

# Public Document Pack



County Offices  
Newland  
Lincoln  
LN1 1YL

12 January 2018

## Highways and Transport Scrutiny Committee

A meeting of the Highways and Transport Scrutiny Committee will be held on **Monday, 22 January 2018 at 10.00 am in Committee Room Three, County Offices, Newland, Lincoln LN1 1YL** for the transaction of the business set out on the attached Agenda.

Yours sincerely

Tony McArdle  
Chief Executive

## Membership of the Highways and Transport Scrutiny Committee (11 Members of the Council)

Councillors M Brookes (Chairman), C J T H Brewis (Vice-Chairman), Mrs J Brockway, M A Griggs, R Grocock, Mrs W Bowkett, S P Roe, A N Stokes, E W Strengiel, R B Parker and B Adams



**HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE AGENDA**  
**MONDAY, 22 JANUARY 2018**

Item	Title	Pages
1	<b>Apologies for Absence/Replacement Members</b>	
2	<b>Declarations of Members' Interest</b>	
3	<b>Minutes of the meeting held on 11 December 2017</b>	5 - 12
4	<b>Announcements by the Chairman, Executive Councillor and Lead Officers</b>	
5	<b>Council Budget 2018/19</b> <i>(To receive a report and presentation from Michelle Grady, Head of Finance - Communities, which describes the budget proposals for the next two financial years based on the four year funding deal announced by Government as part of the 2018/19 Local Government Finance Settlement. This report specifically looks at the budget implications for highways and transport activities within the commissioning strategy 'Sustaining and Developing Prosperity through Infrastructure')</i>	13 - 18
6	<b>Roundabout Sponsorship</b> <i>(To receive a report by Paul Little, Network Manager North, which updates members on the current policy arrangements in relation to the sponsorship of roundabouts within the public highway in Lincolnshire)</i>	19 - 26
7	<b>Priorities for National Infrastructure - Response to National Infrastructure Assessment</b> <i>(To receive a report By David Hickman, Environment Commissioner, which provides the Committee with an opportunity to consider Lincolnshire County's Council's response to the National Infrastructure Assessment)</i>	27 - 46
8	<b>Grantham Southern Relief Road (GSSR) - Land Acquisition, Orders and Contracts</b> <i>(To receive a report and update from Alen Chanamuto, Senior Project Leader (Major Schemes), on the Grantham Southern Relief Road (GSSR) – Land Acquisition, Orders and Contract which was presented to the Executive on 3 January 2018)</i>	47 - 70
9	<b>Highways and Transport Scrutiny Committee Work Programme</b> <i>(To receive a report by Daniel Steel, Scrutiny Officer, which provides the Committee with an opportunity to consider its work programme for the year ahead to ensure that scrutiny activity is focused where it can be of greatest benefit)</i>	71 - 78

Democratic Services Officer Contact Details

Name: **Rachel Wilson**

Direct Dial **01522 552107**

E Mail Address [rachel.wilson@lincolnshire.gov.uk](mailto:rachel.wilson@lincolnshire.gov.uk)

**Please note:** for more information about any of the following please contact the Democratic Services Officer responsible for servicing this meeting

- Business of the meeting
- Any special arrangements
- Copies of reports

Contact details set out above.

All papers for council meetings are available on:

[www.lincolnshire.gov.uk/committeerecords](http://www.lincolnshire.gov.uk/committeerecords)



## HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 11 DECEMBER 2017

### PRESENT: COUNCILLOR M BROOKES (CHAIRMAN)

Councillors C J T H Brewis (Vice-Chairman), Mrs J Brockway, R Grocock, S P Roe, B Adams, R B Parker, A N Stokes, E W Strengiel and I G Fleetwood

Councillors: R G Davies and Mrs C L Perraton-Williams attended the meeting as observers

Officers in attendance:-

Matt Jones (Parking Services Manager), Paul Rusted (Infrastructure Commissioner), Daniel Steel (Scrutiny Officer), Rachel Wilson (Democratic Services Officer) and Andy Gutherson (County Commissioner for Economy and Place)

### 38 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE/REPLACEMENT MEMBERS

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Mrs W Bowkett and M A Griggs.

The Chief Executive reported that, under Local Government (Committee and Political Groups) Regulations 1990, Councillors B Adams and I G Fleetwood had been appointed to the Highways and Transport Scrutiny Committee to replace Councillors C L Strange until further notice and Mrs W Bowkett for this meeting only.

### 39 DECLARATION OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS

There were no declarations of interest at this point in the meeting.

### 40 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 6 NOVEMBER 2017

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the meeting held on 6 November 2017 be signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

### 41 ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIRMAN, EXECUTIVE COUNCILLOR AND LEAD OFFICERS

The Chairman requested that thanks to the gritter crews for their work during the recent cold snap be recorded, and also expressed thanks to the officers for the updates sent to councillors in relation to winter maintenance.

**HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE  
11 DECEMBER 2017**

Members were advised that in relation to the item from the previous meeting on weed control, the Executive and Executive Councillor had been asked to examine the frequency of weed spraying and asking them to consider this as part of the upcoming budget round.

There were no announcements at this time from the Executive Councillor for Highways, Transport and IT or the senior officers.

**42      UPDATE ON HIGHWAYS 2020**

The Committee received an update from Paul Rusted, Infrastructure Commissioner, on the progress with the Highways 2020 options appraisal following the meeting of the Executive on 5 December 2017. It was reported that this was unanimously well received by the Executive and provided the opportunity to move on with the rest of the work. Since the meeting, various working groups had started meeting including officer groups looking at the performance specification and contract documents. This work would be brought back to this committee as well as the councillor working group.

The authority was still undertaking market engagement and there continued to be interest in the work from those companies that would be interested in tendering for this work. It was considered positive that there was a lot of interest in tendering for this work particularly as there were projects such as HS2 which were beginning to have an impact on capacity within the industry.

Officers would begin working on tender documents to ensure that they were ready to go out at the appropriate time.

Members queried how the HS2 project would impact on Lincolnshire and were advised that it would be due to civil engineering resources and it was being found that a lot of staff from civil engineering companies were being drawn to the HS2 scheme, and it was already proving difficult to recruit to vacancies for the Lincoln Eastern Bypass. There was also the issue of material supply, as a project such as HS2 required a lot of materials, which could cause the market costs of materials to increase.

**43      CCTV TRIAL ENFORCEMENT REPORT**

The Committee received a comprehensive report regarding the CCTV enforcement trial implemented outside eight schools within the county. It was noted that the Highways and Transport Scrutiny Committee had previously supported and recommended that Lincolnshire County Council implement a trial scheme involving a CCTV vehicle to be used outside of eight primary schools to monitor motorists' behaviour on school keep clear markings. The scheme was implemented in January 2017 and was ongoing at the time of the meeting.

It was reported that the eight schools involved in the trial were as follows:

- William Alvey Primary School, Eastgate, Sleaford
- St Thomas' School, Wyberton Low Road, Boston

**HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**  
**11 DECEMBER 2017**

- Boston West Academy, Sussex Avenue, Boston
- National Junior School, Castlegate, Grantham
- Sir Francis Hill School, Bristol Drive, Lincoln
- The Priory Witham Academy, Shannon Ave, Lincoln
- Leslie Manser Primary School Kindgsdown Road, Lincoln
- Kingsdown Nursery School, Kingsdown Road, Lincoln

Members were provided with an opportunity to ask questions to the officers present in relation to the information contained within the report and some of the points raised during discussion included the following:

- The Executive Councillor commented that it was an excellent report, and reported that he had visited each of the locations before the trial, and again during the trial with an officer. It was acknowledged that there were some substantial challenges with some of the locations.
- Generally the trial had been very well received, and there had been a number of head teachers who had been in contact requesting the trial for their school. There had been some negative feedback from those schools where the authority had found it difficult to engage on these issues.
- It was clarified that a majority of the parents spoken to as part of this trial were drivers, and it was not just the 'walking' parents who were supportive of this initiative.
- One member commented that safety outside schools was regularly reported as an issue at the Carholme Forum meetings.
- It was suggested that extending the trial was the right thing to do and then would need to be examined whether it became part of the day to day business of the authority.
- It was queried how long a vehicle had to be on zig zag lines for it to be classed as an offence. Members were advised that these were no stopping areas and as soon as the car stops it would be in breach of the restrictions.
- It was noted that evidence had to be strong enough to be able to issue a ticket, such as recording the car registration number as well as clear signage in the area. The footage would then be sent to the back office to review and it would be determined whether there was enough evidence to issue a ticket.
- It was commented that the CCTV vehicles were expensive items to purchase and it was queried whether there would be a way to make better use of them as they would probably not be used between 9am and 2.45pm. It was queried whether they could be used for pedestrian crossings, however, members were advised that there were limits on what the camera could actually do.
- It was noted that the safety signs around schools were only advisory and were not enforceable, and a traffic regulation order was required to make them compliant. The only areas where they were enforceable were outside of those schools which were included in the trial.
- It was queried whether the perception that it was negative to drive to the school could be encouraged, and other methods of travelling to schools such as walking trains, linking with pub car parks for parking and then walking the rest of the school etc. be promoted. It was noted that in relation to these initiatives, after an initial burst of enthusiasm take up often dropped off.

**HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE****11 DECEMBER 2017**

- In terms of the suggestion for the CCTV vehicles to be able to park on yellow lines, members commented that they would support it, and it was confirmed that a dispensation would be issued to allow the vehicle to park and there would be a notice which could be displayed in the vehicle clarifying why the vehicle was there.
- It was highlighted that in terms of the proposal to extend the trial for a further 12 months, each year there would be a new intake of children and therefore new sets of parents. It was noted that one of the aims would be to carry out education and ongoing training. It was suggested that it should not be looked at for just 12 months and it was hoped that this would continue.
- It was commented that schools played a key role in getting information out to parents.
- It was reported that in some areas it had been known for some parents to park in other peoples' driveways.
- It was noted that due to the layouts around some schools, at some site, the parking restriction could not be made enforceable.
- One member commented that at the parish council meetings they attended, the parking situation around schools came up at almost every meeting.
- The lack of schools in the South Holland area in the trial was highlighted, and it was requested whether a school from South Holland could be included if the trial was extended for another 12 months. It was noted that the parking outside of schools was one of the issues which generated the most comments and queries from the public. It was also noted that a lot of feedback was received from the area highways managers about where particular issues were occurring. It was also noted that if officers became aware of a particular school where there were a lot of complaints then someone would look at it more closely.
- In relation to the particular query about the inclusion of schools in South Holland, it was noted that the council did not receive a lot of comments from this area of the county.
- It was queried whether there was any way that the Police could help in terms of cars parking illegally and causing an obstruction. Members were advised that it would be almost impossible to prove cars were causing an obstruction without a lot of effort. However, a number of fixed penalty notices had been issued around the county from obstruction.
- It was commented that it had been observed where cars had started parking outside of schools from 2.00pm. It was thought that there was a need to enforce tickets as fully as possible, as this was an issue outside all schools in the county.
- It was suggested that parking a CCTV vehicle in an area with parking restrictions would make the council look hypocritical and the public would not respect the Authority for that action even though the vehicle would have been issued with a dispensation.
- It was queried what the authority wanted to achieve through the extension of the trial, was it to try and deliver an equitable service or to address the areas with the greatest pressures. It was also queried whether the trial, if it was extended, would be a replication of the eight existing sites, or if it would look to have a more even spread of schools throughout the county.

**HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**  
**11 DECEMBER 2017**

- There was support from the Committee for the extension of the trial, but caution was expressed regarding the issue of granting permission for the CCTV vehicles to park in areas with parking restrictions.
- It was felt that further information was required on how the trial extension would be implemented, as well the use of fixed point CCTV.

**RESOLVED**

1. That the Committee support the extension of the CCTV enforcement trial for a further 12 months.
2. That a feasibility study be carried out and the outcomes reported back to a future meeting of the Committee.
3. That a further update be presented to the Committee in 2018.

**44      PERFORMANCE REPORT, QUARTER 2 (JULY 2017 TO SEPTEMBER 2017)**

Consideration was given to a report which set out the performance of the highways service including the Lincolnshire Highways Alliance, Major Highway Schemes Update, the National Highways and Transport (NHT) Survey 2017 and the Customer Satisfaction Information.

Members were guided through the report and were given the opportunity to ask questions to the officers present in relation to the information contained within the report and some of the points raised during discussion included the following:

- It was commented that the Alliance performance was good, but the results of the NHT Survey were disappointing.
- In terms of the transport assessment for the western growth corridor, implications for impacts on the A46 were being scoped, but it would come down to an issue of balancing costs against a list of priorities.
- It was commented that the satisfaction levels being down were more likely due to the visible weeds at the side of the road, as this would create a perception about the condition of the roads in general.
- It was queried whether there was any merit in looking at the quality of footpaths around schools, however, it was noted that this should be included as part of a school's travel plan.
- In terms of the Lincoln Eastern Bypass, it was commented that one of the issues was capacity and cars being stationary, and so it was queried whether so many roundabouts were needed. However, it was also considered positive that the project was coming in under budget in some areas, and it was queried whether the savings could be used to make modifications to the scheme.
- It was queried whether there was an issue of confidence with the contractor as its share price had dropped dramatically since the start of the contract as details of its financial situation had emerged. Members were reassured that the project would be constructed and finished in an appropriate time. It was noted that some of the issues being experienced by the contractor had so far had any impact on this project. The phase of works which would be the

**HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE****11 DECEMBER 2017**

earth works was about to commence and the authority would be closely monitoring the project.

- It was noted that ragwort was a particularly difficult weed to remove and that it needed to be sprayed at the right time, officers reported that it would only be treated where it was adjacent to live stock.
- It was important that the archaeology from the Lincoln Eastern Bypass was captured and recorded.
- Queries were raised regarding the repair of faulty streetlights, and members were advised that there should not be any back log and as long as they were being reported in the correct way they should be being repaired.
- It was noted that in relation to the National Highways and Transport Survey, and the Highways Maintenance/Enforcement theme benchmark results, Lincolnshire had not achieved the average result for any of the indicators. Members were advised that the survey had been sent out to between 1400 – 1500 members of the public, and measured peoples satisfaction with certain aspects of the highways service. In technical terms, it was believed that the highways network was performing well.
- It was thought that customer perception of highways services should be better than it was. It was noted that there were some authorities who had a poorer condition of highway, but were receiving higher customer satisfaction scores.
- Members were advised that the authority would continue to carry out work in accordance with the asset management strategy but there was a need to start to think about how the authority could have an impact on the customer perception of the work carried out.
- A suggestion of holding a focus group with some of the respondents of the survey was put forward, but it was commented that this tended to only produce individual responses and it was suggested that it could be more effective to speak with other authorities to get a more positive message.
- It was confirmed that the archaeology work for the Grantham Southern Relief Road was due to commence in January 2018.
- In relation to the Grantham Southern Relief Road it was reported that in broad terms, the design work was mainly complete, but there a couple of issues where some more detailed decisions on the impact of the work on nearby land were needed. Just about all comments from Highways England on the design for phase 2 had been received with only minor adjustments required.
- It was commented that from a highways point of view, the authority was doing well across the county, and it was thought that officers from the Communications Team should be in attendance at these meetings to advise members on how to best present this information to other organisations such as parish and district councils.
- It was commented that members were pleased that a scheme for a relief road in Hykeham was being worked on.
- It was confirmed that actions set out in Appendix D to the report would be progressed, and the Committee would receive feedback on this which would be included in the next performance report.
- It was requested that a report on a short term communications strategy should be brought to a future meeting.

**HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE  
11 DECEMBER 2017**

**RESOLVED**

1. That progress against the action plan set out in Appendix D to the report be included in the next performance report to the Committee.
2. That a report on a Communication Strategy be brought to a future meeting of the Committee to address the public perception of the condition of the county's highways.
3. That the comments made in relation to the performance report be noted.

**45      HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME**

Consideration was given to a report which enabled the Committee to consider and comment on the content of its work programme for the coming year to ensure that scrutiny activity was focused where it could be of greatest benefit.

Members were advised that at the next meeting on 22 January 2018, the Committee would have the opportunity to consider and comment on the proposed highways budget.

It was also noted that the following items would be added to the work programme:

- Short term communications strategy
- CCTV enforcement trial strategy

It was also noted that a meeting of the Well Managed Highways Sounding group would be booked in for after the next meeting in January.

It was reported that two subjects had been identified for future scrutiny as follows:

- Speed management policy for 20mph limits
- Roundabout sponsorship

It was suggested that a report on both of these subjects should come to the Committee to determine whether they should go forward to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board as a topic for Scrutiny Panel.

**RESOLVED**

1. That the work programme as set out in Appendix A of the report be noted.
2. That the future agenda items identified be added to the work programme.
3. That the potential scrutiny panel topics highlighted above be investigated further.

The meeting closed at 12.30 pm

This page is intentionally left blank

# Agenda Item 5



## Policy and Scrutiny

### Open Report on behalf of Richard Wills, Executive Director for Environment & Economy

Report to:	<b>Highways and Transport Scrutiny Committee</b>
Date:	<b>22 January 2018</b>
Subject:	<b>Council Budget 2018/19</b>

#### **Summary:**

The report describes the budget proposals for the next two financial years based on the four year funding deal announced by Government as part of the 2018/19 Local Government Finance Settlement. This report specifically looks at the budget implications for the Highways and Transport activities within the commissioning strategy 'Sustaining and Developing Prosperity Through Infrastructure'.

The budget proposals are now open to consultation. Members of this committee have the opportunity to scrutinise them and make comment, prior to the Executive meeting on 6 February 2018.

#### **Actions Required:**

The Highways and Transport Scrutiny Committee is asked to consider this report and members of the committee are invited to make comments on the budget proposals. These will be considered by the Executive at its meeting on 6 February 2018.

#### **1. Background**

1.1 The Executive are currently consulting on a two year financial plan for revenue and capital budgets to take the Council to the end of the four year funding deal from government. This is the first time in four years the Council has been able to develop budget plans for more than the next financial year. The Council continues to face significant reductions in government funding, growing cost pressures from demand led services such as adult and children's social care, waste disposal and the Council's responsibility to pay staff and contractors the National Living Wage. Uncertainty around government funding beyond the four year finding deal (which runs from 2016/17 to 2019/20) means the Council doesn't consider it practicable, at present, to develop sustainable long term financial plans into the next decade.

1.2 In developing its two year financial plan the Council has considered all areas of current spending, levels of income and council tax plus use of one off funding (including use of reserves and capital receipts) to set a balanced budget. All areas

of service expenditure have been reviewed to identify cost pressures which must be funded and savings which can be made, through efficiencies and by reducing the level of service provided.

1.3 At its meeting on 19 December 2017 the Executive agreed proposals for the Council's revenue and capital budgets, and Council Tax level for 2018/19 to be put forward as a basis for consultation.

#### Sustaining & Developing Prosperity Through Infrastructure

1.4 Table A shows the total proposed revenue budget for the Highways and Transport activities within the commissioning strategy Sustaining & Developing Prosperity Through Infrastructure'.

TABLE A

Change of Previous Year	£'000
<b>Original Budget</b>	<b>39,063</b>
<b>Changes for 2018/19</b>	
Pay Inflation	145
Cost Pressures	350
Transfers	0
Savings	-186
<b>Proposed Budget 2018/19</b>	<b>39,371</b>
<b>Changes for 2019/20</b>	
Pay Inflation	147
Cost Pressures	312
Savings	0
<b>Proposed Budget 2019/20</b>	<b>39,830</b>
Percentage Change	2.0%

1.5 The Highways and Transport activities are proposing to make savings of £0.186m in 2018/19 and there are cost pressures identified of £0.350m in 2018/19 and £0.312m in 2019/20.

1.6 As part of the initial budget proposals for 2016/17 a potential saving of £2.235m was identified by removing bus subsidies and the saving was profiled as £1.200m in 2016/17 and £1.035m in 2017/18. When the Executive made its budget proposals for the 2016/17 year, the saving of £1.200m for bus subsidies was included. At this time, it was highlighted that the delivery of this saving, was likely to result in a cost shunt to Children's Services of an estimated £0.750m as provision would need to be made for school children travelling on public service routes. At the County Council meeting in February 2016 it was agreed to defer the saving of £1.200m and the subsequent £1.035m for two years. The Council has

reconsidered delivering savings on bus subsidies and is still not proposing any savings in this area in the next two financial years (2018/19 and 2019/20).

1.7 Due to the Department for Transport re-designation of Lincoln as a 'PTE like' area, there is an expected increase in the cost of concessionary fares of £0.100m in 2018/19 rising by £0.045m in 2019/20 to give a full year effect. There is a proposed saving of £0.060m in 2018/19 from the removal of temporary funding supporting the Lincoln to Nottingham Rail Service. This funding was part of a 3 year deal struck between local authorities, Local Enterprise Partnerships, DfT and the train operator to trial an improved service along the line. The service has been successful with strong growth in passenger numbers. From 2018 onwards it will be funded through a new Direct Award negotiated between the operator and DfT pending the start of the new East Midlands Franchise in 2019.

1.8 An element of the cost pressures for these activities (mainly within Transport) relates to an increase in contract costs, which have a direct relationship to national living wage levels. There are proposed cost pressures of £0.250m in 2018/19 and £0.267m in 2019/20 to meet the Council's obligation to pay staff and some contractors the central government set national living wage.

1.9 Winter maintenance vehicles are currently supplied under a lease arrangement. As these leases expire, there is a proposal to move to a capital purchase of these vehicles. This proposed saving in 2018/19 (£0.126m) for four vehicles is reliant upon the approval of the appropriate capital programme spend which is included in these budget proposals. Further budget savings can be realised in line with further lease expiry dates, the majority of which are in 2020 and beyond.

1.10 The budget proposals assume inflation increases of 1% for pay for the next two financial years.

1.11 Table B below shows the impact of these changes on the activities included within this commissioning strategy.

TABLE B

SUSTAINING & DEVELOPING PROSPERITY THROUGH INFRASTRUCTURE	Original budget £000	Changes 2018/19 £000	Proposed Budget 2018/19 £000	Changes 2019/20 £000	Proposed Budget 2019/20 £000	% Change
1 Transportation including concessionary fares and other government grants	13,923	112	14,035	322	14,357	3.12%
2 Highway asset maintenance	16,058	-766	15,292	41	15,333	-4.51%
3 Highway network management	8,357	961	9,318	67	9,385	12.30%
New transport investments including highways						
4 improvements and bypasses, growth corridors and programmes	725	1	726	29	755	4.18%
Total	39,063	308	39,371	459	39,830	2.0%

## County Council Capital Programme

1.12 The proposed capital programme matches the revenue budget and runs until 2019/20, plus major schemes which stretch into future years. Schemes comprise: a number of major highways schemes, the rolling programme of renewal and replacement of fire fleet vehicles, and the new rolling programmes to replace the gritters fleet and equipment and vehicles at the Waste Transfer Stations). The gross programme is set at £322.647m from 2018/19 onwards, with grants and contributions of £132.088m giving a net programme of £190.559m to be funded by the County Council.

