church Hill, Kimberley	Broxtowe	≤ £50k	Quarter 3
South Street, Eastwood	Broxtowe	£50-250k	Quarter 3
Broughton Avenue / Park Street / Bramcote Avenue, Beeston	Broxtowe	£50-250k	Quarter 4
The City, Beeston	Broxtowe	≤ £50k	Quarter 3
Collyer Road, Calverton	Gedling	£50-250k	Quarter 2
Upton Mount / Colwick Road / Blyth Close, Mansfield	Mansfield	≤ £50k	Quarter 2
Edgar Avenue, Mansfield	Mansfield	≤ £50k	Quarter 2
Cromer Close, Mansfield	Mansfield	≤ £50k	Quarter 3
Highland Close, Mansfield Woodhouse	Mansfield	≤ £50k	Quarter 3
Lichfield Lane, Mansfield	Mansfield	≤ £50k	Quarter 2
Ellesmere Road, Forest Town	Mansfield	£50-250k	Quarter 3
Gladstone Street, Belper Street, Hardwick Street, Mansfield	Mansfield	≤ £50k	Quarter 3
Moor Lane, Syerston	Newark & Sherwood	≤ £50k	Quarter 1
Hawksworth Road, Syerston	Newark & Sherwood	≤ £50k	Quarter 1
Bentinck Close, Boughton	Newark & Sherwood	£50-250k	Quarter 3
Forest Road, Clipstone	Newark & Sherwood	£50-250k	Quarter 3
Francklin Road, Lowdham	Newark & Sherwood	≤ £50k	Quarter 1
Church Lane, Kirklington	Newark & Sherwood	≤ £50k	Quarter 2
Balmoral Road, Bingham	Rushcliffe	≤ £50k	Quarter 1
Fisher Lane, Bingham	Rushcliffe	≤ £50k	Quarter 2
Barn Lane, Upper Broughton	Rushcliffe	≤ £50k	Quarter 3
Orchard Close, Barnstone	Rushcliffe	≤ £50k	Quarter 3
Rectory Road / Bridgford Road, West Bridgford	Rushcliffe	£50-250k	Quarter 1
Sub-block total		£2,645	

Sub-block/scheme	Area	Scheme budget (£000)	Programmed for delivery
Footway Maintenance			
Wighay Road, Hucknall	Ashfield	≤ £50k	Quarter 2
Grundy Avenue, Selston	Ashfield	≤ £50k	Quarter 1
Top Street, East Drayton	Bassetlaw	≤ £50k	Quarter 2
Hawthorne Close, Beckingham	Bassetlaw	≤ £50k	Quarter 1
Main Street, Harworth	Bassetlaw	≤ £50k	Quarter 1
Thorpe Road, Mattersey	Bassetlaw	≤ £50k	Quarter 1
New Eaton Road, Stapleford	Broxtowe	≤ £50k	Quarter 1
Sidney Road, Beeston	Broxtowe	£50-250k	Quarter 1
Town Street, Bramcote	Broxtowe	≤ £50k	Quarter 2
Forest Road, Calverton	Gedling	£50-250k	Quarter 3
Windsor Gardens, Mansfield	Mansfield	≤ £50k	Quarter 1
Southwell Road West, Mansfield	Mansfield	≤ £50k	Quarter 1
Falstone Avenue, Newark on Trent	Newark & Sherwood	≤ £50k	Quarter 1
Savile Road, Bilsthorpe	Newark & Sherwood	£50-250k	Quarter 1
Cockett Lane, Farnsfield	Newark & Sherwood	≤ £50k	Quarter 1
Hawthorn Crescent, Farndon	Newark & Sherwood	≤ £50k	Quarter 1
Butt Lane, East Bridgford	Rushcliffe	£50-250k	Quarter 4
Fisher Lane, Bingham	Rushcliffe	≤ £50k	Quarter 2
Marshall Road, Cropwell Bishop	Rushcliffe	≤ £50k	Quarter 3
Sub-block total		£1,030	

2015/16 Capital maintenance programme

Sub-block/scheme	Area	Scheme budget (£000)	Programmed for delivery
Drainage			
A38 Kings Mill, Sutton in Ashfield	Ashfield	≤ £50k	Quarter 1
Brotts Lane, Normanton on Trent	Bassetlaw	≤ £50k	Quarter 2
Shaw Road, Gringley on the Hill	Bassetlaw	≤ £50k	To be programmed
The Limes, Beckingham	Bassetlaw	≤ £50k	Quarter 2
Daisy Farm Estate, Newthorpe	Broxtowe	≤ £50k	Quarter 2
Ravenshead soakaway replacement	Gedling	≤ £50k	Quarter 2
Peafield Lane, Warsop	Mansfield	≤ £50k	Quarter 2
Mansfield Road, Halam	Newark & Sherwood	≤ £50k	Quarter 2
The Ropewalk, Southwell	Newark & Sherwood	≤ £50k	Quarter 2
Field Lane, Blidworth	Newark & Sherwood	≤ £50k	Quarter 1
Fishpool Road, Blidworth	Newark & Sherwood	≤ £50k	Quarter 1
C74 Plumtree Road / Bakers Hollow, Cotgrave	Rushcliffe	≤ £50k	Quarter 1
Countywide Pumping Station Services	Countywide	≤ £50k	Quarter 1, 2, 3, 4
Misc Drainage Repairs - Ashfield	Ashfield	≤ £50k	Quarter 1
Misc Drainage Repairs - Bassetlaw	Bassetlaw	≤ £50k	Quarter 1, 2, 3, 4
Misc Drainage Repairs - Broxtowe	Broxtowe	≤ £50k	Quarter 1
Misc Drainage Repairs - Gedling	Gedling	≤ £50k	Quarter 1, 2, 3, 4
Misc Drainage Repairs - Mansfield	Mansfield	≤ £50k	Quarter 1, 2
Misc Drainage Repairs - Newark	Newark	≤ £50k	To be programmed
Misc Drainage Repairs - Rushcliffe	Rushcliffe	≤ £50k	Quarter 1, 2, 3, 4
Sub-block total		£500	

Sub-block/scheme	Area	Scheme budget (£000)	Programmed for delivery
Flood Risk Management			
Works programme under development			
Block Allocation		£1,076	

