

IMPROVING PLACES SELECT COMMISSION
Wednesday, 14th October, 2015

Present:- Councillor Beck (in the Chair); Councillors Atkin, Buckley, Cutts, Godfrey, Jepson, McNeely, Pickering, Reeder, C. Vines, Whelbourn, Whysall and Wyatt.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Gosling and Wallis and from co-opted member Mrs. L. Shears.

18. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no Declarations of Interest made at the meeting.

19. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

There were no questions from members of the public or the press.

20. COMMUNICATIONS

Waste Management Task and Finish Group

Councillor Godfrey, Chair of the Task and Finish Group, reported that the Group had met three times with a further meeting planned shortly. A visit to North Yorkshire was planned to take place to look at their household waste disposal and policies they have in relation to charging for certain types of waste. It was hoped to pull together a report before the end of the year. A meeting was to take place the following week with the British Heart Foundation to discuss a possible partnership in relation to the bulky goods service.

Christine Majer, Policy Officer, also reported that the Group had been invited to a meeting on 20th October with representatives of the Local Government Association and those carrying out the Health Checks on the Waste Service.

21. HIGHWAY ASSET MANAGEMENT POLICY, STRATEGY AND PLAN 2015-2021

Colin Knight, Highway Network Manager, presented the Council's Highways Asset Management Policy, Strategy and revised Highway Asset Management Plan (HAMP) for the period 2015-2021.

The Chairman drew attention to the fact that the Policy had been considered by Commissioner Manzie and was to be considered at the 21st October Council meeting. Assurances had been given that any recommendations made by the Select Commission would be conveyed to officers and Commissioners and raised at the Council meeting.

Members received the following powerpoint presentation:-

Highway Maintenance Background

- The Council was responsible for maintaining 700 miles of roads and 1,300 miles of footways/PROW
- The highways network was the Council's single biggest asset with a value of around £1.72b (gross replacement value)
- The Authority's approach to highway maintenance was based on two principles:-
 - Primary objective was to keep Rotherham's roads and footways in a safe condition and to nationally recognised standard
 - Carry out programmed maintenance works as cost effectively as possible (not necessarily works on roads that are in the worst condition)
- A deteriorating network means an increasing amount of funding is spent on reactive maintenance (potholes).

Assets and Performance Management

Asset Type	Quantity	Estimated Gross Replacement Cost (£M)	Depreciated Replacement Cost (DRC) (£M)
Carriageways	712 miles (1,143 km)	£1,257M	£1,202M
Footways	1,052 miles (1,689 km)	£219M	£192M
Drainage	45,500 chambers, gullies etc. and 35 km of drainage pipes/chambers	Included in carriageway costs	Included in carriageway costs
Street Lighting/Furniture	35,216 street lights columns	£73M	£67M
Structures	185 structures – bridges, culverts and underpasses	£164m	£157m
Traffic Systems	107 traffic signalised junctions and pedestrian crossings	£14M	£6M
	Total Cost	£1.726b	£1.630b

Highway Asset Condition

Road Classification	RMBC (2013/14)	National Average (2013/14)
Principle – A Roads (In 2008 extra £5M Capital funding injected to improve road network)	3%	4%
Non-Principal – B & C Roads (an extra £3M investment over 3 years)	7%	8%
Unclassified – U Roads (estate roads) (Capital investment in 2015/16 and 2016/17 of £5M to address the deterioration)	21%	18%
Footways	25%	Not available

Policy – Sets out what we want to achieve and links to the Corporate Vision over the medium to long term.