1.13 Table C shows the proposed net capital programme for this commissioning strategy. The net contributions relate mainly to the LCC contribution and underwriting developer contributions for the major road schemes.

TABLE C

<b>Capital Programme</b>	<b>Net Programme 2018/19 £000's</b>	<b>Net Programme 2019/20 £000's</b>
Sustaining and Developing Prosperity Through Infrastructure	45,478	55,528

1.14 The Council receives government grant funding to support large parts of the capital programme, including schools and roads maintenance. The following grants have been announced and incorporated into the capital programme in 2018/19, 2019/20 and future years:

- An indicative award of £24.995m per annum for three years, 2018/19 to 2020/21, of Highways Asset Protection Maintenance Block;
- An indicative three year award for Integrated Transport Grant of £3.312m per annum from 2018/19 to 2020/21; and
- An award of £2.000m in 2018/19 from the National Productivity Investment Fund. This is for the A46 Lincoln Road, Welton, Lincoln scheme, which will convert the priority "T" junction to a roundabout to cater for extra traffic from proposed local housing developments.

## Further consultation

1.15 A consultation meeting with local business representatives, trade unions and other partners will take place on 26 January 2018.

1.16 The proposals will be publicised on the Council website together with the opportunity for the public to comment.

1.17 All consultation comments and responses will be available to be considered when the Executive makes its final budget proposals on 6 February 2018.

## **2. Conclusion**

2.1 These budget proposals reflect the level of government funding available to the Council and the proposal to increase Council Tax in 2018/19 by 1.95% and in 2019/20 by 1.95%. Adult Care Premium is proposed to increase by 2.00% in 2018/19 and 2.00% in 2019/20. They are based on a thorough and comprehensive review of the Council's services. The budget proposals therefore aim to reflect the Council's priorities whilst operating with the resources available to it.

## **3. Consultation**

### **a) Have Risks and Impact Analysis been carried out?**

No

### **b) Risks and Impact Analysis**

An Equality Impact Assessment will be completed for the proposed increase in Council Tax. This will be reported to the Executive at its meeting on 6 February 2018.

Further risk and impact assessments will need to be undertaken on a service by service basis.

## **4. Background Papers**

Document title	Where the document can be viewed
Council Budget 2018/19 - Executive Report 19 December 2017	Democratic Services, County Offices , Newland, Lincoln

This report was written by Michelle Grady, who can be contacted on 01522 553235 or [Michelle.Grady@Lincolnshire.Gov.uk](mailto:Michelle.Grady@Lincolnshire.Gov.uk).

This page is intentionally left blank

# Agenda Item 6



## Policy and Scrutiny

### Open Report on behalf of Richard Wills, Executive Director for Environment & Economy

Report to:	<b>Highways and Transport Scrutiny Committee</b>
Date:	<b>22 January 2018</b>
Subject:	<b>Roundabout Sponsorship</b>

#### **Summary:**

The purpose of this report is to update members on the current policy arrangements in relation to the sponsorship of roundabouts within the public highway in Lincolnshire.

#### **Actions Required:**

Members of the Highways and Transport Scrutiny Committee are invited to:

- 1) Consider the current policy arrangements with regards to Roundabout Sponsorship, and;
- 2) Identify whether to endorse the current arrangements or recommend that a Scrutiny Review Panel examine this topic in more detail.

#### **1. Background**

- 1.1 This matter has been discussed at previous meetings of both this Committee on 7<sup>th</sup> March 2016, 14<sup>th</sup> December 2015 and 29<sup>th</sup> July 2013; and the Highways, Transport and Technology Scrutiny Committee on 21<sup>st</sup> January 2013.
- 1.2 The current policy dealing with the sponsorship of roundabouts has been in existence since 1996 and is laid out in the Highways and Traffic guidance note HAT 63-01-10; which is included as Appendix A. This policy only applies to the provision of planting/ grass cutting on roundabouts/reservations with the intention that planting will be confined to the main towns.
- 1.3 Currently the County Council does not directly manage or operate any sponsorship deals.
- 1.4 The current policy provides a framework for the approval of planting schemes being licenced by the County Council as Highway Authority.
- 1.5 Governance arrangements, where sponsorship deals are in place, are managed by Lincolnshire's District/Borough/City Councils working with their chosen commercial providers.
- 1.6 The Highway Authority's role is limited to approving the planting scheme on highway safety grounds and issuing the licence to use highway ground. The

County Council receives no income from these sites, but the maintenance costs are borne by the applicant, thus reducing the Authority's financial commitment.

- 1.7 A proposed policy change to permit the erection of advertising boards, managed by local councils supported by commercial providers, was considered in March 2016. The policy change would have permitted the erection of advertising boards.
- 1.8 The most noticeable change in the streetscape was that larger signs were required for advertising to be effective.
- 1.9 The Committee resolution was "That the guidance outlined in the Highways and Traffic Guidance Notes (HAT 63/1/10) in connection with the approved policy for sponsorship of highway planting, be supported, with the exception of the need to make any reference to Lincolnshire Green".
- 1.10 There are currently around 60 no. agreements in place with the majority being in the City of Lincoln area.
- 1.11 The existing Highway and Traffic (HAT) guidance note is scheduled to be updated as part of the new highway working arrangements.

## **2. Conclusion**

- 2.1 Since the above scrutiny consideration, our District Councils have continued to operate based on the existing arrangements. There has been little interest and no further work carried out in promoting advertising on roundabouts.
- 2.2 The existing guidance is being updated and this provides an opportunity to seek the views of the Committee on the relevance of the policy.
- 2.3 The Committee may wish to:
  - Endorse the current arrangements
  - Establish a Scrutiny Review Panel to examine the topic
  - Suggest another course of action
- 2.4 Councillors are invited to comment on the above update and consider options.

## **3. Consultation**

- a) Have Risks and Impact Analysis been carried out

N/A

- b) Risks and Impact Analysis

N/A

#### **4. Appendices**

These are listed below and attached at the back of the report	
Appendix A	Current policy with respect to roundabout sponsorship HAT 63-01-10

#### **5. Background Papers**

Document Title	Where document can be viewed
Highways, Transport and Technology Scrutiny Committee - 21 <sup>st</sup> Jan 2013	Council Website
Highways and Transport Scrutiny Committee - 15th July 2013	Council Website
Highways and Transport Scrutiny Committee – 14 <sup>th</sup> December 2015	Council Website
Highways and Transport Scrutiny Committee – 7 <sup>th</sup> March 2016	Council Website

This report was written by Paul Little, who can be contacted on 01522 782070 or [cschighways@lincolnshire.gov.uk](mailto:cschighways@lincolnshire.gov.uk).

This page is intentionally left blank

# HIGHWAYS AND TRAFFIC GUIDANCE NOTES

|||||||  
NO. HAT 63/1/10  
SUBJECT REQUEST FOR SPONSORSHIP OF HIGHWAY PLANTING  
EFFECTIVE FROM June 2010  
AUTHOR Area Highways Manager (Boston)  
DISTRIBUTION Distribution List  
|||||||

## 1. Introduction

- 1.1 This HAT sets out the approved policy for the provision of planting within the highway. The policy was approved by the Environment Committee on 24 January 1996.

## 2. Scope

- 2.1 This policy only applies to requests for the provision of planting on the highway by other Councils, Community Groups and Commercial Sponsors. The policy is designed to encourage planting in suitable locations to enhance the visual environment. Borough/District/City Councils also have an interest in many planting schemes and as Planning Authorities may need to approve any associated signing in addition to approval by the Highway Authority.

## 3. Policy

### 3.1 Borough/District/City Councils

- 3.1.1 Where a Borough/District/City Council wishes to carry out planting or already does so, the Highway Authority's role will be confined to approving the planting scheme and any associated signing on highway safety grounds and issuing a licence to plant in the highway. If the Borough/District/City Council wished to enter into an agreement with a commercial sponsor this will be permitted and it will be left to that Council to determine the design of any signs and consider whether Planning permission is required.
- 3.1.2 Generally such schemes will be confined to the main towns. Existing schemes will be regularised by the Highway Authority licensing the use of highway land.

### 3.2 Community Groups and Parish Councils

- 3.2.1 The Highway Authority's role will be to approve the planting scheme on highway safety grounds and to licence the use of highway land. Generally, such schemes do not include any signing.

3.2.2 If the sponsor wishes to provide signing, two different approvals will be required:

- (a) the Highway Authority for traffic safety
- (b) the Planning Authority for planning permission

A simple solution might be to agree a standard form of sign with all the local Planning Authorities thereby removing the need to approve individual signs. This could include standard wording as in Appendix A.

### 3.3 Commercial Organisations

3.3.1 Where a commercial organisation agrees to carry out or sponsor a planting scheme which is not already undertaken by a Borough/District/City Council this will be encouraged. In some towns it will, subject to the agreement of the other Council, be treated as a Borough/District/City Council scheme as in paragraphs 3.1.1 and 3.1.2.

3.3.2 Elsewhere it will be dealt with direct by the Highway Authority as in paragraphs 3.2.1 and 3.2.2 except that the standard sign would read as in Appendix A.

3.3.3 Some sponsors may wish to have a sign design which is more in line with their corporate livery or logo. In such cases it will be the sponsor's responsibility to obtain the approval of the local Planning Authority. Also the sign should also retain the LINCOLNSHIRE GREEN reference and be approved by the Highway Authority.

### 3.4 General

3.4.1 All planting schemes will require licences to ensure they are approved on highway safety grounds but no charge will be levied.

3.4.2 There will be a general presumption that the sponsor bears the full cost of all planting schemes, including maintenance and associated signing and returning the highway to its original condition on termination of any licence. Cost sharing will be considered on an exception basis where one of the following conditions is met:

- (a) there is a significant cost saving to the Highway Authority
- (b) the site and scheme are particularly noteworthy in contributing to an improved roadside environment

Such exceptions would need the approval of the Divisional Highways Manager after consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair of the Planning and Regulation Committee.

3.4.3 Anyone undertaking planting in the highway will be required to have public liability insurance to an indemnity level of £5 million and to agree safe methods of working with the Highway Authority.

3.4.4 The standard letters and application form for use in granting the relevant licence are attached as Appendix B.

Uncontrolled Copy

This page is intentionally left blank

# Agenda Item 7



## Policy and Scrutiny

### Open Report on behalf of Richard Wills, Executive Director - Environment & Economy

Report to:	<b>Highways and Transport Scrutiny Committee</b>
Date:	<b>22 January 2018</b>
Subject:	<b>Priorities for National Infrastructure – Response to National Infrastructure Assessment</b>

#### **Summary:**

The National Infrastructure Commission (NIC) is a body independent of Government, responsible for carrying out an overall assessment of the UK's policy on economic infrastructure of national importance once per parliament. This takes the form of a National Infrastructure Assessment, which will underpin national policy towards economic infrastructure investment for the next thirty years.