Sub-block/scheme	Area	Scheme budget (£000)	Programmed for delivery
Surface Dressing			
Pleasley Road, Skegby	Ashfield	≤ £50k	Quarter 1
Dawgates Lane, Skegby	Ashfield	≤ £50k	Quarter 1
Alexandra Avenue, Sutton in Ashfield	Ashfield	≤ £50k	Quarter 1
Lime Avenue, Sutton in Ashfield	Ashfield	≤ £50k	Quarter 1
Chesterfield Road, Huthwaite	Ashfield	≤ £50k	Quarter 1
A638 Great North Road, Barnby Moor	Bassetlaw	£50-250k	Quarter 1
A631 Gainsborough Road, Gringley on the Hill	Bassetlaw	≤ £50k	Quarter 1
A631 Flood Road, Beckingham	Bassetlaw	≤ £50k	Quarter 1
A57 Whimpton Moor, Darlton	Bassetlaw	£50-250k	Quarter 1
A638 London Road, Retford	Bassetlaw	≤ £50k	Quarter 1
B6079 Retford Road, Worksop	Bassetlaw	≤ £50k	Quarter 1
Rydal Drive, Beeston	Broxtowe	≤ £50k	Quarter 1
Kendal Drive, Beeston	Broxtowe	≤ £50k	Quarter 1
Meadow Road, Beeston Rylands	Broxtowe	≤ £50k	Quarter 1
Eskdale Drive, Chilwell	Broxtowe	≤ £50k	Quarter 1
Stapleford Road, Trowell	Broxtowe	≤ £50k	Quarter 1
Burnstump Hill, Papplewick	Gedling	≤ £50k	Quarter 1
Cornwall Road, Arnold	Gedling	≤ £50k	Quarter 1
Park Road, Calverton	Gedling	≤ £50k	Quarter 1
Longdale Lane, Ravenshead	Gedling	≤ £50k	Quarter 1
Dawgates Lane, Mansfield	Mansfield	≤ £50k	Quarter 1
Baxter Hill, Mansfield	Mansfield	≤ £50k	Quarter 1
Leeming Lane North, Mansfield Woodhouse	Mansfield	≤ £50k	Quarter 1
Abbott Road, Mansfield	Mansfield	≤ £50k	Quarter 1
New Mill Lane, Mansfield Woodhouse	Mansfield	≤ £50k	Quarter 1
Sheepbridge Lane, Mansfield	Mansfield	≤ £50k	Quarter 1
High Oakham Hill, Mansfield	Mansfield	≤ £50k	Quarter 1
High Street, Pleasley	Mansfield	≤ £50k	Quarter 1
Crow Hill, Pleasley	Mansfield	≤ £50k	Quarter 1
Mansfield Road, Mansfield Woodhouse	Mansfield	≤ £50k	Quarter 1
B6047 Longster Lane and Sookholme Road	Mansfield	£50-250k	Quarter 1
A1133 Gainsborough Road, Gorton	Newark & Sherwood	£50-250k	Quarter 1
A6075 Mansfield Road, Edwinstowe	Newark & Sherwood	£50-250k	Quarter 1
A614 Old Rufford Road, Edwinstowe	Newark & Sherwood	£50-250k	Quarter 1
A612 Main Road, Hockerton	Newark & Sherwood	≤ £50k	Quarter 1
A616 Little Carlton, South Muskham	Newark & Sherwood	£50-250k	Quarter 1
A617 Centenary Avenue, Rainworth	Newark & Sherwood	£50-250k	Quarter 1
C14 Ollerton Road, Kelham	Newark & Sherwood	≤ £50k	Quarter 1
A612 Southwell Road Gonalston	Newark & Sherwood	≤ £50k	Quarter 1
Bulham Lane, Sutton on Trent	Newark & Sherwood	≤ £50k	Quarter 1
A60 Costock - Bunny Hill, Costock	Rushcliffe	≤ £50k	Quarter 1
A606 Upper Broughton	Rushcliffe	≤ £50k	Quarter 1
C26 West Leake Road, East Leake	Rushcliffe	£50-250k	Quarter 1
Church Street, Shelford	Rushcliffe	≤ £50k	Quarter 1
West Street, Shelford	Rushcliffe	≤ £50k	Quarter 1
C98 Clawson Lane	Rushcliffe	≤ £50k	Quarter 1
C18 Main Street	Rushcliffe	≤ £50k	Quarter 1
C60 Wysall Lane and Keyworth Road	Rushcliffe	≤ £50k	Quarter 1
Sub-block total		£3,300	

Sub-block/scheme	Area	Scheme budget (£000)	Programmed for delivery
Street lighting replacement/upgrades			
Shireoaks Road, Worksop	Bassetlaw	≤ £50k	To be programmed
Lilac Crescent, Beeston	Broxtowe	≤ £50k	To be programmed
Erewash Grove, Beeston	Broxtowe	≤ £50k	To be programmed
Coventry Road/Avon Place, Beeston	Broxtowe	≤ £50k	To be programmed
King Street, Beeston	Broxtowe	≤ £50k	To be programmed
Pelham Crescent, Beeston	Broxtowe	≤ £50k	To be programmed
Audon Avenue, Chilwell	Broxtowe	≤ £50k	To be programmed
Charnwood Avenue, Chilwell	Broxtowe	≤ £50k	To be programmed
Cumberland Avenue, Chilwell	Broxtowe	≤ £50k	To be programmed
Larch Crescent, Chilwell	Broxtowe	≤ £50k	To be programmed
A60 Mansfield Road, Arnold	Gedling	£50-250k	To be programmed
Westmoore Close, Mapperley	Gedling	≤ £50k	To be programmed
Bowbridge Road, Newark	Newark & Sherwood	≤ £50k	To be programmed
Mansfield Road, Kings Clipstone	Newark & Sherwood	£50-250k	To be programmed
Newark Road, Kirklington	Newark & Sherwood	≤ £50k	To be programmed
Kirklington Road, Bilsthorpe	Newark & Sherwood	≤ £50k	To be programmed
Westfield Lane, Mansfield	Mansfield	£50-250k	To be programmed
St Peters Way, Mansfield	Mansfield	£50-250k	To be programmed
Beaumont Avenue, Mansfield	Mansfield	≤ £50k	To be programmed
Devon Drive, Mansfield	Mansfield	≤ £50k	To be programmed
Countywide Emergency Replacements	Countywide	≤ £50k	To be programmed
Sub-block total		£1,000	

Sub-block/scheme	Area	Scheme budget (£000)	Programmed for delivery
Salix Grant			
Works programme under development			
Sub-block total		£534	

Sub-block/scheme	Area	Scheme budget (£000)	Programmed for delivery
Traffic signal renewal			
Burton Rd/Manor Rd, Gedling	Gedling	£50-250k	To be programmed
Carlton Hill/Station Rd/Cavendish Rd, Gedling	Gedling	£50-250k	To be programmed
A38 Sutton Rd/Sheepbridge Ln, Mansfield	Mansfield	£50-250k	To be programmed
Nottingham Rd/Albert St, Mansfield	Mansfield	£50-250k	To be programmed
Sub-block total		£350	

Sub-block/scheme	Area	Scheme budget (£000)	Programmed for delivery
Safety fencing			
Countywide Structural Testing of Safety Fencing	Countywide	£50-250k	To be programmed
Chesterfield Road, Huthwaite	Ashfield	£50-250k	To be programmed
West Burton Power Station	Bassetlaw	£50-250k	To be programmed
A610 Ikea island, Giltbrook	Broxtowe	≤ £50k	To be programmed
Sub-block total		£350	

Sub-block/scheme	Area	Scheme budget (£000)	Programmed for delivery
Structural Patching			
Works programme under development	Countywide		
Sub-block total		£1,180	

19 March 2015**Agenda Item: 8**

REPORT OF SERVICE DIRECTOR HIGHWAYS

NOISE ACTION PLANS

Purpose of the Report

1. The purpose of this report is to update Committee on the noise action plan work undertaken to date; and to seek approval to implement highways schemes that will reduce the impact of traffic noise in priority locations.
2. Approval at this time provides an opportunity to consider the inclusion of a small number of road traffic noise improvement schemes within the 2015/16 highways capital programme.

Information and Advice

3. Government adopted and published noise action plans for agglomerations (areas with a population of more than 100,000 and population density equal to or greater than 500 people per km²) and major roads (outside agglomerations) in March 2010. The noise action plans are designed to address the management of noise and effects from major roads in England under the terms of the Environmental Noise (England) Regulations 2006. These Regulations were required to address Directive 2002/49/EC relating to the Assessment and Management of Environmental Noise (commonly referred to as the Environmental Noise Directive or END).
4. The action plans identified first priority locations and other important areas that needed to be investigated further. These locations were identified through the strategic noise mapping undertaken on behalf of DEFRA to implement the Environmental Noise (Identification of Noise Sources) (England) Regulations 2007 and are the 1% of the population that are potentially affected by the highest noise levels from major roads (based on the traffic flows and a building's proximity to the road). This approach has been taken because the population at these locations is likely to be at the greatest risk of experiencing a significant adverse impact to health and quality of life as a result of their exposure to road traffic noise. The noise index LA10,18h dB is currently used to assess the impact of traffic noise where traffic noise is measured over the period 0600-0000. The current END states that where the dB(A), LA10, 18h is above 65 dB(A) (ignoring the effect of reflection from the façade of the relevant building) then mitigation measures should be considered.
5. The responsibility for investigating and implementing actions to address noise issues from road traffic lies with the relevant highway authority. The highway authority is tasked with examining locations on a prioritised basis and having regard to any ongoing noise mitigation initiatives, schemes and plans. The noise mapping identified a number of locations on the

County Council's road network that needed investigating further and the County Council is therefore currently investigating these sites as detailed below.