- We believe good asset management is fundamental in enabling RMBC to effectively deliver highway services to achieve our long term corporate priorities
- It will enable informed decisions to be made about investment and maintenance funding
- Resources can then be targeted at where they are most effective
- Enable the identification and management of risk associated with our statutory duty to manage and maintain

Strategy - Outlines the approach to managing highway infrastructure

- Corporate objective – to keep highways safe and well maintained
- Departmental priorities – to national average condition
- Asset Management Policy
- Asset Management Strategy
- Highway Asset Management Plans
- Rotherham’s Highway Asset Management Plan
 - Good data management (inventory)
 - Levels of Service and Performance Management
 - Asset Lifecycle Planning
 - Risk Management
 - Works Programmes

Outcomes

- To provide safe highway network for all our users
- Improve customer satisfaction
- Maximise the funding to repair as much of highway network as possible
- Reduce the number of properties at risk of flooding
- Reduce our energy consumption

Highway Lifecycle Planning

- The impact of early intervention treatments (such as surface dressing) can return the carriageway to an almost new condition
- Lifecycle planning used to develop investment strategies to deliver an agreed level of performance or, where funding becomes constrained, a prediction of the effect of particular funding scenarios on the levels of served that can be delivered
- Enabled Services to be delivered as effectively as possible allowing a clear and logical allocation of resources to those areas which would contribute most to the overall objectives and priorities of the Council and allow an assessment to be made of the residual risk

Decision Making Process

- Taking into consider asset condition, safety lifestyle cost, stakeholder interest and how supports Corporate objectives
- By the use of robust evidence-based decision making processes, the Department was able to optimise assets by the appropriate prioritisation of work within the available funding
- Potential for schemes to be co-ordinated across asset groups – alignment of schemes within the works programmes was key to optimising available funding
- Highway Asset Managers regularly met to review works programmes for each of the assets groups. Locations that appeared near to the top of more than one of the priority lists were to be considered as to whether a joined up scheme may be feasible

Long Term Maintenance Investments

- To bring the unclassified network (estate roads) up to national average or better requires a total investment of £15M
- Priority to carry out timely maintenance before the road was in poor condition
- If roads in an amber condition were targeted there would be a 4-5% reduction in these roads that required significant work
- If the £5M was used on the worst roads, red condition, this would approximately treat 18km. If the funding is targeted at amber condition roads over a 2 years period 4 times that length would be treated
- DfT Local Highways Maintenance Capital Block Funding (LTP) and recognition of following good asset management principles.
- If good asset management principles are not adhered to then the highway condition will continue to deteriorate at an accelerated rate
- The number of potholes would increase as would the spending on reactive maintenance:-

Spend on Reactive Work (potholes)

Year	Number	Cost (000's)	Cost/Defect
2008/09	12,000	243	£20
2014/15	34,000	435	£12

Additionally the number of third party claims would potentially increase

Discussion ensued on the presentation with the following issues raised/clarified:-

- Members now had a greater awareness of the condition of the road network and the challenges the Service faced. Over 54 schemes would be delivered this year which had been suggested by Members. Sessions had also been run where Members had been invited out to meet the Highway Inspectors to see what was involved in “the day of the life of a Highway Inspector”
- Intensive weather events had identified significant flooding risks and the capacity of the highway drains to deal with such events. The Authority worked closely with Yorkshire Water on the capacity of their systems and capability of our gullies etc. Investment had also recently been made in telematics which would record whether a gully was blocked, half full or clear, enabling the gully cleaning schedule to be prioritised accordingly
- Members found the weekly traffic delay report very helpful although there were sometimes issues with the road signage not being removed as efficiently as they should. It would also be helpful if a monthly schedule could be provided on which roads were to be treated appreciating that there may be events that overtook planned works. It would be looked to be included on the website so it could be accessed at any point
- The unclassified roads programme required an extra £10M to the £5M Capital funding and there was currently no possibility of that coming from any other source(DfT), £3.6M has been received in 2015/16 as part of the DfT annual LTP settlement. A submission would be made to the Council Capital pot for the £10m funding. This would bring the unclassified network to the national average condition. It was noted that when a level of performance is reached for the highway network it then requires £6.5m every year to maintain the roads at that level
- The Council’s approach to highway maintenance, as endorsed at the Members’ workshop in May, 2015, is to priorities roads in an amber condition as well as picking up several kilometres of “red” roads. If successful in the bid for funding and the extra £10M secured, this would address all the red roads to a level that would achieve national average condition