LCC Members have contributed throughout the drafting of LCC's response to the draft National Infrastructure Assessment. The response was submitted to the NIC by the 12<sup>th</sup> January deadline, and is appended to this report.

#### **Actions Required:**

Members of the Highways and Transport Scrutiny Committee are required to identify any key areas where they might wish to maintain a watching brief in advance of the publication of the final National Infrastructure Assessment.

## **1. Background**

### The draft National Infrastructure Assessment

The NIC completed its public consultation on its draft National Infrastructure Assessment, following a period of stakeholder engagement. The NIC's remit covers six key sectors of government's activity. These are:

- Transport
- Energy
- Water and sewerage
- Flood risk
- Digital
- Waste

In exploring these sectors, the NIC's priorities are formed from identification of emerging key issues, and LCC has been actively involved in expert advisory

panels on water and flood risk to help the NIC to understand the potential impacts and benefits of investment in this area.

In the draft National Infrastructure Assessment the NIC identified three overarching challenges, which it considers essential to address in planning for infrastructure investment.

These 'three Cs' are:

- Congestion
- Capacity (of infrastructure)
- Carbon (reduction)

The draft National Infrastructure Assessment is, therefore, structured around ways of tackling these challenges, and the questions put forward in the consultation document were framed to elicit responses to them. Further, the assessment considers the challenges in the context of seven priorities. These are listed below.

- Building a digital society
- Connected, liveable city-regions
- Infrastructure to support housing
- Eliminating carbon emissions from energy and waste
- A revolution in road transport
- Reducing the risks of drought and flooding
- Financing and funding infrastructure in efficient ways

Further detail on each of these priorities can be found in the executive summary of the draft assessment, attached with this briefing note, while the full document can be accessed via the NIC's website -

<https://www.nic.org.uk/publications/congestion-capacity-carbon-priorities-for-national-infrastructure/>

It will be apparent that while several of these themes are universally applicable – and of particular relevance to Lincolnshire's circumstances - some reflect a strong focus on the economic potential of major urban centres. Indeed, the consultation draft explicitly stated that 'Cities are the engine of the economy'.

## 2. Conclusion

### Lincolnshire County Council's (LCC) response

LCC's response, therefore, sought to strengthen those areas which are of particular relevance to the county, while evidencing the present and future potential contribution of more rural areas to the national economy.

The response is attached as Appendix A, and Members are invited to identify particular areas where they might wish to be kept informed of progress towards the

final version of the Assessment, and of any opportunities that might arise through LCC's ongoing engagement with the NIC to further influence the final document.

### **3. Consultation**

#### **a) Have Risks and Impact Analysis been carried out?**

N/A

#### **b) Risks and Impact Analysis**

N/A

### **4. Appendices**

These are listed below and attached at the back of the report	
Appendix A	LCC Response to National Infrastructure Assessment (Congestion, Carbon, Capacity: Priorities for National Infrastructure)

### **5. Background Papers**

No background papers within Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972 were used in the preparation of this report.

This report was written by David Hickman who can be contacted on 01522 554809 or [david.hickman@lincolnshire.gov.uk](mailto:david.hickman@lincolnshire.gov.uk).

This page is intentionally left blank

**Final Draft LCC Response to National Infrastructure Assessment (Congestion, Carbon, Capacity: Priorities for National Infrastructure) 9<sup>th</sup> January 2018****Introduction****1) How does the UK maximise the opportunities for its infrastructure, and mitigate the risks, from Brexit?**

The UK needs a clear vision and plan for its success post Brexit, including in the way in which it develops and deploys its infrastructure. This is an opportunity to ensure that strategic review of infrastructure assets (such as the major route network) is undertaken with sensitivity to future requirements and with a view to opening up growth opportunities both in the medium and long term.

New international relationships and trading circumstances will place much greater emphasis upon the UK's national resilience. A powerful example of this is in food security, where the ability to purchase food from abroad will be increasingly constrained (at least in terms of price) as climate change places growing pressure on many current sources of imports. In this regard, the capacity of flood risk infrastructure securing and protecting 50% of the UK's highest quality food producing and processing land offers an immediate national benefit to the UK's security and future economic stability.

At present, the development of infrastructure in the UK continues to be hampered by the number of bureaucratic hurdles presented by the current systems and practice, including lengthy procurement processes. These make it difficult to deliver and improve infrastructure in an effective and efficient way. Brexit presents an opportunity to remove some of these barriers by reviewing the current rules and regulations surrounding infrastructure and replacing these with something that would offer the UK a competitive advantage as we leave the EU. In particular there should be more consideration given to achieving greater efficiencies in consenting across multi-agency regulatory regimes. We would also wish to stress the need greater alignment and flexibility for business planning between organisations with local, regional and national infrastructure responsibilities.

**2) How might an expert national infrastructure design panel best add value and support good design in UK infrastructure? What other measures could support these aims?**

An expert national infrastructure design panel could best add value and support by promoting the delivery of good design with the aim of embedding sustainability and whole life costs into infrastructure planning, if infrastructure is truly to provide social, economic and environmental benefit. A reasonable starting point might be reviewing the existing specifications and design guides to ensure that they present the most appropriate support to achieving good design.

Good design can occasionally cost more to deliver than existing standard designs so the delivery of good design could be encouraged by an adjustment to the existing benefit/cost models for infrastructure evaluation. This could perhaps also be encouraged by the adoption of measures reflecting the importance of achieving multiple benefits through good design.

**3) How can the set of proposed metrics for infrastructure performance (set out in Annex A) be improved?**

A focus on key objectives, such as productivity and protection of our capacity to sustain and grow the UK economy will in itself draw out the key areas where we need to measure the effectiveness of the country's infrastructure networks.

The proposed metrics are fairly narrowly defined and may benefit from the inclusion of a wider range of data. However, there is already a great deal of data and measures relating to infrastructure in existence. Therefore, these should be used where they can help to assess the support provided by infrastructure assets to key national objectives, and to develop particular regional strengths.

There may also be benefits in incorporating infrastructure performance in a range of existing documents that create policy frameworks locally and regionally, for example through Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategies, Local Flood Risk Strategies, Local Plans and other core elements of Local Authority policy and performance management.

**4) Cost-benefit analysis too often focuses on producing too much detail about too few alternatives. What sort of tools would best ensure the full range of options are identified to inform the selection of future projects?**

The existing cost benefit approach tends to operate to the disadvantage of larger rural local authorities in a nationally competitive funding environment. It is better suited to facilitating major infrastructure projects in the more urban areas, and there is a need for it to more effectively recognise the impact of rurality and relative lack of congestion in comparison to large urban areas. In addition, the development of a lighter touch approach for small and medium schemes would be beneficial especially with the move towards competitive bidding rounds for many of the infrastructure related funding routes.

There may also be opportunities to include an enhanced approach to valuing a wider measure of benefits such as good design and reflecting the Public Value Framework emerging from the Barber Review.

**Building a digital society**

**5) What changes are needed to the regulatory framework or role of Government to ensure the UK invests for the long-term in globally competitive digital infrastructure?**

**6) What are the implications for digital infrastructure of increasing fixed and mobile convergence? What are the relative merits of adding more fibre incrementally over time compared to pursuing a comprehensive fibre to the premises strategy?**

**7) What are the key factors including planning, coordination and funding, which would encourage the commercial deployment of ubiquitous connectivity (including, but not only, in rural areas)? How can Government, Ofcom and the industry ensure this keeps pace with an increasingly digital society?**

**8) How can the risks of 'system accidents' be mitigated when deploying smart infrastructure?**

The need for UK businesses and individuals to have access to the world's best digital infrastructure is paramount. The NIC's identification of this issue is welcomed. We would, however, suggest that the focus of the NIC could be on different issues to those identified in the consultation.

Lincolnshire has been one of the earlier adopters of superfast investment by BDUK. 90% of premises in the county are already passed by superfast technology and work is ongoing to quickly raise that figure to 95%.

However, our analysis of the situation in Lincolnshire shows that:

- Consumers still do not understand that superfast broadband is available
- The initial roll-out of superfast broadband in Lincolnshire needed to be subsidised by the public sector because rural areas are felt to be unviable by the private sector –yet take up of the BT superfast service has exceeded their targets. This suggests that there is a market failure in place.
- Businesses have a different interpretation of the word "superfast" to consumers
- Digital businesses need more capacity than other businesses. There is little doubt that attempting to provide 'ultrafast' fibre based broadband to all businesses isn't necessary and the flexibility of alternative technological solutions can be used to ensure the correct level of need/future growth capacity is provided where it is actually needed. This would drive a more cost efficient deployment strategy.

Many rural businesses rely on digital technology to overcome the problems they face with peripherality, distance, and rurality. These are not lifestyle businesses. They are often knowledge based businesses providing specialist support to help the UK's most important businesses to grow. The current Government thinking in terms of attempting to provide Fibre to the Premises (FTTP) to as many UK premises as possible is theoretically the correct path to follow.

However, there is a very real risk where encouraging private investors to deploy as much FTTP, the digital divide between urban/sub-urban and rural communities actually widens. Historically, we have already seen the divide created where incumbent providers deployed to areas deemed commercially viable and at the same time, ignoring more rural areas. The intervention of BDUK to fund broadband build in the remaining areas was the only realistic way that these areas would get better broadband. There is a real risk that current policy will do the same again with FTTP.

Instead, the NIC might wish to consider investing in further deployment of the rural fibre footprint, whilst at the same time, encouraging other technologies to utilise the increased fibre reach. This would ensure high speed broadband would be more

widely available in rural areas, whilst accepting that funding isn't limitless and that blanket FTTP coverage is at this point, a bridge too far.

Our further discussion with businesses shows that the level of mobile phone coverage is not comprehensive, and that certain providers have strong signals in areas where other providers do not –and vice versa. It is readily acknowledged that mobile technology is at least as important for business applications as superfast broadband and arguably it will overtake that level of importance in the coming years.

From liaison with counterparts elsewhere in the country it appears that the situation in Lincolnshire is not dissimilar to that of other areas.

The National Infrastructure Commission could tackle these problems by:

- Assessing whether current levels of promotion of digital infrastructure by government and non-governmental organisations are appropriate; it is important that investment in infrastructure is supported by helping individuals to use infrastructure to the best effect
- Commissioning studies into the level of real demand for digital infrastructure in rural areas, scrutinising the planning assumptions of telecommunication businesses and understanding the real benefit of rural digital infrastructure on the national economy
- Identifying how different digital technologies can sit alongside one another to the benefit of consumers and businesses –firstly balancing business and consumer definitions of "superfast" and secondly juggling mobile coverage between providers to the benefit of customers

### **Connected, liveable city-regions**

#### **9) What strategic plans for transport, housing and the urban environment are needed? How can they be developed to reflect the specific needs of different city regions?**

A substantial proportion of the UK's economic activity, including tourism, and the majority of its food producing and processing capacity, takes place outside the city regions. City-regions depend for many of their basic necessities on the rural areas of the UK, while their capacity to support the city-regions is likewise supported by appropriate and effective infrastructure. To consider city regions as separate entities from the domestic regional and national supply chains, amenity and food provision risks arriving at infrastructure priorities that are in themselves unsustainable.