6. The noise action plans set out the national approach to address issues at prioritised locations through the use of:
 - a. control of noise at source – EU noise emission standards for individual vehicles
 - b. planning controls – the use of noise impact assessments when planning new or additional capacity on roads
 - c. compensation and insulation – providing compensation for dwellings affected by increased noise from new or improved highways
 - d. maintenance – the use of laying a low noise road surface, one that assists in reducing the noise generated by the tyre/road interface
 - e. specific initiatives – undertaking specific noise abatement initiatives (such as improved noise barriers) where they are feasible, offer value for money, and where funding permits.
7. The County Council, as highway authority, therefore has the responsibility to undertake actions c-e above, as well as contributing towards action b above by ensuring transport comments in response to planning applications include reference to noise abatement measures when appropriate.
8. Noise impact assessments are routinely undertaken when planning new roads or where additional capacity is added to existing roads, and mitigation against the impacts of increased noise are included within scheme designs. Similarly, the County Council provides compensation and insulation for dwellings affected by increased noise from new or improved highways when they are the scheme promoter.
9. The County Council has investigated each of the locations identified through the national noise mapping exercise to determine if any specific measures may be appropriate to reduce noise at the prioritised locations. The measures considered included:
 - re-routing of traffic (determining if a suitable alternative route is available and appropriate, or the construction of new roads)
 - use of laying a low noise road surface (one that assists in reducing the noise generated by the tyre/road interface) when the road is next resurfaced
 - reducing speed limits
 - noise barriers or other similar methods (such as landscaping).
10. The construction of new roads to bypass locations is not considered feasible as such schemes would be very costly and they would not offer sufficient other benefits to secure the necessary funding to deliver such schemes. All but two of the locations are on the A road network and therefore are on the strategic routes. Alternative routes were considered but it is not considered that traffic can be diverted elsewhere as any alternative would merely move the problem somewhere else, would affect a greater number of residents and force large volumes of traffic on to less suitable roads.
11. Speeds below 50mph are generally due to engine noise, rather than from tyre surface noise. Therefore any use of low noise road surfacing at locations where the speed limit is currently 50mph or less would not offer value for money in terms of the benefits (reductions in noise) that it delivers.

12. Similarly, the low noise reductions delivered by speed limit reductions where the posted speed limit is already 50 mph or below mean that such changes offer little value for money. Some of the locations identified in the noise mapping are, however, located along roads with existing 60mph or 70 mph speed limits.
13. Some locations may potentially benefit from additional noise barriers but firstly these locations require further investigation to determine if it is feasible and if the location actually requires any mitigation. Further assessments will now be undertaken at each of these locations to:
- determine if noise levels breach 65 dB(A), LA10, 18h to firstly determine if the County Council need to undertake any remedial measures
 - determine if the provision of noise barriers is feasible and acceptable given constraints
 - determine the likely noise reductions that would be achieved if noise barriers were provided, and therefore the value for money of providing such features
 - use the findings from the assessments to prioritise any locations that do breach the levels so that the properties most affected by noise are treated first (as funding becomes available).
14. It is therefore proposed that:
- greater weighting is given to requests for speed limit reductions when they would also benefit locations identified through the DEFRA noise mapping
 - additional noise barriers/landscaping is considered at locations identified in the noise mapping exercise where further noise assessments have identified that the locations exceed 65 dB(A), LA10, 18h and where it is considered feasible, affordable and value for money to provide such measures
 - the County Council ensures that any transport comments made in respect of proposed new development make reference to noise mitigation where appropriate and that sufficient funds are requested from developers to provide any required mitigation.
15. It is proposed that an annual prioritised programme of the above measures be developed and delivered as funding permits where road noise levels breach 65 dB(A), LA10, 18h; where such measures are feasible, acceptable and offer value for money. Schemes to address road traffic noise issues will be included within the highways capital programmes (integrated transport programme or highways maintenance programme depending on the type of measure to be introduced), which are subject to capital budget approvals at County Council meeting and this Committee. Each potential scheme will also be subject to the necessary consultation, statutory undertakings and other issues arising from feasibility studies, detailed scheme investigation, design and consultation.

Other Options Considered

16. Options considered are set out within this report.

Reason/s for Recommendation/s

17. The provision of noise abatement measures will benefit the health and well-being of those most greatly affected by road traffic noise. Such measures will help ensure delivery of County Council priorities, national priorities and local transport goals and objectives. The packages of measures detailed in the report have been developed to reflect a balance of member, public and stakeholder requests and priorities, evidence of need (including

technical analysis), value for money (including the co-ordination of works) and delivery of the County Council's vision and transport objectives.

Statutory and Policy Implications

18. This report has been compiled after consideration of implications in respect of crime and disorder, finance, human resources, human rights, the NHS Constitution (Public Health only), the public sector equality duty, safeguarding of children and vulnerable adults, service users, sustainability and the environment and ways of working and where such implications are material they are described below. Appropriate consultation has been undertaken and advice sought on these issues as required.

RECOMMENDATION/S

- 1) It is recommended that Committee:
 - a) note the contents of this report and
 - b) approve the development and implementation of schemes as detailed in this report, particularly paragraphs 13 to 15.

Neil Hodgson
Interim Service Director Highways

For any enquiries about this report please contact:
Sean Parks – Local Transport Plan manager

Constitutional Comments (LM 13/01/15)

19. The Transport and Highways Committee has delegated authority within the Constitution to approve the recommendations in the report.

Financial Comments (GB 13/01/15)

20. Schemes to address road traffic noise issues will be funded from within the approved Transport and Highways capital programme.

Background Papers and Published Documents

- Nottinghamshire Local Transport Plan Strategy 2011/12-2025/26
- Nottinghamshire Local Transport Plan Implementation Plan 2011/12-2014/15
- Nottinghamshire Local Transport Plan Evidence Base 2010
- Noise Action Plan Major Roads (outside first round agglomerations) – DEFRA March 2010
- Noise Action Plan Nottingham Agglomeration – DEFRA March 2010

Electoral Division(s) and Member(s) Affected

- All

19 March 2015**Agenda Item: 9****REPORT OF SERVICE DIRECTOR HIGHWAYS****NOTTINGHAMSHIRE CYCLING STRATEGY DELIVERY PLAN****Purpose of the Report**

1. The purpose of this report is to reaffirm Committee support for investment in cycling backed by the development of a cycling vision for Nottinghamshire and updated strategy which will set out how the County Council, in partnership with others, will seek to increase cycling levels to benefit the local economy, the health of residents and road safety for cyclists.
2. Approval of the development of a cycling vision and strategy at this time would provide an opportunity for the County Council to work in partnership with Government, and other local stakeholders, to fully realise opportunities to enhance cycling across Nottinghamshire.

Information and Advice

3. The economic benefits of cycling are well established – improved access to local centres increases their vitality; well-planned leisure routes can increase the visitor offer and therefore improve the visitor economy; and car drivers that switch to cycling help reduce local congestion with resulting benefits to the economy. Similarly cycling (along with walking) is a major theme in government plans to increase physical activity levels to improve the physical and mental health and wellbeing of the population, which in turn reduces the financial burden on the health service and lost productivity within the business economy. Increased cycling levels also help improve cycle safety through the recognised 'safety in numbers' effect. Such benefits help deliver many of the County Council's strategic priorities, particularly those relating to protecting the environment, supporting economic growth and promoting health.

Existing trends in cycling

4. Nottinghamshire has over 350km of on-road and off-road cycle paths. The County Council continues to invest in cycling infrastructure as well as promotional activities (such as personalised travel planning) where projects offer value for money. Cycling levels are monitored at over 30 sites across the county using permanent automatic counters located in both rural and urban areas to reflect the whole of the county; and along commuting and leisure routes to reflect the usage of the cycle network. This monitoring shows that cycling levels in Nottinghamshire continue to grow and have increased by 8% between 2010 and 2013. 2011 Census figures show that 3.0% of Nottinghamshire residents cycled to work, the same as the East Midlands average but lower than the average in England (3.2%). Whilst

this is encouraging, levels of cycling are very low compared to some other towns and cities in England and in many parts of Europe as shown in appendix 1.