- There was currently no single major maintenance projects prepared at the moment. However, bids totalling £12M had been submitted to the DfT last year for maintenance works on Rotherham's strategic network and bridge structures but had unfortunately not been successful. Feedback from the DfT had revealed that if the Authority had increased its minimum funding requirement (was submitted as 10%), the chances of success would increase. Discussions were taking place with regard to considerations for submissions for the second round of funding but more would be known once the assessment criteria for LTP funding comes out in November
- If the highways were maintained there would be a decrease in the number of potholes. The multi-hog served a good purpose and was very useful in estate type roads where it could be used with minimum traffic management. The national cost for repairing a pothole was approximately £54; in Rotherham it cost £13. There were no criteria set against the average cost so the Authority had asked a specific question to APSE as to the cost for plant, labour and materials to enable a true comparison to be made. On average, the national cost was 30-40% more than Rotherham's. There were very few repeat potholes but was more the case of one developing adjacent to the original
- Engagement had been carried out with key stakeholders on the Strategy for managing Rotherham's highway assets. Those that had responded had endorsed the process regarding prioritisation of works and the Policy and Strategy. A presentation had also been made to the Council's Learning from Customers Forum about the prioritisation of the works. However, there was genuine concern that members of public would feel that the worst roads were not being dealt with and it was important to get communication and information out to Members to share with members of the public at surgeries
- There was an action plan attached to the Asset Management Plan which would be reported to Councillors and Commissioners. It was imperative that the complete document was prepared and endorsed by Council for 2015/21 as part of the submission for DfT LTP funding. As part of the annual update, an Executive Summary would be prepared
- With regard to pothole cost against quality, the services that delivered highway maintenance had been reorganised into one team in 2010/11 which had brought about efficiencies. There were also different types of materials and close working with a local asphalt provider to develop materials. Like all authorities, there would be reports of potholes not lasting/stable but there was not a significant number. The Highways Delivery Team Manager had been requested to keep a record of all reports and also quality check the work carried out

- Some of the highways in the Highways three year work programme appeared twice as they were phased for engineering and financial reasons
- The Authority's Street Lighting Team often did the design and build for new developments so that it could control what lighting was provided
- A number of concerns had been raised at the recent Commissioners' Roadshows highlighting that highways were seen as a priority to members of the public. They would be fed into the budget setting process this year and into the Capital budget process
- The Highway Works Programme mid-term review was planned for the following week. There would be a session for Members in February/March, 2016, regarding the prioritisation and where the best value for money for the available budget

The Chairman stated that the Select Commission would be interested in the Strategy's performance management going forward as well as a number of the Key Performance Indicators being relevant to the Commission's area of work. Once live and in operation, the Select Commission would wish an annual update on progress, any issues/areas of concern.

Colin Knight reported that there was criteria associated with the LTP funding of 3 different levels:-

Level 1 - the Authority will not receive all the available funding

Level 2 - the Authority will receive full funding for a period of time

Level 3 - was a stretched target and the Authority will be striving to achieve this over the coming years.

Resolved:- (1) That Highways Asset Management Policy, Strategy and revised Highways Asset Management Plan (HAMP) 2015-2021 be endorsed.

(2) That as part of the annual update, an executive summary be produced for the Select Commission.

22. ROTHERHAM TRANSPORT STRATEGY

Tom Finnegan-Smith, Transportation Highways and Project Manager, presented the draft Rotherham Transport Strategy which outlined the proposed strategic approach to the provision and management of transport and transport infrastructure in Rotherham.