Lincolnshire is a sparsely populated rural county with only Lincoln (pop. c. 90,000) recognisable as an urban area in regional terms. The emphasis on large city regions as the main engines of economic growth is at odds with one of the NIC's main objectives which is to "support sustainable economic growth across all regions of the UK" (page 37). Given the predicted volume of growth nationally, but particularly in London and the South East, there is a need for a National Planning Spatial Strategy

(in addition to NPPF) which seeks to address issues of congestion and overheating by challenging "predict and provide" assumptions of where development should be located. Cost benefit analysis for new infrastructure must include quality of life and dis-economy of scale considerations before investment decisions are made. Small to medium cities have an important role to play in supporting economic growth because of their superior quality of life and efficiency as measured by such indicators as house prices, air quality and lower congestion. The cost of infrastructure will also be less based on lower land values and labour costs plus the ability to deliver solutions at surface level rather than underground.

Several of the devolution deals signed with English city-regions required a commitment to draw up a conurbation-wide statutory spatial plan. The government's housing white paper, published early this year, announced a drive "to promote the alignment of decisions on infrastructure and housing at higher spatial levels, including through joint local planning and statutory spatial plans". The November 2017 Budget, made the government's support of cross-boundary strategic planning even more explicit. In the Budget documents, the government makes it clear that it sees strategic planning as key to ensuring that the £15 billion of new financial support for housebuilding over the next five years is "well targeted". As a further incentive to plan across boundaries, the Budget documents also say that combined authorities and planning joint committees with statutory plan-making functions could be given the option to levy a "strategic infrastructure tariff", in the same way that the London mayor has levied his own community infrastructure levy to fund Crossrail.

The existing Local Plan system allows neighbouring local authorities to combine as a statutory joint authority (through parliamentary statutory instrument) to cover the geography (usually housing market and journey to work areas) necessary to deliver and manage growth thereby achieving a strategic overview. This has been achieved successfully in Central Lincolnshire (West Lindsey, City of Lincoln and North Kesteven) where Lincoln is the centre of an identified Urban Area able to accommodate significant growth. Across Central Lincolnshire, a total of 9 Sustainable Urban Extensions are proposed. Lincolnshire County Council is responsible for producing a Strategic Infrastructure Delivery Plan for the Greater Lincolnshire Local Enterprise Partnership which covers all the county's districts and the two south Humberside unitaries. This co-ordinated approach informs each Local Plan as to priority schemes, funding arrangements and the local policy and land requirements necessary for delivery.

***10) What sort of funding arrangements are needed for city transport and how far should they be focused on the areas with the greatest pressures from growth?***

The importance of transportation between cities, regional centres and their hinterland cannot be underestimated in the context of labour supply. Strengthening commuter

routes and access to opportunities between urban and more rural areas is essential to long term sustainability for both.

The role that the major urban areas have to play in delivering economic growth nationally is understood. The announcement by the Government in the recent Budget of a new 'Transforming Cities Fund' within the National Productivity Investment Fund is recognition of this role. However, too great a focus on the larger urban areas will result in a three tier funding regime for transport – London and the South East, the larger Cities and the rest of the UK. This will not help those smaller authorities such as Lincolnshire who are looking to stimulate economic growth and housing delivery locally but are finding it difficult to secure funding for the necessary transport infrastructure often required with such proposals. There is a danger of these authorities not being able to play their part in moving the focus of economic growth nationally away from the South East and improving the prosperity for their local communities. To this end, LCC would support the Commission's suggestion that any new mechanism to capture land values should reflect the fact that land value uplift in London and the South East can make a more significant contribution to the necessary infrastructure thereby reducing competition for scarce national funding in other parts of the country.

***11) How can the Section 106 and Community Infrastructure Levy regimes be improved to capture land and property value uplift efficiently and help fund infrastructure? Under what conditions are new mechanisms needed?***

There needs to be a better understanding of relative land values and the opportunity that exists for development uplift in value in large rural and currently marginalised geographical areas. This ultimately affects overall scheme viability and therefore reduces the potential for the delivery of local benefits through the development process with much greater demand than there is funding. It is important to emphasise that the planning system and process alone cannot be expected to provide the full delivery of all identified infrastructure and other social needs.

Attempts to 'capture land and property value uplift' have been challenging for local and national Government well before the introduction of CIL. The Government recently appointed an expert panel to review CIL effectiveness. The Panel found CIL to be wanting in certain areas and recommended a way forward which would at least simplify rate setting and in respects would simplify implementation, it seemed without the need for primary legislation. Although recommended changes were set out in the 2017 Budget for further consultation, these were less significant than the Panel recommendations. There has been virtually no time at which CIL has not been proposed for review, with the 2010 Regulations a few months before the Coalition Government. The Government now seems to have made its position clear it would be best that there is now a period of stability. CIL and section 106 are not perfect but those looking to deliver infrastructure need to be given the chance to try to make the system work. One area where particular challenges are emerging is in relation to

the restrictions on section 106 pooling. The current limit (of five contributions to one piece of infrastructure) is a challenge to delivery. The Government is right to look at this area as suggested in the 2017 Budget.

### **Infrastructure to support housing**

#### ***12) What mechanisms are needed to deliver infrastructure on time to facilitate the provision of good quality new housing?***

In our experience a principal difficulty reported by developers in delivering infrastructure is predicting costs and low levels of certainty regarding payback periods. This is in part due to shifting costs in the first place, but also arises from limited customer focus from providers and the time lag in installing infrastructure to new developments.

There is a strong case for Local Plans and Infrastructure Plans to broaden their emphasis from development roads to a much wider range of infrastructure provision. In Lincolnshire this has already been done in respect of roads and sustainable drainage, but there is scope for a wider application of this principle across a much wider range of types of infrastructure.

There may also be opportunities to allow exploration of new methods of development, for example encouraging investment in modular construction, similarly to the current practice of Enterprise Zones, in order to accelerate their production pipeline.

Throughout Chapter 3 (Infrastructure to Support Housing), there is an implication that infrastructure be treated as a commercial product with the need for a healthy financial return. One approach to securing this outcome is to transfer ultimate risk to the taxpayer by, for example, guaranteeing revenue to private investors. It should be acknowledged that infrastructure is essentially a "public good" for the benefit of all and in the case of housing a necessary condition for development to proceed sustainably. The perennial "chicken and egg" debate about which comes first can be resolved by institutionalising a forward funding mechanism which funds infrastructure based on the sound social, environmental and economic assessments included in existing Infrastructure Delivery Plans.

Regional Investment Banks should be created and funded by the Treasury with disbursements based on Local Plan housing allocations and indices of deprivation. This will incentivise local planning authorities to adopt ambitious growth targets and grant planning permission to secure investment. Housebuilders and local authorities will not have to bankroll opening up infrastructure but developers will ultimately repay all or a significant amount of the cost based on scheme viability. This model of funding would eventually replace the Community Infrastructure Levy which is unhelpfully collected in arrears and overly bureaucratic in its administration. Sc 106 would remain to deliver affordable housing site by site. A major benefit of providing infrastructure funding on this basis would be increased community confidence in

development which was properly planned and designed resulting in fewer objections locally.

### **Eliminating carbon emissions from energy and waste**

#### ***13) What will the critical decision factors be for determining the future of the gas grid? What should the process for deciding its future role be and when do decisions need to be made?***

Theddlethorpe on the Lincolnshire coast is a major facility redistributing gas piped ashore from the North Sea fields, which will be decommissioned as North Sea gas fields cease production. Nationally it is vital that major existing assets of this nature are seriously considered for their potential continued use for energy provision once their legacy functions have been superseded.

In addition, the cumulative national impact of local energy production from a variety of sources must be considered in addition to a more centralised model based around large scale individual assets. There are also significant advantages in the use of locally deployed alternative fuels, particularly in relation to current costs and the issue of fuel poverty.

Fuel poverty mapping in a rural county like Lincolnshire frequently echoes the areas that are not on the gas network, as household choice is very limited and the cost of heating oil is high. It is not feasible to bring the gas mains to all areas it may be possible to extend the mains supply into areas that are close to the existing gas infrastructure.

The authority is seeking to exploit heat generated as a by-product, in particular: heat from energy from waste plants or Combined Heat and Power from Anaerobic Digestion plants. Consideration may also be able to provide a more renewable heat source especially if these plants are located correctly.

#### ***14) What should be the ambition and timeline for greater energy efficiency in buildings? What combination of funding, incentives and regulation will be most effective for delivering this ambition?***

Building regulation should be used to directly influence the take up of more energy efficiency by stipulating levels of efficiency and or energy consumption and or generation. Developers would be able to select from a range of measures: such as solar PV, rain water harvesting etc to achieve specifications. This would mean that appropriate technologies are put into buildings as standards rather than using the model at the moment (part L) which allows the developer to choose.

The current housing stock also needs to be addressed; local authorities could provide local delivery for national schemes. However, the private sector, in particular the energy sector has a leading role to play.

**15) How could existing mechanisms to ensure low carbon electricity is delivered at the lowest cost be improved through:**

- Being technology neutral as far as possible
- Avoiding the costs of being locked in to excessively long contracts
- Treating smaller and larger generators equally
- Participants paying the costs they impose on the system
- Bringing forward the highest value smart grid solutions

Demand for electricity whether for heating or through more use of electric vehicles is going to dramatically rise. The use of battery storage for renewable technologies is likely to go some way to providing a stable supply as part of the development of SMART networks. There could be an increased focus around renewables such as tidal that can provide a steady supply and are not dependant on either daylight or wind, although much like nuclear government funding will be required if the sector is to develop.

**16) What are the critical decision factors for determining the role of new nuclear plants in the UK in scenarios where electricity either does, or does not, play a major role in the decarbonisation of heat? What would be the most cost-effective way to bring forward new generation capacity? How important would it be for cost-effectiveness to have a fleet of nuclear plants?**

Lincolnshire County Council is keen to be at the forefront of rural authorities exploring new technologies to enable SMART grids and the decarbonisation of transport. As such we are keen to examine a variety of options. Nuclear whether on the scale of Hinckley Point or on a smaller scale – Small Modular Nuclear Reactors – brings very many challenges, not least cost and the issue of waste. Potentially a fleet of SMNRs across the country could resolve many of the supply issues that are currently being projected, while addressing some concerns around carbon. It is clearly important that the government explores this technology at the same time as examining other sustainable options, and that decisions are led using an evidence based approach.

Many new technologies will require a substantial shift in public opinion before they can be considered acceptable, and Local Authorities are well placed to explore such issues with their communities in a way that would be less cost effective from a national perspective.

**17) What are the critical decision factors for determining the role of carbon capture and storage in the UK in scenarios where electricity either does, or does not, play a major role in the decarbonisation of heat? What would be the most cost-effective way to bring it forward?**

Lincolnshire County Council believes that the demonstration carbon capture project should be reconsidered. This technology offers a medium term solution to rising carbon levels whilst some of the more promising but highly technological solutions are developed in the coming years. Lincolnshire has a number of businesses

working on very innovative low carbon and carbon reduction technology, carbon capture work could be complementary so a renewed interest in this area nationally could be of interest to the business community in Lincolnshire.