5. During the same period (2010 to 2013) all cycling casualties decreased slightly from 201 to 198. During this period the numbers of cycle casualties with slight injuries reduced by 10%. The number of fatal casualties in 2013 (two fatalities) is the same as in 2010 but the numbers of cycle casualties with serious injuries has increased by 31%. The numbers of cycle casualties in the county since 2010 are shown in the table below and more detailed analysis of the accidents is shown in appendix 2. Analysis of the accidents shows that they predominantly involve adults travelling on 30mph roads during the morning and afternoon peak in fine, dry weather. Programmes of education and promotion have been developed and are being delivered to address the increases in serious cycling casualties. These programmes include cycle training for all ages, free high-visibility accessories and helmets for commuter cyclists to improve visibility, and infrastructure schemes such as those delivered in Worksop, Retford and Newark in 2013/14 at locations with a history of accidents. It is anticipated that the benefits of these programmes will be seen in future years.

Year	KSI	Slight	KSI	Slight	KSI	Slight	Total
	Under 16		17 and over		TOTAL		
2010	2	56	40	103	42	159	201
2011	9	36	45	123	54	159	213
2012	13	26	43	126	56	152	208
2013	11	31	44	112	55	143	198
2014 (01.01.14 to 31.07.14)	3	18	17	95	20	113	133

Policy/strategy background

6. In April 2013 the All Party Parliamentary Cycling Group published the 'Get Britain Cycling' report which included 18 recommendations to Government to improve cycling levels relating to funding, design, speed limits, training & education, and political leadership. Similarly, in April 2014 the All Party Commission on Physical Activity published 'Tackling Physical Inactivity: A Coordinated Approach' which also set out a number of recommendations to get the country more active.
7. In October 2014 Government subsequently published its draft Cycling Delivery Plan, its 10 year plan for England, summarising Government's vision for cycling and walking and the role everyone has to play in achieving the vision. The Cycling Delivery Plan has four major themes:
 - i. Vision, leadership and ambition
 - ii. Funding
 - iii. Infrastructure and planning
 - iv. Safety and perceptions of safety.
8. Government is seeking to work in partnership with local authorities to deliver cycling improvements across the country. Future funding for cycling will be prioritised in local authorities that sign up to the commitments in Government's Cycling Delivery Plan. Local authorities signing up to the commitments will need to:

- Set a clear vision of how cycling and walking will be increased in their area
 - Develop a local walking and cycling delivery plan which is supported by local partners
 - Appoint a walking and cycling champion (e.g. an elected member)
 - Demonstrate commitment to door to door journeys, creating safe walking and cycling provision, and a planned and funded cycling and walking investment programme
 - Demonstrate that walking and cycling delivery plans include steps to meet the needs of hard to reach groups.
9. The County Council has advised the Department for Transport that, whilst it is interested in working in partnership with them, before it is able to submit a formal expression of interest discussions with neighbouring highway authorities, particularly Nottingham City, as well as the other highway authorities in the D2N2 LEP will need to be undertaken to determine the best way to proceed; and also political approval would need to be sought.
10. It is proposed that the Vice-Chairman of the Transport & Highways Committee be appointed as the County Council's walking and cycling champion.

Proposed Nottinghamshire cycling strategy

11. It is recommended that, if supported by Transport & Highways Committee, discussions will firstly be undertaken with Nottingham City Council, followed by the remaining D2N2 highway authorities. These discussions will determine whether a LEP-wide cycling vision or a more local approach should be developed. It is anticipated and assumed currently that the documents will start as a local Nottinghamshire approach, to possibly be extended to an N2 approach in light of the emerging combined authority for Nottinghamshire with the option longer-term of becoming LEP wide. Once a preference has been determined, further discussions will be undertaken with the district councils and other stakeholders.
12. The County Council's overarching cycling strategy is included within the Nottinghamshire Local Transport Plan 2011/12 to 2025/26 (LTP) that was approved at the 31 March 2011 County Council meeting. The LTP does, however, commit to developing a more detailed cycling strategy. If future funding is to be secured for Nottinghamshire there is a need to develop a cycling vision and review current cycling policies/strategy. Given existing cycling levels it is also considered that there is scope to increase the number of cyclists commuting to work and visiting Nottinghamshire on leisure rides. It is therefore proposed that a 10 year cycling strategy delivery plan for Nottinghamshire be developed (consistent with the lifetime of Government's Cycling Delivery Plan).
13. The Cycling Strategy Delivery Plan will aim to deliver more, as well as safer, cycling as these two elements are interdependent. There is already a body of evidence that suggests that as cycling levels increase in an area the cycling risks go down; and as safety improves more people cycle.
14. It is envisaged that the proposed Nottinghamshire Cycling Strategy Delivery Plan will comprise three components:
- a) Measures aimed directly at road users including
- Education and training for cyclists, pedestrians and motorised vehicle users with a particular focus on road safety

- Promotion of the benefits of cycling and walking

b) Measures to maintain, manage and develop the cycle network including

- On-road and off-road routes
- Commuter and leisure journeys
- Speed management measures and their enforcement
- Sympathetic design of new and improved facilities
- A door-to-door approach taking account of cycle parking and interchange with other modes of travel.

c) Ways of working to increase support for the Delivery Plan including

- Partnership working – with neighbouring authorities, district councils, employers, schools, and other stakeholders and interest groups in the delivery of the strategy to ensure an effective network and increase the numbers of people cycling and walking. This partnership working will include working with national organisations that promote sustainable travel such as Sustrans, as well as local community based cycling groups such as Pedals, on the development of the strategy and the programmes to deliver the strategy
- Political Leadership with the appointment of a Cycling Champion reporting regularly to Transport and Highways Committee on the development and implementation of the Delivery Plan.

In addition to

- Links to, and support for, other programmes of work (particularly health)
- Clear performance indicators to monitor cycling improvements, such as those relating to numbers of people cycling, cycle safety etc.
- The programmes of measures to be developed to deliver the strategy, including education, enforcement, infrastructure improvements; and promotion and encouragement of cycling.

15. Cycle safety will be at the core of the strategy. The causes of cycle casualties will continue to be investigated and analysed (such as those detailed in appendix 2) and a programme of safety measures will be developed to specifically address the causes of such casualties.
16. The link between cycling, physical activity levels and health has already been noted and information regarding physical activity and health can be found in the Nottinghamshire Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA). It is proposed that this report is brought to the attention of the Nottinghamshire Health and Well Being Board via the Obesity Integrated Commissioning Group.
17. Investment in cycling offers good value for money. Major transport schemes are assessed on their benefit cost ratio (BCR). The BCR considers the impacts the scheme has in relation to the economy, society, the environment and the public accounts. It offers an estimate of the value of benefit generated for every £1 of public expenditure on a project or scheme. Government guidance on major transport schemes identifies a 'medium' value for money scheme as having a BCR of between 1.5 and 2; a 'high' value for money scheme as having a BCR of between 2 and 4; and a 'very high' value for money scheme as having a BCR of more than 4. Studies into cycling projects have shown that:

- Investment in cycle training has one of the highest BCRs. A study of cycle training in London found that the overall BCR was 7.44:1, so for every £1 spent on cycle training it delivers £7.44 worth of benefits
 - Cycling infrastructure investment produces high rates of return. The estimated return on the investment in the first six Cycle Demonstration Towns suggests a BCR of between 2.6 and 3.5:1 over 10 years (in terms of reduced mortality, reduced road casualties, congestion benefits, reduced absenteeism, and amenity). Similarly, an assessment of the London Cycle+ programme gave it an overall BCR of 3.94:1, which is far higher than most major road or public transport projects.
18. Sustrans research has also shown that the average BCR of cycling and walking schemes it has delivered is 3:1, higher than many road schemes and that every £1m invested in walking and cycling creates 11 jobs, five times more than the best major road schemes they analysed. Jobs created by cycling schemes include those in the delivery of infrastructure schemes; manufacturing of new bikes as people take-up cycling; the wholesale and retail trade in new bicycles; associated services such as repair and rental of bicycles; and increased cycle tourism, including accommodation, food & drink, etc.. The jobs created also tend to be local and therefore benefit the local economy.
19. Cycling investment, if done properly, is therefore one of the most cost-effective forms of transport investment. The Cycling Strategy Delivery Plan will also be used to inform future large scale cycling infrastructure projects funded and delivered both internally and externally (e.g. funded from developer contributions). Whilst the proposed Cycling Strategy Delivery Plan will have regard for existing funding constraints it will seek a commitment to prioritise cycling funding for the improvements detailed within it, if or when alternative funding opportunities become available. These opportunities may include:
- Central Government funding opportunities
 - Developer contributions arising from major new housing and employment development
 - Local Growth Fund
 - Sustrans funding.