The following powerpoint presentation as given:-

Why do we need a Transport Strategy

- Lots of policy documents both national and regional
- Need to know how Policy relates to Rotherham
- The Strategy captures interaction with other disciplines such as land use planning, air quality, health and regeneration
- Within this framework, a Strategy is needed to prevent a piecemeal approach to projects
- Based on the evidence of the need and challenges faced, it sets out priorities and informs decisions

The Role of Transportation in supporting Rotherham's Economic Growth

- Government have reinforced the key role that effective and efficient Transportation and Highway networks have on Economic Growth

How Transportation has fed into the development of the growth plan for City Region and Rotherham's Growth Plan

- International, national transport and land planning policy and law
- Sheffield City Region Transport Strategy (2011-2026) and Local Transport Plan
- Local Plan Core Strategy (local planning and land use)
- Sheffield City Regional Strategic Economic Plan (Growth Plan)
- Rotherham Corporate Plan and Health and Wellbeing Strategy
- Rotherham Growth Plan
- Transport and highways projects in Rotherham

Rotherham's Transport Strategy 2015-2026

By 2028 Rotherham will

- Enjoy sustainable growth – new development will be based on compact mixed use centres focussed on high quality public transport
- Be a connected place – people and places are connected by an integrated, safe and efficient transport network
- Make sustainable travel choices – walking, cycling and public transport are a normal part of daily travel

Challenges

- Economic growth
- Car dependency
- Physical inactivity
- Energy and climate change
- Traffic congestion
- Less funding

Objectives

- Integrated transport and land use – to support well designed new development that reduces the need to travel and is accessible to everyone by frequent public transport, walking and cycling
- Public transport (bus, tram and train) – to improve the public transport network so it provides an alternative to the private car
- Active transport network – to make the transport network safe and

- attractive for walking and cycling
- Travel behaviour change – to reduce car dependency and increase levels of walking, cycling, car share and public transport use
- Roads and freight – to develop and manage an efficient road network for the movement of people and goods that can be shared by everyone
- Safer roads – to make the transport network safe for everyone

Themes and Actions

- To focus new development along key public transport corridors and in places adjacent to existing shops and services
- To develop high quality accessible public places (centres)
- To improve rail services and access to stations and to ensure SCR is served by high speed rail
- To improve connectivity between major settlements
- To develop public transport that connects people to jobs and training
- To improve safety on public transport
- To work with operators to keep fares affordable
- To develop high quality, connected cycling and walking networks
- Connecting and completing the existing active transport network
- Connecting with public transport
- Connecting colleges and schools
- Connecting our urban centres
- To encourage active travel especially to address local obesity and inactivity problems, encourage schools to adopt active travel projects and create a lasting legacy from LSTF projects
- To provide information and travel advice for the users of all modes of transport
- To improve surface access to international gateways
- To reduce the amount of productive time lost on the strategic and local road network and to improve its resilience and reliability
- To ensure networks are well maintained
- To promote efficient and sustainable means of freight distribution
- To work to improve the efficiency of vehicles and reduce carbon emissions and to improve air quality especially in designated areas
- To apply parking policies to promote efficient car use, while remaining sensitive to the vulnerability of local economics
- To encourage safe road use and reduce casualties on our roads
- To focus safety efforts on vulnerable groups
- To work with the Police to enforce traffic laws

Outcomes

- To support economic growth and develop a resilient transport system
- Reduce emissions and protect our natural environment
- To maximise safety on a more 'active' transport network
- To enhance a social inclusion and health through a more equitable transport system

Changing face of funding

- Sheffield City Regional Growth Plan
This is a strategic bidding document to the Local Growth Fund
- Rotherham Transport Strategy and Growth Plan
- Local Growth Fund (2015-16)
Major scheme funding
40% top-slice LTP IT block
LSTF
DfT are providing £1.1b of the £1.3b Capital element of LGF for 2015/16
- Local Funding (with SY influence)
CIL and S106
S278
Residual LTP IT Block
LTP Maintenance
DfT Competitive funds
DfT Partnering funds
Capital investment
- The Strategy will no longer be delivered solely through an annual programme of Transportation and Highways grant funded schemes and initiatives. The influence of Devolution on our future funding and transport infrastructure is likely to be significant

Discussion ensued on the presentation with the following issues raised/clarified;-

