

ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY SAFETY OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Agenda Item 37

Brighton & Hove City Council

Subject:	Local Transport Plan Progress Report 2008		
Date of Meeting:	10 November 2008		
Report of:	Director of Environment		
Contact Officer:	Name:	Andrew Renaut	Tel: 29-2477
	E-mail:	andrew.renaut@brighton-hove.gov.uk	
Wards Affected:	All		

FOR GENERAL RELEASE.

1. SUMMARY AND POLICY CONTEXT:

1.1 Local highway authorities have a statutory requirement to submit a Local Transport Plan [LTP] to the government. The LTP sets out a 5-year delivery programme of integrated transport and maintenance measures to improve local transport conditions and contribute towards meeting wider objectives and priorities, which include those of the government, the city council, it's partners, and stakeholders.

1.2 The approach adopted in developing the city council's second LTP [LTP2] was shaped significantly by the guidance issued by the government's Department for Transport [DfT]. This was focused on the 4 shared transport priorities for accessibility, air quality, congestion and safety that have been agreed between the DfT and the Local Government Association [LGA]. These form the basis for assessing the contribution that local measures in LTP2s will make towards national objectives and targets.

1.3 The significant contribution that transport can make to improving the city is also recognised in the Sustainable Community Strategy under the priority of 'promoting sustainable transport'. Working in partnership is key to addressing transport issues and many organisations in the city such as transport operators, businesses, schools, health service providers and local communities are important stakeholders who can contribute towards meeting wider objectives.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

2.1 That the Committee makes comments on the headline progress that is being made towards targets during the first two years of the second Local Transport Plan that should be reported to, and taken into account by, the Environment Cabinet Member.

3. RELEVANT BACKGROUND INFORMATION/CHRONOLOGY OF KEY EVENTS:

3.1 The current LTP covers the period 2006/07 to 2010/11. It is the second such document, and is often referred to as LTP2. It was approved by the council's Policy & Resources Committee, and submitted to the government, in March 2006. The LTP

contains the council's short- to medium-term plans to achieve longer-term objectives, with reference to the overall approach to delivery, the progress made in fulfilling government requirements and responding to GOSE advice, and how this has influenced the proposed 5-year programme of capital investment in transport infrastructure. The investment programme includes measures to promote and provide for the continued increased use of more sustainable forms of transport for some journeys, as well as important programmes of maintenance.

3.2 In 2008, the government requires Local Authorities to review their progress in implementing LTP2s and to publish concise progress reports. This should focus on the progress made in meeting objectives and targets in the first two years of the plan and to consider any opportunities or threats to the delivery of the LTP in the remaining years.

3.3 When published, the LTP2 contained 20 targets that were to be used as the basis for monitoring how well the council was doing. These targets included a combination of 7 mandatory government targets, 9 Best Value Performance Indicators [BVPIs], and 4 Local Targets. These include :-

- Road and footway conditions
- Fatal, serious and slight road traffic casualties
- Bus patronage and passenger satisfaction and punctuality
- Cycling trips
- Journeys to school
- Road traffic mileage and peak hour traffic flows

3.4 The introduction of new Local Area Agreements in 2008 has placed a further focus on the importance of transport in local authorities. The LAA for the city includes 3 transport indicators from the National Indicator Set – congestion, access to services and fatal and serious road traffic casualties.

3.5 The monitoring of targets occurs on a variety of different frequencies, time periods and baselines and relies on a number of different monitoring methodologies or sources of information. A summary of current progress is included at Appendix A, using a DfT-recommended scale for identifying potential risks. Of the 20 LTP2 targets, the progress made against 17 of these can be assessed. Of these, 10 are on target (green), 6 are making good progress towards targets (amber) and 1 is not on target (red).

3.6 Sufficient data are not currently available to enable progress to be reported for the remaining 3 targets at this time, primarily because:-

- a number of new baselines have been set during 2007 to reflect required changes in monitoring methodologies e.g cycling;
- survey methodologies are being reviewed e.g walking
- new monitoring software is not performing as expected e.g bus punctuality

3.7 The highest level of risk (red) where a target may not be met by 2010/11 relates to road safety. The target is to achieve a 40% reduction by 2010 in the total number of people killed or seriously injured [KSI] (when compared to a baseline of data averaged over 5 years – 1994-1998). Works, measures and initiatives that have been undertaken since 2000 to assist in reducing casualties include road safety engineering, safer routes to school schemes, and road safety education, training and publicity campaigns.