Other Options Considered

20. Other options considered are set out within this report.

Conclusions

21. Following approval of the report, consultation will be undertaken and work will continue to ensure that the Cycling Strategy Delivery Plan is completed by the end of October 2015. This will allow for the outcome of the work to be considered in the development of the 2016/17 integrated transport capital programme, the draft of which is planned to be approved at October 2015 Transport & Highways Committee. The indicative timetable for the delivery of the Cycling Strategy Delivery Plan is shown below:

Task	Estimated completion
Collection of existing evidence / needs analysis	End of March 2015
Production of draft strategy / delivery plan	End of June 2015
Consultation on draft documents	Mid-August 2015
Finalisation of strategy / delivery plan	End of September 2015
County Council approval of documents	End of October 2015

Statutory and Policy Implications

22. This report has been compiled after consideration of implications in respect of crime and disorder, finance, human resources, human rights, the NHS Constitution (Public Health only), the public sector equality duty, safeguarding of children and vulnerable adults, service users, sustainability and the environment and ways of working and where such implications are material they are described below. Appropriate consultation has been undertaken and advice sought on these issues as required.

RECOMMENDATION/S

23. It is recommended that Committee:

- a) confirm their support for the County Council to work in partnership with the Department for Transport as set out in paragraphs 8 to 10 of this report
- b) approve the development of a Cycling Strategy Delivery Plan for Nottinghamshire as set out within paragraphs 11 to 19 of this report
- c) approve consultation and partnership working on the development of the Cycling Strategy Delivery Plan.

Neil Hodgson
Interim Service Director Highways

For any enquiries about this report please contact:
Sean Parks – Local Transport Plan manager

Constitutional Comments (SJE – 27/02/2015)

24. This decision as to a delivery plan to implement strategy falls within the remit of the Transport & Highways Committee to whom responsibility for functions relating to traffic management and road safety have been delegated. Should formulation of a wider Cycling Strategy be required, Policy Committee would be the most appropriate forum. Conversely, should decisions as to Cycle Path implementation be required, Planning and Licensing Committee would be the appropriate forum.

Financial Comments (GB – 06/03/15)

25. There are no direct financial implications arising from this report.

Background Papers and Published Documents

- Nottinghamshire Local Transport Plan Strategy 2011/12-2025/26
- Nottinghamshire Local Transport Plan Implementation Plan 2011/12-2014/15
- Nottinghamshire Local Transport Plan Evidence Base 2010
- Get Britain Cycling – All Party Parliamentary Cycling Group, published April 2013
- Cycling Delivery Plan – Department for Transport, published October 2014

- Tackling Physical Inactivity: A Coordinated Approach – All Party Commission on Physical Activity, published April 2014
- Everybody Active, Everyday – Public Health England, published October 2014
- Value for Money Assessment: Advice Note for Local Transport Decision Makers – Department for Transport, published December 2013
- Valuing the Benefits of Cycling: A Report to Cycling England – SQW Consulting, May 2007
- Cycling Demonstration Towns Development of Benefit Cost Ratios – Department for Transport, published February 2010
- Walking and cycling: local measures to promote walking and cycling as forms of travel or recreation NICE Public Health Guidance (PH 41) November 2012
- Nottinghamshire Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA)

Electoral Division(s) and Member(s) Affected

- All

Appendix 1 – Cycling levels

Cycling levels in England – Percentage of 16-74 year olds travelling to work by bicycle (excluding those working at home and not in employment)

Nottinghamshire districts	
Broxtowe	4.6%
Newark & Sherwood	4.4%
Rushcliffe	3.4%
Bassetlaw	2.8%
Ashfield	2.2%
Gedling	2.1%
Mansfield	1.5%

Counties	
Cambridgeshire	10.7%
Oxfordshire	7.9%
Norfolk	4.9%
Lincolnshire	4.4%
Suffolk	4.4%
Somerset	4.4%
Herefordshire	4.3%
Gloucestershire	4.2%
Hampshire	3.5%
West Sussex	3.4%
Shropshire	3.4%
Dorset	3.3%
Devon	3.1%
Nottinghamshire	3.0%
Leicestershire	2.9%
Warwickshire	2.7%
North Yorkshire	2.6%
Surrey	2.5%
Lancashire	2.3%
Worcestershire	2.3%
Essex	2.3%
Northamptonshire	2.1%
Staffordshire	2.0%
East Sussex	1.9%
Kent	1.9%
Hertfordshire	1.8%
Derbyshire	1.6%
Buckinghamshire	1.5%

England and Wales	3.1%
England	3.2%

Regions	
London	4.3%
East	3.9%
South West	3.9%
South East	3.3%
East Midlands	3.0%
Yorkshire and the Humber	2.8%
North West	2.4%
West Midlands	2.1%
North East	1.9%

Selected cities	
Cambridge	32.5%
Oxford	19.1%
Norwich	9.5%
Kingston upon Hull	8.5%
Bristol	8.2%
Lincoln	6.4%
Ipswich	4.9%
Southampton	4.9%
Manchester	4.2%
Derby	4.0%
Leicester	3.9%
Nottingham	3.7%
Newcastle upon Tyne	2.9%
Northampton	2.8%
Liverpool	2.2%
Leeds	1.9%
Birmingham	1.7%

Source: 2011 Census

Cycling levels in European countries

EU member state	% of population that cycles everyday	% of population that cycles a few times a week
Netherlands	43%	28%
Denmark	30%	26%
Finland	26%	29%
Hungary	25%	20%
Germany	19%	25%
Sweden	19%	24%
Croatia	15%	14%
Slovakia	15%	25%
Belgium	15%	19%
Poland	14%	29%
Latvia	14%	19%
Italy	13%	13%
Austria	13%	25%
Estonia	12%	23%
Slovenia	12%	24%
Lithuania	10%	20%
Romania	10%	13%
Czech Republic	7%	21%
Portugal	7%	8%
Greece	5%	7%
France	5%	13%
Ireland	5%	10%
Bulgaria	5%	7%
UK	4%	10%
Luxembourg	4%	17%
Spain	4%	10%
Cyprus	2%	8%
Malta	1%	2%

Source: CTC / 2013 European Commission report – Attitudes of Europeans Towards Urban Mobility, December 2013

Pedal cyclist casualties where the injured person(s) in the accident is a pedal cycle rider.

ACCIDENT SEVERITY UPTO 2014

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	Total
Fatal	2	2	6	2	1	13
Serious	41	54	51	55	20	221
Slight	158	157	151	141	113	720
Damage	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	201	213	208	198	134	954

ACCIDENTS BY MONTH AND YEAR UPTO 2014

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	Total
January	13	19	17	10	18	77
February	16	12	17	14	14	73
March	14	22	20	5	23	84
April	18	12	16	10	21	77
May	25	12	16	12	20	85
June	23	20	10	25	15	93
July	28	22	20	26	23	119
August	17	19	14	19	0	69
September	16	24	24	24	0	88
October	18	22	22	16	0	78
November	10	14	21	23	0	68
December	3	15	11	14	0	43
Total	201	213	208	198	134	954
%	21%	22%	22%	21%	14%	####

ACCIDENTS BY DAY AND TIME

	Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat	Total
Midnight - 00:59	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2
01:00 - 01:59	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
02:00 - 02:59	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
03:00 - 03:59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
04:00 - 04:59	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	4
05:00 - 05:59	0	5	4	1	3	1	1	15
06:00 - 06:59	0	6	5	5	5	5	1	27
07:00 - 07:59	3	11	19	15	10	6	2	66
08:00 - 08:59	2	14	14	17	15	15	6	83
09:00 - 09:59	5	6	5	10	11	6	7	50
10:00 - 10:59	7	5	3	1	5	4	7	32
11:00 - 11:59	11	4	8	3	11	8	13	58
12:00 - 12:59	15	6	6	6	7	5	7	52
13:00 - 13:59	8	6	7	6	6	5	11	49
14:00 - 14:59	8	12	8	7	11	6	6	58
15:00 - 15:59	6	6	8	8	11	12	3	54
16:00 - 16:59	8	14	11	13	15	16	10	87
17:00 - 17:59	10	22	15	17	22	20	7	113
18:00 - 18:59	4	17	13	8	18	15	1	76
19:00 - 19:59	3	8	10	9	6	4	9	49
20:00 - 20:59	3	6	7	6	5	4	1	32
21:00 - 21:59	2	2	1	3	3	2	1	14
22:00 - 22:59	2	2	1	3	3	5	1	17
23:00 - 23:59	2	4	1	0	1	2	3	13
Total	101	158	146	140	169	143	97	954
%	11%	17%	15%	15%	18%	15%	10%	100%

Pedal cyclist casualties where the injured person(s) in the accident is a pedal cycle rider.