- The Council had 4/5 designated Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA), areas defined as having a reading over a certain threshold in terms of air quality emissions. Such issues were monitored across South Yorkshire with an external provider doing some of the work and an Environmental Officer. The reasons for having poor air quality would be considered together with potential mitigations to bring the areas out of being an AQMA some of which included public transport providers and bus operators around cleaner technology for their vehicles. There was no one solution but making public transport attractive would help. Work was taking place with Highways England regarding the poor air quality near to the M1 motorway in Brinsworth, Tinsley and Blackburn particularly given the development of the smart motorway
- A review of the bus network had been undertaken last Summer in the run up to the launch of the Rotherham Voluntary Bus Partnership. At that time work had taken place with SYPTTE and the main bus operators that were engaged in the Partnership to review the network and try and agree a network that effectively tried to link to communities as best it could given that the operators were commercial operators and would take business decisions based on whether they thought a route could be sustained. For those routes/communities that the operators did not wish to serve there was

a secondary criteria for the PTE and their bus tendered services i.e. the ones that filled in the gaps either in total or for periods of the day where a private operator did not want to run a route. There may well be smaller communities that did not meet the criteria for the provision of a tendered service. Whilst certain communities have seen the overall number of services reduced and therefore the range of destinations reduced the aim of the network review was to ensure that communities were still provided with a service, from which passengers could interchange between services to get them to their ultimate destination.

- It had been in the media about a possible new railway station in the Parkgate area of Rotherham. This had come from a recent study undertaken by the SYPTTE which had looked at the rail service that was provided at Rotherham Central Station and whether that service provision could be improved with better links to a wider range of destinations and more frequent service. Although the Station itself had been refurbished recently the services that served the Station remained as they were before. Tram train was a key part of that provision but the study had effectively highlighted the constraints of additional services serving Rotherham Central Station were as a result of the Station not being on the mainline. Due to this, there were issues around the delays that train companies would experience by travelling off and onto the mainline and due to the alignment of the track serving Rotherham Central the slow line speeds. A range of options had been considered to find a solution but they were not considered to be value for money and would mean re-aligning the main line through the Central Station which was not cost effective. For Rotherham to have an enhanced connection and higher quality destinations would require a new mainline station
- The Tram Train project has been delayed until early 2017. The tram train vehicles themselves were on their way to South Yorkshire with the first ones arriving in December, 2015. The delay was as a result of programming/project management of the scheme; Network Rail had been challenged to come back from a position of delay and the revised timescale now stated 2017. Colleagues from the PTE were working predominantly on that project and had had a number of issues and discussions with Network Rail. The vehicles would be used along the Yellow tram route between Sheffield and Meadowhall but would not connect with the heavy rail route until 2017. An order under the Transport and Rail Act 1992 was required and Network Rail had submitted this to the Secretary of State for Transport on the 13 March 2015.
- Funding for work around sustainable travel, including the promotion of the car sharing initiative, came from the current Local Sustainable Travel Fund which would finish on 31st March, 2016. The cessation of funding would leave a gap and a problem in terms of continuing much of that activity. One of the benefits of the Fund, and South Yorkshire

was very successful being the only metropolitan area that received the total funding sought (approximately £35M), was that it was not all Capital funding but Revenue funding to promote other forms of transport and the car club was not a capital scheme. Although it was accepted that the scheme in its own right could be more successful than it was there without funding it would not go ahead at all

- There were a number of charging points for electric vehicles. There was a free rapid charging point in the Drummond Street car park and on the Waverley AMP. The funding for such facilities was via the Local Sustainable Transport Fund, however, the vehicles were still expensive to purchase/lease. The Authority was keen to do more in terms of electric vehicles as it was with other emerging technologies i.e. the recent launch of hydrogen refuelling station at Waverley AMP
- Acknowledgement that it was an opportunity to look at wider rail provision and integration in terms of bus and rail particularly in the southern part of the Borough where the rail service was extremely well used. Car parking should also be included in any consultation

Resolved:- (1) That the draft Transport Strategy 2015-2026 be noted.

(2) That a report be submitted on air quality in the Borough.

23. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 2ND SEPTEMBER, 2015

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission, held on 2nd September, 2015, be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

24. DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING

Resolved:- That a further meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission be held on 25th November, 2015, commencing at 1.30 p.m.