**18) How should the residual waste stream be separated and sorted amongst anaerobic digestion, energy from waste facilities and alternatives to maximise the benefits to society and minimise the environmental costs?**

The waste hierarchy places great emphasis on reducing generation of waste in the first place, thereby placing less reliance on disposal methods further down the chain. This is especially the case for food waste, which can contaminate otherwise recyclable materials, but can also provide a valuable feedstock for AD plants.

Lincolnshire is currently exploring the potential viability for separate food waste collection alongside the possible benefits that could be achieved from greater consistency in approaches to collection. Experience also makes very clear that extensive and ongoing publicity campaigns are essential in engaging people in making changes to the waste that is collected kerbside and presented to recycling centres.

**19) Could the packaging regulations be reformed to sharpen the incentives on producers to reduce packaging, without placing disproportionate costs on businesses or creating significant market distortions?**

Lincolnshire County Council would welcome stronger regulation with regard to packaging. Of particular concern is that packaging in lots of cases is excessive and not recyclable when this could be reduced without any detrimental effect on the product. Also packaging type i.e. plastic not only confuses consumers on whether it is recyclable but there are numerous types used. Some of these are recyclable whilst some are not, with a bit of thought and work with distributors the types of plastics could be reduced with only recyclable plastics used making recycling easy. Lincolnshire's "Pack it In" campaign resulted in many producers redesigning their packaging and far from disproportionate costs being added to their product the reduced packaging ended up being cheaper and resulting in less waste.

A strong line on this from central government could have a very significant impact on recycling results locally. Many people are confused by plastic food packaging. Regulation to only allow recyclable material to be used in food packaging would resolve this issue instantly and would drive creativity in the industry.

### **A revolution in road transport**

**20) What changes to the design and use of the road would be needed to maximise the opportunities from connected and autonomous vehicles on:**

- **motorways and 'A' roads outside of cities?**
- **roads in the urban environment?**

***How should it be established which changes are socially acceptable and how could they be brought about?***

As the NIC report rightly highlights, "*the right changes to the road and road use will take detailed investigation*". This investigation will need to fully consider both the final position when all vehicles are fully connected and automated, as well as the interim position when there is a mix of differing levels of connectivity and automation across the vehicle fleet. It is the latter which perhaps presents the greatest challenge. Lincolnshire is very interested in exploring opportunities to pilot potential solutions to these challenges.

Restricting the use of particular lanes on motorways and major A roads to platooning vehicles may well provide an appropriate solution where more than one lane is available. However, for many rural counties such as Lincolnshire, there are very limited lengths of such roads, with few rural dual carriageways and no motorway. Great care will need to be taken to ensure that rural-based businesses, such as the economically important agri-food industry in Lincolnshire, are not put at a disadvantage as new technologies are rolled out. It is important that technologies to enable the introduction of CAVs in rural areas are available for end-to-end journeys if the benefits for non-drivers, such as the elderly, the disabled and the young currently struggling to access key services and employment due to rural isolation, are to be delivered. For example, CAV technology will be heavily dependant upon the use of 5G mobile signals. Currently, 4G coverage across rural parts of Lincolnshire is far from complete.

In urban areas, the introduction of CAV technology should eventually allow for a shift in balance between the impact of vehicles and the wider street-scape. For example, a move away from the current car ownership model (which sees commuter's vehicles parked in city centres unused for most of the day) towards a 'Mobility as a Service' model (where CAVs are hired for specific journeys and can then be used elsewhere) should release land currently used for car parking for other uses. The NIC report also highlights the possible benefits in reducing congestion by the more efficient flow of vehicles through junctions, in particular at traffic lights. However, many such junctions also provide opportunities for pedestrians to cross busy roads and the interaction of CAVs in urban areas with not only pedestrians, but also cyclists and motorcycle users, will need to be given careful consideration.

A further concern relates to the ongoing maintenance of road signing and lining. It currently appears likely that the technology used by autonomous vehicles to position themselves on the road will, to some degree, include the need to be able to clearly distinguish road markings (and possibly signage) using on-board cameras. This presents a major challenge to local transport authorities in keeping these in a state fit for such use, particularly if they are to avoid the possibility of legal claims following any incidents. Further guidance will be needed from government as to the precise requirements, but with one of the largest highway networks in England at some

8940km, Lincolnshire (along with other authorities) is likely to require additional funding to bring all lines and marking up to the necessary standard.

The move to CAVs will be a major step change for travel for most of the population. Hence it will be important to ensure that the general public are fully engaged at an early stage and the benefits properly articulated to gain their acceptance and avoid the scale of opposition seen in the early discussions on road pricing. Of particular importance will be the need to demonstrate that the benefits will be just as relevant in the rural parts of the country such as Lincolnshire and not to be seen to be favouring the urban areas.

***21) What Government policies are needed to support the take-up of electric vehicles? What is the role of Government in ensuring a rapid rollout of charging infrastructure? What is the most cost-effective way of ensuring the electricity distribution network can cope?***

The Government's announcement on the ending of the sales of new conventional petrol and diesel cars and vans by 2040 is welcomed since this gives some clarity to the anticipated timeframe going forward for the car industry, businesses and the public in general. Similarly, the continued and new funding announced in the recent Budget for charging infrastructure and electric vehicle grants will help to grow the demand for electric vehicles and move them into mainstream use.

It should be noted, however, that manufacturers are increasingly aiming to be able to offer viable alternatives to diesel and petrol vehicles by 2020/21, which suggests that the pace of change envisaged in the consultation document may not be sufficiently advanced. The importance of public behavioural change in driving implementation of such a significant shift is at least as important as infrastructure investment and should be seen as part and parcel of it.

The requirement in the new Automated and Electric Vehicles Bill currently going through Parliament for motorway service stations and larger petrol stations to provide electric charging points is also a move in the right direction, although there is a question of how well this will benefit Lincolnshire residents, due to the lack of motorways in the county and the rural nature of the road network. There is also a possible risk that Lincolnshire EV owners might find access to an EV charge point is limited compared to other areas of the country. However, the Government could provide a stronger lead in this area by strengthening the reference in the national Planning Policy Framework to make it a firm requirement that all new residential developments with dedicated parking provide charging facilities. Consideration should also be given to also making it a requirement at other developments such as larger retail sites and employment sites.

If 50% of vehicles on the road were electric, there would be an increase in demand for electricity of 16%. A large proportion of this charging would occur at peak times,

mostly 5pm to 6pm. To avoid power outages and associated problems, there are three possible solutions:

1. Upgrade the traditional network, through upgrading existing cables, installing new cable routes, re-balancing phases and installing larger transformers and static balancers.
2. Install a "smart" network, that includes street power storage, dynamic phase balancing, secondary transformer tap changers, in-street voltage regulators, power factor management and street level demand side management
3. Solutions within the home: install dynamically charged energy storage and micro renewables; and demand side management.

Scottish and Southern Electricity Network propose that the ideal response would be a combination of a smart network and solutions within the home, and should therefore be a key focus. The National Grid goes one step further, by suggesting that the ideal answer would be a "mosaic" of solutions, including in home changes (e.g. behaviour change) to rapid chargers available in all public places.

Another method to ensure the electricity network can cope with the increased demand would be further research and investment into vehicle to grid (V2G) technology, whereby energy stored in EVs is fed back to the national electricity grid to help supply energy at peak times. V2G technology is often combined with renewable energies, as the energy created can be stored for when it is needed.

**22) How can the Government best replace fuel duty? How can any new system be designed in a way that is fair?**

As vehicles move away from petrol and diesel power (with the consequential fall in revenue to central government from fuel tax), it is perhaps inevitable that this will mean an eventual move towards some form of road pricing. Gaining public acceptance for such an approach will be challenging. It will be important to set out what is proposed at an early stage before those who are among the first to take up electric-powered vehicles see their initial savings in travel cost (and hence improved overall financial position) eroded away by a new road pricing regime. Key to gaining public acceptance will be a government assurance that all such revenue will ring-fenced to be used to improve transport in general.

Careful consideration will also need to be given to the weighting between congestion-based and distance-based charging. An over-emphasis on the distance-based element will disadvantage people living in large, rural areas such as Lincolnshire who need to travel longer distances to access employment, as well as health, retail and leisure services. Many rural households already have lower than average household incomes and spend a larger proportion of this income on travel. Any road pricing regime which exacerbates this further should be avoided.

## **Reducing the risks of drought and flooding**

### **23) What should be done to reduce the demand for water and how quickly can this have effect?**

The Greater Lincolnshire LEP is committed to maximising the impact of water efficiency and management as a driver for economic growth. This applies equally in terms of agricultural production, food processing and the requirements of the visitor economy. Currently demand management plays a prominent role in planning for the future of public water provision, and while this clearly has a place it is unlikely to meet the requirements of the levels of future growth projected in Local Plans and in Strategic Economic Plans.

In broader terms, strategic provision of good quality water to support housing and business growth needs a longer term vision which takes account of potential future growth and capacity to provide this locally and regionally. A key factor in this will be smarter use of existing supply, such as retention of water for use at a later date or for redistribution to areas vulnerable to water stress, or where significant growth can be unlocked by improving water availability.

### **24) What are the key factors that should be considered in taking decisions on new water supply infrastructure?**

It is essential that water supply infrastructure is designed, where possible, in a way that contributes to local and regional flood risk mitigation, facilitates community and business resilience and growth (by securing current and future need for water supply & quality) and enables environmental enhancement. Key factors that should be considered include future growth, both planned and potential, utility provision, and opportunities to align with – and contribute to - future infrastructure plans for flood risk management, water retention and drainage or water level management.

### **25) How can long term plans for drainage and sewerage be put in place and what other priorities should be considered?**

We are aware that Water Companies are developing Water Resource Management Plans along with Water Supply and Drainage Management Plans. It is very important that long term plans developed by the water industry are able to align with and support other key plans (such as Local Flood Risk Management Strategies) in a way that respects local prioritisation and governance arrangements. In particular local flood risk and drainage management arrangements are based on a level of democratic accountability through Local Authority and Drainage Board decision-making that would be difficult to replicate at regional or supra-regional level. A high level of dialogue with local elected representatives will be essential if such plans are genuinely to complement local water management arrangements, as well as effective engagement with key partnership bodies involved in flood risk and drainage activities. In addition, there is a need to engage closely with Local Planning

Authorities and with Local Enterprise Partnerships, not least in order to fully reflect the nature and extent of planned development as well as aspirations for unlocking future growth potential.

**26) What investment is needed to manage flood risk effectively over the next 10 to 30 years?**

Defra's six year flood risk capital programme provides an element of certainty nationally for funding. However this is largely related to coastal and fluvial flood risk management, and does not necessarily guarantee a proportional investment in surface water or groundwater risk management at the local level where its impacts are most keenly and frequently felt.

Most importantly, the current allocation reflects a key assumption in the national flood risk funding formula, which is that benefits from flood risk management are calculated on the basis of what currently exists, with an emphasis on homes and protection of life. Where this creates a difficulty is that it means that national investment in this work cannot be focused on locations where the prime benefit is protection to existing business – especially rural based business such as agri-food – and cannot anticipate potential future growth.

In effect, it means that flood risk management cannot easily be funded in order to unlock and promote future growth, and is geared towards a discrete project-by-project approach, rather than recognising flood risk and water management infrastructure as a linked system of interdependent assets and maintenance activities. It is also questionable that the current capital funding system is well suited to promoting the accumulation of smaller local improvements that collectively can support the delivery of better surface water flood risk locally and regionally.