JUNCTION DETAIL	Number	%
SLIP ROAD	2	0
MULTIPLE JUNCTION	5	1
OTHER JUNCTION	10	1
CROSS ROADS	102	11
NOT AT JUNCTION	216	23
PRIVATE DRIVE	127	13
ROUNDBOUT AND MINI	107	11
T OR STAGGERED	385	40
TOTAL	954	

JUNCTION CONTROLS	Number	%
AUTHORISED PERSON	2	0
STOP SIGN	1	0
AUTOMATIC TRAFFIC SIG	62	6
GIVE WAY SIGN	673	71
NOT AT JUNCTION	216	23
TOTAL	954	

SPEED LIMIT	Number	%
20 MPH	5	1
30 MPH	769	81
40 MPH	63	7
50 MPH	21	2
60 MPH	90	9
70 MPH	6	1
TOTAL	954	

ROAD CLASS	Number	%
A	279	29
B	204	21
C	165	17
Unclassified	306	32
TOTAL	954	

NUMBER OF ACCIDENTS INVOLVING PEDESTRIANS	Number	%
	0	0

NUMBER OF ACCIDENTS INVOLVING SKIDDING	Number	%
	39	4

WEATHER	Number	%
FINE	810	85
RAIN	58	6
SNOW	1	0
FINE WIND	14	1
RAIN WIND	5	1
SNOW WIND	1	0
FOG MIST	11	1
OTHER	19	2
UNKNOWN	35	4
TOTAL	954	

ROAD SURFACE	Number	%
DRY	730	77
WET	161	17
SNOW	1	0
ICE	16	2
FLOOD	1	0
	44	5
	1	0
TOTAL	954	

LIGHT CONDITIONS	Number	%
Light	769	81
Dark	185	19
TOTAL	954	

Pedal cyclist casualties where the injured person(s) in the accident is a pedal cycle rider.

CASUALTY SEVERITY UPTO 2014

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	Total
Fatal	2	2	6	2	1	13
Serious	40	53	50	54	20	217
Slight	161	163	156	144	113	737
Total	203	218	212	200	134	967
%	21%	23%	22%	21%	14%	####

CASUALTIES BY MONTH AND YEAR UPTO 2014

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	Total
January	13	19	18	10	18	78
February	16	12	17	15	14	74
March	14	22	20	5	23	84
April	18	12	16	10	21	77
May	25	12	16	12	20	85
June	24	20	10	25	15	94
July	28	22	20	26	23	119
August	17	20	14	20	0	71
September	16	24	26	24	0	90
October	18	25	22	16	0	81
November	11	15	22	23	0	71
December	3	15	11	14	0	43
Total	203	218	212	200	134	967
%	21%	23%	22%	21%	14%	#####

CASUALTIES BY DAY AND TIME

	Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat	Total
Midnight - 00:59	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2
01:00 - 01:59	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
02:00 - 02:59	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
03:00 - 03:59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
04:00 - 04:59	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	4
05:00 - 05:59	0	5	4	1	3	1	1	15
06:00 - 06:59	0	6	5	5	5	5	1	27
07:00 - 07:59	3	11	19	15	10	6	2	66
08:00 - 08:59	2	14	14	17	16	15	6	84
09:00 - 09:59	5	6	5	10	11	6	8	51
10:00 - 10:59	7	5	3	1	5	4	7	32
11:00 - 11:59	11	4	8	3	11	8	15	60
12:00 - 12:59	15	6	6	6	7	5	10	55
13:00 - 13:59	8	6	7	6	6	5	12	50
14:00 - 14:59	8	12	8	7	11	6	6	58
15:00 - 15:59	6	6	8	9	12	12	3	56
16:00 - 16:59	8	15	11	13	15	16	10	88
17:00 - 17:59	10	22	15	17	22	21	7	114
18:00 - 18:59	4	17	13	8	18	15	1	76
19:00 - 19:59	3	8	10	9	6	4	9	49
20:00 - 20:59	3	6	8	6	5	4	1	33
21:00 - 21:59	2	2	1	3	3	2	1	14
22:00 - 22:59	2	2	1	3	3	5	1	17
23:00 - 23:59	2	4	1	0	1	2	3	13
Total	101	159	147	141	171	144	104	967
%	10%	16%	15%	15%	18%	15%	11%	100%

Pedal cyclist casualties where the injured person(s) in the accident is a pedal cycle rider.

CASUALTIES BY TYPE AND AGE GROUPING

	Unknown Age	0 to 10	11 to 15	16 to 24	25 to 44	45 to 64	65 Plus	Total	%
Pedal Cyclist	38	39	144	184	308	205	49	967	100
TOTAL	38	39	144	184	308	205	49	967	
%	4	4	15	19	32	21	5		

Number of Casualties with unknown age: 38

VEHICLE MANOEUVRES

	Number	%
CHANGING LANE TO LEFT	6	1
CHANGING LANE TO RIGHT	13	1
GOING AHEAD LEFT HAND BEND	15	2
GOING AHEAD OTHER	693	72
GOING AHEAD RIGHT HAND BEND	43	4
STARTING	14	1
OVERTAKING MOVING VEHICLE ON ITS OFFSIDE	10	1
OVERTAKING ON NEARSIDE	6	1
OVERTAKING MOVING VEHICLE ON ITS NEARSIDE	38	4
PARKED	2	0
STOPPING	11	1
TURNING LEFT	25	3
TURNING RIGHT	70	7
WAITING TO GO AHEAD BUT HELD UP	9	1
WAITING TO TURN RIGHT	12	1
TOTAL	967	

BREATH TEST

	Number	%
NOT APPLICABLE	938	97
NEGATIVE	2	0
NOT REQUESTED	20	2
DRIVER NOT CONTACTED	5	1
MEDICAL REASONS	2	0
TOTAL	967	

19 March 2015**Agenda Item: 10****REPORT OF SERVICE DIRECTOR, HIGHWAYS****RESPONSES TO PETITIONS PRESENTED TO THE CHAIRMAN OF THE
COUNTY COUNCIL ON 15TH JANUARY 2015.****Purpose of the Report**

1. The purpose of this report is to recommend to Committee the responses to the issues raised in petitions presented to the County Council on 15th January 2015.
- A. Petition Requesting the Investigation of Provision of Separate Right Turn Lane for A60 Northbound Traffic at A60/A6006 Traffic Signal Junction (Ref 2015/097)**
2. A 160 signature petition was presented to Full Council on 15th January by Councillor Andrew Brown requesting the re-investigation of the right turn facility and lane allocation on the northbound A60 approach to the A60/A6006 traffic signal junction at Rempstone. The petition also requested investigation of the capacity of the A6006 through Rempstone to cope with the volume of Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs) that pass through the village as they continually mount the pavement.
3. With regard to the first section, on the A60 northbound approach to the junction there are far more left turning vehicles than right turners and the current lane allocation reflects this. The current lane allocation is nearside lane left turn only, offside lane ahead and right turn. Adjusting the lane allocations would reduce capacity and increase queues as more traffic would be forced into one lane. It would also increase the risk of collisions between vehicles moving from the nearside lane to the offside lane to get round left turning vehicles.
4. Regarding the second request, the A6006 through Rempstone is an 'A' class road. These type of roads have the purpose of carrying HGVs as they are part of the National Route Network. The overriding of the footway is not due to the volume of HGVs, but bad driving. Bollards cannot be employed to try and deter this practice as the footways are too narrow for them to be accommodated without also obstructing pedestrians and wheelchair users. There has been no recent pattern of accidents occurring due to this behaviour and it is unlikely that HGVs are overriding the footways at speed or without due care of any pedestrians who might be present. Subsequently, instances of driving on the footways should be reported to the Police.