3.8 The LTP1 (2001/02-2005/06) Delivery Report published in 2006 identified that the number of people KSI did not appear to be reducing in line with the target trajectory. In order to address this, a more targeted approach to capital investment in treating the

highest risk casualty sites and a restructured Road Safety Team were implemented in 2006. These changes have occurred relatively close to the 2010 target date and therefore their effects would be expected to take some time to deliver more positive change.

3.9 There are a number of factors that may have contributed to the current level of progress. These include the significant amount of essential roadworks and other LTP improvement schemes that have been taking place in the city centre, where the majority of higher risk sites are located because of the greater levels of movement that occur and subsequent increased likelihood of conflict and collision. This has meant that it has not been possible to treat a number of those sites because of the disruptive effects of the roadworks on those locations or the effects that associated traffic management schemes or construction works have had on sites or adjacent routes.

3.10 Alternatively, the contributory factors that can cause collisions and casualties can be complex and may not be resolved simply through an engineering scheme or education and training. These can include errors of judgements, weather conditions, irrational behaviour due to drink or drugs, or lack of familiarity with surroundings (for example, the city is visited by 8 million people per year). The severity of casualties can often reflect the vulnerability of those involved, such as children and older people, or pedestrians, cyclists or motorcyclists. Although local research has indicated that there is no direct relationship between child casualties and areas of deprivation in the city, a popular and successful programme of Child Pedestrian Training has been introduced in these areas.

3.11 In order to understand these relationships better and identify any gaps in knowledge, officers have begun to review a number of possible means by which improvements in casualty reduction could be achieved. A constructive and positive working arrangement has been set up with the Sussex Safer Roads Partnership and its Data Intelligence Group. This has provided increased resource to enable a more robust and in-depth analysis of collision data to ascertain the severity ratio and trends in contributory factors to collisions, and therefore develop more tailored solutions to reducing casualties in particular locations.

3.12As previously reported to this Overview & Scrutiny Committee, the council's 2008 LTP Delivery Report is required to incorporate the 2008 Air Quality Action Plan Progress Report given the direct relationship with transport emissions. It is also expected to include an update on the progress being made by the council towards the statutory network management duty.

3.13The final draft of the 2008 Progress Report will be considered at the December Environment Cabinet Member Meeting prior to its submission to the Government Office for the South East by the end of this year. The views expressed by this Committee and the LSP will be taken into account.

4. CONSULTATION

4.1 There has been no formal consultation undertaken on this report. The LTP was the subject of consultation prior to its approval in 2006, and the DfT strongly recommends that the opportunity is taken to engage with key stakeholders on the 2008 Progress Report, such as the Local Strategic Partnership [LSP]. A presentation is being arranged for the LSP in mid-November.

5. FINANCIAL & OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

Financial Implications:

5.1 There are no direct financial implications associated with this report. The DfT has already confirmed the three-year local transport capital settlement for 2008/09 to 2010/11. The allocation of the 2008/09 Local Transport Plan was approved at Environment Committee on 20 March 2008.

5.2 The DfT have indicated that when considering the level of future funding allocations to be made available for LTP3, it will review any areas where current investment in integrated transport has not matched the transport capital allocation.

Finance Officer Consulted: Karen Brookshaw

Date: 8/10/08

Legal Implications:

5.3 There are no direct legal implications associated with this report. In relation to the LTP, the council is fulfilling its obligations in accordance with sections 108-109 of the Transport Act 2000 for the LTP. This is the statutory requirement referred to in paragraph 1.1 of this report.

Lawyer Consulted: Oliver Dixon

Date: 7/10/08

Equalities Implications:

5.4 There are no direct equalities implications associated with this report.

Sustainability Implications:

5.5 There are no direct sustainability implications associated with this report.

Crime & Disorder Implications:

5.6 There are no crime and disorder implications associated with this report.

Risk and Opportunity Management Implications:

5.7 There are no direct risk and opportunity management implications associated with this report.

Corporate / Citywide Implications:

5.8 The progress being made against LTP2 objectives and targets will also have implications for the LSP's Sustainable Community Strategy, particularly the section entitled 'promoting sustainable transport'.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Appendices:

Appendix A – Summary of progress towards LTP2 targets

Documents In Members' Rooms:

None.

Background Documents:

1. Local Transport Plan : 2006/07 – 2010/11 (March 2006)
2. DfT Guidance on Second Local Transport Plan Progress Reports (2008)