In 2014 the Environment Agency's Long Term Investment Strategy estimated that optimal investment in flood risk management (meaning coastal, fluvial and surface water flooding) would be £750-800m per annum during 2015-2025, rising from the 2020s to 2040s to £850-900m per annum (all present value equivalents in 2014). Once discounted to present values, the cost of funding all activity to manage flood and coastal erosion risk where benefits are greater than costs would be around £25 billion over the next 100 years.

It should be noted, however, that this calculation does not include costs of repairing risk management assets beyond normal 'wear and tear' (ie it does not anticipate costs of repairing damage from flooding or coastal surge events). It also does not include economic growth benefits that could be achieved in areas where the standard of protection against flooding is improved over time, or other benefits such as health or reduced risk to life. In effect, this is the anticipated cost up the 2040s of protecting what currently exists (in 2014), with no allowance for growth, and without factoring in investment in protection to business growth.

From 2015 Government estimated that the costs to Lead Local Flood Authorities of implementing the revised arrangements for advising on SuDS and surface water issues on developments would be a maximum of £10,000 per annum. These new arrangements make limited provision for future management of drainage assets in new developments, and leave the extent and scope of LLFA advice to the discretion and resource capacity of each area. There is, therefore, a risk that this will create a disjointed impact nationally, with varying quality of development infrastructure provision from locality to locality. In effect, there are locations where future problems may be being 'built in', in direct contrast to the intended effect of the Pitt Review and the 2010 Act.

### **Financing and funding infrastructure in efficient ways**

**27) What would be the most effective institutional means to fulfil the different functions currently undertaken by the European Investment Bank if the UK loses access? Is a new institution needed? Or could an expansion of existing programmes achieve the same objectives?**

If the UK loses access to the European Investment Bank then its functions should be replaced by an expansion of existing programmes. Attempting to replace it with a new institution would have the potential to increase bureaucracy and stifle the development of infrastructure and the resultant growth.

A critical aspect of responding to such a situation would be to change the state aid rules. In their current form, these could act to prevent an effective replacement being put in place.

**28) How could a comprehensive analysis of the costs and benefits of private and public financing models for publicly funded infrastructure be undertaken? Where might there be new opportunities for privately financed models to improve delivery?**

The comprehensive analysis of the costs and benefits of private and public financing for publicly funded infrastructure is likely to require the establishment of a formal Commission. This complex subject would require a wide ranging study of the performance of existing models of delivering infrastructure. Well published problems with some of the existing models indicate that the factors governing effective delivery model selection are not always well understood. Lessons from previous infrastructure delivery failures are not always circulated to enable wider learning of the complex range of factors influencing the outcomes. A well-structured Commission would allow the appropriate level of knowledge capture to help inform delivery choices and to identify new opportunities for privately financed models of delivery.

# Agenda Item 8



## Policy and Scrutiny

### Open Report on behalf of Richard Wills, Executive Director for Environment and Economy

Report to:	<b>Highways and Transport Scrutiny Committee</b>
Date:	<b>22 January 2018</b>
Subject:	<b>Grantham Southern Relief Road (GSRR) - Land Acquisition, Orders and Contracts</b>

#### **Summary:**

This report informs the Committee that Alen Chanamuto, Senior Project Leader (Major Schemes) will provide an update at the meeting on the Grantham Southern Relief Road (GSRR) - Land Acquisition, Orders and Contracts which was presented to the Executive on 3 January 2018.

The Executive approved the recommendation as detailed in attached report (Appendix 1). The update will be provided to the Committee with a view to brief Councillors on the current situation and future direction.

#### **Recommendation(s):**

The Committee is invited to consider and comments on the approved recommendation as set out in Appendix 1 in relation to the Grantham Southern Relief Road (GSRR).

#### **1. Background**

Alen Chanamuto, Senior Project Leader (Major Schemes) will provide an update at the meeting on the on the Grantham Southern Relief Road (GSRR) - Land Acquisition, Orders and Contracts report which was presented at Executive on 3 January 2018. The Executive approved the recommendation as detailed in attached report (Appendix 1).

The report was not considered by a scrutiny committee prior to the decision taking place. This Post-decision scrutiny report is intended to give the Highways and Transport Scrutiny Committee an opportunity to review the outcome of the decision and highlight any comments for consideration.

#### **2. Conclusion**

To consider and comment on the update provided.

### **3. Consultation**

#### **a) Have Risks and Impact Analysis been carried out?**

N/A

#### **b) Risks and Impact Analysis**

N/A

### **4. Appendices**

These are listed below and attached at the back of the report	
Appendix 1	Grantham Southern Relief Road (GSRR) - Land Acquisition, Orders and Contracts (I014796)

### **5. Background Papers**

No background papers within Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972 were used in the preparation of this report.

This report was written by Alen Chanamuto, who can be contacted on 01522550393 or alen.chanamuto@lincolnshire.gov.uk.

**Executive**

<b>Open Report on behalf of Richard Wills, Executive Director for Environment and Economy</b>
---

Report to:	<b>Executive</b>
Date:	<b>03 January 2018</b>
Subject:	<b>Grantham Southern Relief Road (GSRR) - Land Acquisition, Orders and Contracts</b>
Decision Reference:	<b>I014796</b>
Key decision?	<b>Yes</b>

**Summary:**

By a decision dated 23 July 2013 the Executive Councillor for Highways, Transport and IT approved the exercise of Lincolnshire County Council's powers under the Highways Act 1980 to pursue the overall strategy and project designed to achieve procurement and construction of the Grantham Southern Relief Road ("GSRR").

The GSRR scheme comprises three phases which are: the section known as King 31 link heading west from the B1174 towards the A1, the A1 grade separated junction connecting the King 31 link to the A1, and the Southern Quadrant Link Road ("SQLR") which connects the B1174 to the A52. The overall GSRR and its phases are described in more detail in the Report and its Appendices.

The purpose of this report is to seek the Executive's approval:-

- to pursue the acquisition of land for the SQLR
- to proceed with making a Compulsory Purchase Order and Side Roads Orders for the GSRR Scheme
- to seek, and if agreed, take a delegation from the Secretary of State for Transport to enable the making of a Slip Roads Order for the GSRR scheme or in the absence of a delegation to assist the Secretary of State in making such an Order
- for the Council to enter into an agreement with Highways England pursuant to Section 6 of the Highways Act 1980 to receive the necessary delegation of trunk road powers for the GSRR Scheme
- in principle to procure and award of a contract for the SQLR (phase 3 GSRR)

**Recommendation(s):**

That the Executive:-

1. Approves Lincolnshire County Council entering into an agreement with Highways England pursuant to Section 6 of the Highways Act 1980 ("the Section 6 Agreement") relating to highway works at the A1 Trunk Road (Grantham Southern Growth Corridor) and the exercise by the Council of all Highways England's powers in respect of the making, publishing and seeking confirmation of Compulsory Purchase Orders and Side Roads Orders necessary to give effect to paragraphs 2 and 3 below, generally in the form of the draft attached at Appendix J .
- 2 Approves Lincolnshire County Council (both for itself and in exercise of the powers of Highways England delegated pursuant to the Section 6 Agreement) exercising powers under Sections 14, 125, 239, 240, 246, 250 and 260 of the Highways Act 1980 and Acquisition of Land Act 1981 to secure the compulsory acquisition of and otherwise deal with all land and rights and interests in and affecting land necessary to construct the GSRR (including the SQLR).
- 3 Without prejudice to the generality of the approval at paragraph 2 above approves Lincolnshire County Council (both for itself and in exercise of the powers of Highways England delegated pursuant to the Section 6 Agreement) making:-
  - (i) A compulsory Purchase Order under Sections 239, 240, 246, 250 and 260 of the Highways Act 1980 and Acquisition of Land Act 1981 generally in the form set out in Appendix F to this report to secure the compulsory acquisition of the land shown pink on the Compulsory Purchase Order plans at Appendix H and the new rights over the land shown coloured blue on the said order plans on the basis that there is a compelling case in the public interest for making this Compulsory Purchase Order; and
  - (ii) Side Roads Orders under sections 14 and 125 of the Highways Act 1980 generally in the forms set out in Appendix B and E to carry out works to existing highways;the orders detailed in sub-paragraphs (i) and (ii) of this paragraph 3 being collectively referred to as "the Orders"
4. Approves
  - (i) Lincolnshire County Council entering into an agreement with the Secretary of State for Transport ("SSfT") and/or the Department for Transport ("DfT") to receive authority or delegation of powers to enable the Council to promote a Slip Roads Order or Orders to be made by the SSfT under sections 10 and 41 of the Highways Act 1980 through to confirmation, including preparation and

	<p>representations at any Public Inquiry and the exercising of those powers if and when authorised or delegated; or</p> <p>(ii) whether or not a delegation is obtained pursuant to paragraph 4 above, Lincolnshire County Council liaising with and assisting the SSfT and/or DfT in respect of publication and promotion of a Slip Roads Order or Orders under Sections 10 and 41 of the Highways Act 1980 in each case for the designation of the new slip roads created as part of the GSRR scheme as trunk roads;</p>
5	Authorises the Executive Director for Environment and Economy to exercise on behalf of the Council any powers of the Secretary of State under section 10 of the Highways Act 1980 delegated pursuant to an agreement as described in paragraph 4(i) above or otherwise to take such steps as may be necessary to liaise with and assist the Secretary of State as described in paragraph 4(ii) above.
6.	Approves in principle the Statement of Reasons ("SoR") for the above mentioned Orders generally in the form of the draft set out at Appendix I
7.	Authorises the Executive Director for Environment and Economy to agree the final version of the SoR, and the final form of the Orders including authority to make, if necessary, any amendments to the Orders referred to in 3 (i) and 3 (ii) above necessary to secure the compulsory acquisition of all land necessary to construct the GSRR (including the SQLR) prior to publication of the Orders.
8.	Authorises the Chief Legal Officer to seal the Orders in their final form.
9	Authorises the Executive Director for Environment and Economy to take all the ancillary and necessary steps, including the publication and service of all statutory notices and presentation of the Council's case at Public Inquiry, to secure the confirmation of the Orders by the Secretary of State and the vesting of the land in the County Council to include authority to request confirmation of the final Orders with modifications if, in the light of new information, it appears expedient to ensure the confirmation of the Orders.
10.	That authority be given to the Chief Legal Officer to acquire all third party interests in land and the properties subject to the Compulsory Purchase Order and as required for the GSRR (whether compulsorily or by agreement) on terms recommended by the Executive Director for Environment and Economy.
11	Approves the capital scheme appraisal for the Southern Quadrant Link Road ("SQLR") in accordance with paragraph B9 of the Financial Regulations forming part of the Council's Constitution and which is intended to form the third phase of the overall Grantham Southern Relief Road ("GSRR")

- 12 Approves in principle the procurement and award of a contract for SQLR (phase 3 GSRR)
- 13 Authorises the Executive Director of Environment and Economy to agree the final form and approve the entering into of all agreements and contracts necessary to secure the construction and completion of the GSRR (including the SQLR) to include (but without limitation)
  - (i) the Section 6 Agreement referred to in paragraph 1 above;
  - (ii) any agreement with the SSfT or DfT whether of a kind referred to in paragraph 4 above or otherwise;
  - (iii) any contract awarded pursuant to paragraph 12; and
  - (iv) any contract or agreement made with statutory undertakers, Network Rail or the like in connection with the Scheme

**Alternatives Considered:**

Not to proceed to the making of Compulsory Purchase Orders or the entering into of the recommended agreements

There are significant benefits in the public interest to proceeding with the GSRR Scheme both in terms of highway considerations and the impact of the Scheme on the growth plans for Grantham. These are dealt with in detail in the Report. The delivery of the GSRR Scheme has been a major objective of the County Council's transport strategy for many years. Similarly, the growth plans associated with the southern quadrant SUE which is enabled by the Scheme are longstanding objectives for the town of Grantham embedded in local strategies and plans. The project has been identified as a priority by the Greater Lincolnshire Local Enterprise Partnership to deliver key aspects of the Strategic Economic Plan. Not to proceed would mean these benefits would be lost and the current transport problems within Grantham would continue. A major opportunity to stimulate growth within Grantham would also be missed

The entering into of the agreements and the making and confirmation of the Orders referred to in the Recommendations are necessary to ensure that land is acquired and associated rights and encumbrances properly dealt with in a way which is most efficient for the delivery of the Scheme.