5. It is recommended that the lead petitioner be informed.

B. Petition Requesting the Resurfacing of Bollards Lane, Sutton Bonington (Ref:2015/098)

6. At the meeting of Full Council on 15th January 2015, Councillor Andrew Brown presented a petition with 51 signatories asking for the carriageway of Bollards Lane to be resurfaced. The petition states that 28 potholes were filled in 2012 and a further 48 potholes are marked out on the road now. The petitioners also state that the nearby Bucks Lane was resurfaced despite it having fewer houses on it than Bollards Lane.
7. The annual inspection of Bollards Lane in 2012 led to 28 potholes being repaired but no repairs were required in 2013. The annual inspection of Bollards Lane in November 2014 showed that although the carriageway condition is generally poor, most of the defects do not meet intervention levels for repair. However, as the surface is stripping off in a number of areas, it was decided that the road would be a good candidate for a new treatment called Nu-phalt in order to stabilise its overall condition. Nu-phalt is a thermal treatment which heats up and recycles the existing surface and is best used to treat roads which have a series of shallow defects. Subsequently, the inspector marked up 48 areas on the road to be treated with Nu-phalt and this work will be carried out shortly.
8. Bucks Lane was resurfaced in Spring 2010 as part of a Building Better Communities initiative which was requested by both the Parish Council and the local Member. The road had drainage issues as well as a poor surface. Heritage funding was also gained for the improvement as the road is on top of an old burial ground and the adjacent brick wall of Sutton Bonington Hall is listed.
9. Bollards Lane is not a high priority for a full resurfacing treatment which would be far more expensive than Nu-phalt. Subsequently, it is felt that the currently planned works are an appropriate approach to maintaining this road.
10. It is recommended that the lead petitioner be informed.

C. Petition Requesting the Implementation of a Residents' Parking Scheme on Windsor Street, Stapleford (Ref:2015/99)

11. A 20 signature petition was presented to the 15th January 2015 meeting of the County Council by Councillor Jacky Williams. The petitioners requested the introduction of a Residents' Parking Scheme on Windsor Street, Stapleford.
12. Windsor Street is a residential street situated close to Stapleford town centre with the majority of properties having off-street parking. Experience shows that the availability of off-street parking makes it likely that residents will decide not to purchase a permit, resulting in the council incurring a cost for introducing and administering a scheme that benefits relatively few residents.

13. Looking at the road in question the issue may well be vehicles parking across driveways and causing an obstruction. In these circumstances a residents' parking scheme is not the most appropriate solution and the residents may want to consider the option of an 'H' bar across their driveway, although there is a charge for this service.
14. It is recommended that the lead petitioner be informed.

D. Petition Regarding Network Rail's proposal to close all Level Crossings between London Kings Cross and Doncaster (Ref 2015/100)

15. A petition of 102 signatures was presented to the County Council meeting on 15th January 2015 by County Councillor Sue Saddington. The petition requests that:

"1) Network Rail do provide their proposed road bridge (with safe footpath) to replace Norwell Lane Crossing; provide a bridleway along the western side of the East Coast Mainline (ECML) from the Norwell Crossing bridge to Bathley Lane, and consider providing a footbridge at Bathley Lane Crossing for access to the centre of the village; and

2) NCC reroute public footpath FP1 (which still crosses the A1, as well as ECML)".

16. During the first consultation events in summer 2014 Network Rail and their consultants, Mott MacDonald, proposed the closure of Bathley Lane level crossing and to divert all users on a new section of road which joins the Great North Road to the south of the existing crossing. Users would then cross the railway by using the existing road bridge on the Great North Road south of the A1 roundabout at North Muskham. Petitioners are requesting that Network Rail consider the provision of a footbridge at Bathley Lane level crossing with links to the rights of way network.
17. Network Rail has received a copy of the petition and the petitioners' suggestions. Network Rail and Mott MacDonald have also considered all the comments and feedback from their first consultation events and they are in the process of undertaking a second round of consultation. Officers from the Authority will continue to discuss the proposals with Network Rail and their consultants. Network Rail and Mott MacDonald are aiming to submit a Transport and Works Act Order to the Secretary of State in summer 2015. Members of the public and stakeholders will have the opportunity to formally object. Unsolved objections will be considered by the Planning Inspectorate at a public inquiry. Petitioners will be kept advised of progress by Network Rail and the County Council and a report on the proposed crossing closures will be brought to a future meeting of the Committee.
18. It is recommended that the lead petitioner be informed.

E. Petition Requesting the Repair of Footway and Road on Hardwick Avenue, Newark (Ref 2015/101)

19. At the County Council meeting on 15th January 2015 a petition (ref: 2015/101) of 22 signatures and comments was presented by County Councillor Stuart Wallace. The petition, from concerned residents, requests that Nottinghamshire County Council refurbishes Hardwick Avenue in Newark. Concern is expressed that tree roots are

breaking up the surface of the footway making it hazardous for pedestrians. They also state that the road is in poor condition.

20. A recent inspection of Hardwick Avenue has shown that substantial footway and carriageway repairs are needed. However, the programme for the next financial year is fully committed so Hardwick Avenue will be considered for inclusion in the 2016/17 works programme.
21. It is recommended that the lead petitioner be informed.

F. Petition Requesting the Extension of No Stopping Restrictions on Sunnycroft Court and The Park in Mansfield (Ref: 2015/102)

22. A 31 signature petition was presented to County Council on 15th January 2015 by Councillor Andy Sissons. The petition supports the parking restrictions to make the existing 'School Keep Clear' markings on The Park in Mansfield legally enforceable, but is requesting that these are extended to cover the whole of Sunnycroft Court and further along The Park (as far as the entrance to Lochbuie Court) to enhance the safety of residents and children at the school. The petition raises concern that the wider area becomes congested at school start and finish times with double parking and conflict between vehicles, students and other pedestrians on the hammer heads used to turn vehicles around.
23. The proposals to make the existing 'School Keep Clear' markings on The Park enforceable were consulted on and advertised as part of an area-wide programme (Mansfield East and South – TRO2177) during July 2014. Apart from the petition requesting further no stopping restrictions there were no objections received that are considered as outstanding to the advertised proposals on The Park.
24. The 'No Stopping On Entrance Markings' restrictions are used to keep the school entrance clear of stationary vehicles (even if picking up or setting down children) and prohibit vehicles from stopping on the markings, they do not exclude vehicles from turning in an area at the end of a road. Additional restrictions such as No Waiting At Any Time (double yellow lines) can be introduced to prevent parking and keep areas clear of vehicles such as around a junction or pedestrian crossing points. The current proposals once in force will be monitored and if necessary consideration given for additional parking restrictions in a future year's programme if funding permits.
25. Any further restrictions would be subject to the necessary consultation and statutory undertakings that may result in further objections being received that would need to be considered.
26. It is recommended that the lead petitioner be informed.

G. Petition Requesting the Registering of a Pathway as a Right Of Way in Carlton (Ref 2015/103)

27. A petition of 118 signatures was presented to the County Council meeting on 15th January 2015 by County Councillor Roy Allen. The petition requests that;

“We the undersigned do hereby petition Nottinghamshire County Council, Gedling Borough Council and whoever else it may concern to ensure continued access for walkers and cyclists (as established by over 130 years of continued and well documented public use), to the grassed footpath section of Ethel Avenue between Emmanuel Avenue and Kenrick Road which has been unofficially blocked since July 2013.

In the light of a current residential planning application which threatens continued public access to this route we also strongly urge Nottinghamshire County Council to prioritise the decision regarding the recent application to have this section of Ethel Avenue registered as a public bridleway, in order to protect this very much valued local route”.

28. The petition refers to an unregistered public right of way in Carlton. The Countryside Access Team received an application from the Ramblers’ in November 2013 to record this path on Nottinghamshire’s legal record of public rights of way, the Definitive Map and Statement. The Countryside Access Team has considered the evidence and believes that on the balance of probabilities that a public bridleway exists between Kenrick Road and Emmanuel Avenue. As part of the process, Officers conducted a pre-consultation with interested parties and received an objection from the developer who has blocked the ‘path’.
29. Officers now need to present a report to the County Council’s Planning and Licensing Committee for a decision on whether to make an Order or not. If an Order is made this will be on public deposit for six weeks and if during this period unresolved objections are received, the Order will be submitted to the Secretary of State for a public inquiry. Petitioners and the developer will be kept advised of progress and recommendations will be made to the Planning and Licensing Committee in due course.
30. The Authority’s Highways Development Control Team has formally objected to the planning application. The applicant intends to use the path for vehicular access to one of the proposed properties. However, due to the current physical width of the path, Highways DC consider that the track is not wide enough to safely accommodate both vehicles and pedestrians. The applicant has entered into negotiations with Gedling Borough Council regarding the potential purchase of land in order to widen the path. This would potentially provide a satisfactory width to accommodate use by vehicles to one dwelling, as well as pedestrians using the path. At this stage there have been no details submitted which indicate how wide the path / access will be.
31. It is recommended that the lead petitioner be informed.

Other Options Considered

32. Each petition response sets out any other options that may be considered.

Statutory and Policy Implications

33. This report has been compiled after consideration of implications in respect of crime and disorder, finance, human resources, human rights, the NHS Constitution (Public Health only), the public sector equality duty, safeguarding of children and vulnerable

adults, service users, sustainability and the environment and ways of working and where such implications are material they are described below. Appropriate consultation has been undertaken and advice sought on these issues as required.

Recommendation

It is RECOMMENDED that the proposed actions be approved, the lead petitioners be informed accordingly and a report be presented to Full Council for the actions to be noted.

Neil Hodgson
Service Director - Highways

For any enquiries about this report please contact:

Neil Hodgson
Tel 0115 977 4681

Background Papers and Published Documents

Minutes of County Council meeting 15th January 2015.

Electoral Division(s) and Member(s) Affected

Soar Valley, Bramcote & Stapleford, Farndon & Muskham, Newark East, Mansfield South, and Arnold South.

19 March 2015**Agenda Item: 11****REPORT OF CORPORATE DIRECTOR, POLICY, PLANNING AND
CORPORATE SERVICES****WORK PROGRAMME****Purpose of the Report**

1. To consider the Committee's work programme for 2015.

Information and Advice

2. The County Council requires each committee to maintain a work programme. The work programme will assist the management of the committee's agenda, the scheduling of the committee's business and forward planning. The work programme will be updated and reviewed at each pre-agenda meeting and committee meeting. Any member of the committee is able to suggest items for possible inclusion.
3. The attached work programme has been drafted in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman, and includes items which can be anticipated at the present time. Other items will be added to the programme as they are identified.
4. As part of the transparency introduced by the new committee arrangements, committees are expected to review day to day operational decisions made by officers using their delegated powers. It is anticipated that the committee will wish to commission periodic reports on such decisions. The committee is therefore requested to identify activities on which it would like to receive reports for inclusion in the work programme. It may be that the presentations about activities in the committee's remit will help to inform this.
5. The work programme already includes a number of reports on items suggested by the committee.

Other Options Considered

6. None.

Reason/s for Recommendation/s

7. To assist the committee in preparing its work programme.

Statutory and Policy Implications

8. This report has been compiled after consideration of implications in respect of crime and disorder, finance, human resources, human rights, the NHS Constitution (Public Health only), the public sector equality duty, safeguarding of children and vulnerable adults, service users, sustainability and the environment and ways of working and where such implications are material they are described below. Appropriate consultation has been undertaken and advice sought on these issues as required.

RECOMMENDATION/S

That the committee's work programme be noted, and consideration be given to any changes which the Committee wishes to make.

Jayne Francis-Ward
Corporate Director, Policy, Planning and Corporate Services

For any enquiries about this report please contact: Pete Barker x 74416

Constitutional Comments (HD)

9. The Committee has authority to consider the matters set out in this report by virtue of its terms of reference.

Financial Comments (NS)

10. There are no direct financial implications arising from the contents of this report. Any future reports to Committee on operational activities and officer working groups, will contain relevant financial information and comments.

Background Papers

None.

Electoral Division(s) and Member(s) Affected

All

TRANSPORT & HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE - WORK PROGRAMME

<u>Report Title</u>	<u>Brief summary of agenda item</u>	<u>For Decision or Information?</u>	<u>Lead Officer</u>	<u>Report Author</u>
23 Apr 2015				
Integrated Passenger Transport Strategy	Strategy approval sought	Decision	Sean Parks	Neil Hodgson
Highways Infrastructure Asset Management Plan (HIAMP)	Update Report	Info	Don Fitch	Neil Hodgson
The Nottinghamshire County Council (Nottingham Road, Eastwood) (Parking Restrictions) Traffic Regulation Order 2015 (5190)	Consideration of objections	Decision	Mike Barnett	Neil Hodgson
The Nottinghamshire County Council (William Street and New Street, Newark on Trent)(Prohibition of Waiting and Residents' Controlled Zone) Traffic Regulation Order 2015 (3185)	Consideration of objections	Decision	Mike Barnett	Neil Hodgson
The Nottinghamshire County Council B6023 Alfreton Road/Fonton Hall Drive, Sutton in Ashfield) (Prohibition of Waiting) Traffic Regulation Order	Consideration of objections	Decision	Mike Barnett	Neil Hodgson
Bus Lane Enforcement, Rushcliffe, Traffic Regulation Order	Consideration of objections	Decision	Mike Barnett	Neil Hodgson

<u>Report Title</u>	<u>Brief summary of agenda item</u>	<u>For Decision or Information?</u>	<u>Lead Officer</u>	<u>Report Author</u>
Objections To Permanent Traffic Regulation Orders	Update on Service Director approvals	Info	Mike Barnett	Neil Hodgson
Civil Parking Enforcement: Enforcement Agent(Bailiff)	Contract award	Decision	Gareth Johnson	Neil Hodgson
Civil Parking Enforcement:Remote Enforcement and Service Improvements	Details of operational procedures	Decision	Gareth Johnson	Neil Hodgson
Petitions Report	Responses to Petitions presented to Full Council	Decision		Various
21 May 2015				
Bus Service Operators Grant (BSOG)	Funding proposals	Decision	Pete Mathieson	Mark Hudson
Local Bus Service Update	Update report	Info	Chris Ward	Mark Hudson
DfT Community Transport Minibus Fund	Results of the awards	Info.	Pete Mathieson	Mark Hudson
Rights of Way Improvement Plan	Update Report	Info.	Neil Lewis	Neil Hodgson
East Coast Mainline: Crossing Closures	Proposed Options	Decision	Karen Nurse	Neil Hodgson
Highway Performance Report Q4	Update on performance monitoring across highway services	Info.	Don Fitch	Neil Hodgson
Highway TRO Report	Report as needed to consider objections to proposed Traffic Regulation Orders	Decision	Mike Barnett	Neil Hodgson
Petitions Report	Responses to Petitions presented to Full Council	Decision		Various
18 June 2015				
Highway TRO Report	Report as needed to consider objections to proposed Traffic Regulation Orders	Decision	Mike Barnett	Neil Hodgson

<u>Report Title</u>	<u>Brief summary of agenda item</u>	<u>For Decision or Information?</u>	<u>Lead Officer</u>	<u>Report Author</u>
Petitions Report	Responses to Petitions presented to Full Council	Decision		Various
16 July 2015				
Highway TRO Report	Report as needed to consider objections to proposed Traffic Regulation Orders	Decision	Mike Barnett	Neil Hodgson
Petitions Report	Responses to Petitions presented to Full Council	Decision		Various