**Reasons for Recommendation:**

To ensure the GSRR scheme is progressed expediently and orders for the scheme can be published at the earliest opportunity enabling the acquisition of land and the proper dealing with rights and encumbrances.

For the reasons set out in the Report and the Statement of Reasons at Appendix I to the Report there are compelling reasons in the public interest for

the exercising of the relevant powers and the making of the Orders referred to in the Recommendations

## 1 Executive Summary

- 1.1 The Grantham Southern Relief Road ("GSRR") is a strategic infrastructure project essential to delivering the growth of Grantham and required to address the strategic transport connectivity around the town as well as addressing specific transport problems within Grantham. It is more fully described in section 2 of this Report. These strategic ambitions are set out within the Local Transport Plan, the adopted South Kesteven Core Strategy and the emerging South Kesteven Local Plan. The project has been identified as a priority by the Greater Lincolnshire Local Enterprise Partnership to deliver key aspects of the Strategic Economic Plan and has therefore been allocated growth funding to facilitate its delivery. The terms of that funding require the delivery of key outputs within agreed timescales and the GL LEP Investment Board are provided with updates on scheme progress
- 1.2 The GSRR scheme is being delivered in phases although the ultimate benefits rely on the complete delivery of the scheme. This is a critical consideration underpinning the need to promote the Orders for the scheme in the way in which it is being proposed rather than in a phase by phase way as the funding and outputs are inextricably linked together. The scheme includes two main parts known as the King 31 link and the Southern Quadrant Relief Road ("SQLR"). The King 31 phase 1 element has been constructed and phase 2 will create a connection on to the A1 whilst the SQLR or phase 3 of the overall scheme provides a connection eastwards so as to avoid the east to west A52 traffic needing to pass through the centre of Grantham.
- 1.3 The GSRR scheme includes a number of complex interdependencies and has required joint working and collaboration between a number of partners including Lincolnshire County Council, South Kesteven District Council, Network Rail, Highways England, Anglian Water and key landowners some of which are promoting key aspects of the proposed development being considered as part of the Spittlegate Heath development proposals. Detail is included in the body of the report on the current status of those relationships.
- 1.4 The GSRR scheme is being promoted by the County Council as a strategic link and accordingly key approvals are being sought to enable the Council to be able to proceed with the delivery of the project. In order to proceed there are agreements needed with the key other stakeholders and powers to be delegated from Highways England to enable the County Council to act as their agents for the purposes of both making and seeking confirmation of compulsory purchase and side roads orders in relation to trunk roads and the carrying out of work on the strategic network i.e. deliver the A1 junction

connection. One element of the orders for the GSRR scheme falls outside the remit of either the County Council or Highways England. This is the power of the Secretary of State for Transport to make an Order that the new slip roads at the A1 junction be trunk roads under section 10 and 41 of the Highways Act 1980. Discussion is ongoing with the Department for Transport ("DfT") as to whether the power to pursue any part of the order making process under section 10 can be delegated to the County Council. If not, regular contact will be maintained with DfT and appropriate pressure applied to ensure that the section 10 order making processes runs alongside and so far as legally possible is integrated with the orders processes being pursued by the County Council on behalf of itself and Highways England

- 1.5 This report is seeking the approval to proceed with the necessary processes to acquire land, award contracts and instigate the necessary legal processes to publish Orders to enable the scheme to progress. These approvals relate to the delivery of Phase 2 (A1 junction) and Phase 3 ("SQLR") of the scheme and will allow the Council to defend the overall scheme delivery at a Public Inquiry should objections be received to the Orders that can't otherwise be resolved. A key element of the management of that risk is to acquire all the land needed to deliver the scheme by negotiation thereby reducing the risk of needing to use CPO powers.
- 1.6 At the point of drafting this report some of the legal agreements with Highways England, Network Rail, landowners and (potentially) the Secretary of State for Transport have not been finalised but these are all progressing with agreements in place as to what all parties are seeking to achieve. Similarly, the drafts of the Statement of Reasons and Orders attached to this Report are well progressed but are nonetheless in draft form and will require amendment before finally being published and issued. The report therefore seeks delegated authority for the Executive Director for Environment and Economy to progress these matters to conclusion.

## **2 Scheme Description**

- 2.1 The Grantham Southern Relief Road (GSRR), located to the south of the Grantham urban area, will form a predominantly single carriageway route linking the A1 to the A52. A more detailed description is contained within the draft Statement of Reasons at Appendix I. The GSRR consists of the following two sections:

- 2.1.1 The King 31 Link, which will connect the A1 to the B1174 at the western end of the relief road and form part of the Spittlegate Development (also known as the 'King 31' development). Planning permission (S08-448) was originally granted on 18 August 2010. LCC then inherited the planning permission from the developer Buckminster Estates. After consideration the 2010 planning permission was considered not suitable to deliver a grade separated interchange for the GSRR. A new planning permission was granted by Lincolnshire County Council planning authority on 27 May 2016 which increased the red line boundary to provide sufficient working

area to build the slip roads. The King 31 Road forms Phase 1 of the GSRR and the A1 junction Phase 2 of the GSRR.

- 2.1.1 The Southern Quadrant Link Road (SQLR), which will link the B1174 to A52 (Phase 3 GSRR) and will also serve the Southern Quadrant (SQ) mixed-use development. Planning permission (S13/0775) was granted for this section in November 2013. A section 73 application (S15/2101) to vary Conditions 2 and 11 of permission S13/0775 was granted in Nov 2015 to allow amendment to viaduct of southern quadrant link road. Non Material Amendment (S15/1354) comprising changes to roundabouts, realignment of access track and alterations to Whalebone Lane junction were approved in June 2015.
- 2.2 The proposed scheme is located within an area of predominantly arable land to the south of the Grantham urban area and the village of Somerby Hill, and to the north of the villages of Little Ponton and Great Ponton. The scheme will enable traffic to travel between the A1 and the A52 without having to travel through Grantham town centre, and it will also provide a crossing of the East Coast Main Line (ECML) railway and the River Witham.

### **3 Transport problems and issues**

- 3.1 A key issue is Grantham currently experiences a high level of congestion within the town centre. Grantham lies close to the A1, which forms a north-south bypass to the west of town. Grantham does not benefit from any other bypasses, and is intersected by the A52 and A607. A number of radial routes connect in the town centre, forming a traffic collar of closely spaced mainly signalised junctions. The timings of the signalised junctions in the town centre are coordinated via the 'SCOOT' Urban Traffic Control system. This system uses real time traffic information to make constant small adjustments to signal timings in order to optimise performance and reduce delays and queuing. However, there are heavy traffic flows through and within the town, with large volumes of HGVs particularly on the eastwest A52.
- 3.2 There are a number of bridges, associated with the East Coast Main Line, with low heights that force HGVs to use the centre of the road to navigate under them. Within Grantham, low rail bridges force freight traffic to use Wharf Road (in the town centre) and the A52 (Barrowby Road) to access, amongst other things, agricultural industries to the east. The Transport Strategy for Grantham (2007-2021) states that; 'Tall vehicles hitting the low bridges in Grantham causes problems through delays to traffic, delays to rail passengers and potentially expensive repairs to the bridge'. In fact, for the year ending 31 March 2012, Network Rail reported 11 recorded bridge strikes at the Barrowby Road Bridge in the Grantham urban area ( 3 of the bridges in the town are amongst the 10 most hit bridges in the country). Consequently, due to a lack of alternative routes and serious bridge height constraints, there are a large number of HGV bridge strikes in and around Grantham Town Centre, which adds to the problems of congestion and delay.

- 3.3 There is significant queuing and congestion during peak periods and during the 'school run' around the town centre traffic collar and along key radial routes. Cycle times at the signal junctions in the town centre are long, resulting in significant delays for pedestrians waiting to cross.
- 3.4 Various small-scale developer and County funded schemes have assisted in improving traffic flow through the town centre, but it is recognised that larger scale developer-funded schemes such as the GSRR would be required in order to effect significant improvements and to accommodate future planned developments
- 3.5 The Local Transport Plan 4 notes that, to date, five Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs), have been declared in Lincolnshire where levels of nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>) are predicted to exceed the threshold set down in the National Air Quality Strategy. In all cases, the primary source of NO<sub>2</sub> is road traffic. Two of the five locations are within Grantham Town Centre:
  - Wharf Road, Grantham.
  - Brook Street / Manthorpe Road, Grantham.
- 3.6 The most recent Air Quality monitoring as outlined in the 2012 Updating Screening and Assessment Report, suggests that there are also other areas in the town where the thresholds are being breached. Consideration is currently being given to consolidating the existing AQMAs into a single area to incorporate these new areas of concern.
- 3.7 Removing through traffic, in particularly HGVs, from Grantham Town Centre may contribute towards tackling the air quality problems.
- 3.8 As well as these specifically transport considerations, there are several key issues currently affecting Grantham. South Kesteven District Council (SKDC) Local Development Framework (LDF) Core Strategy outlines that Grantham has been identified as 'an urban area with the capacity to support sustainable growth. This will provide the means to strengthen the role of the town as a Sub-Regional Centre. Grantham has also been awarded New Growth Point status, which will require two urban extensions to accommodate the increased development.'
- 3.9 The latest SKDC housing strategy, for the period 2013-2018, outlines that the growth plans for the district anticipate the development of 7,500 homes and up to 4,000 new jobs by 2026 in the Sustainable Urban Extensions (SUEs) of Grantham, referred to as the North West Quadrant/Poplar Farm and the Southern Quadrant (SQ), reflecting Grantham's status as a Growth Area. The SQ SUE lies on the southern edge of the built up area of Grantham between the A1 and A52. The land is situated 1.5km south of the town centre and has the potential for up to 3,500 new homes, alongside local shops, schools, community facilities and 110,000sqm of employment land.
- 3.10 Whilst a small quantum of the SQ development could be served from the existing highway network, the full delivery of the SQ SUE can only be

facilitated by the delivery of the GSRR, which is therefore fundamental to the development proposals. Whilst the GSRR scheme therefore has a strong justification in purely highways terms it also makes a major contribution to the growth plans for the town of Grantham and the road has been designed in consultation with South Kesteven District Council and the relevant landowners to ensure that the road is able to contribute as much as possible to the growth ambitions for the town.

#### **4 GSRR Scheme objectives**

- 4.1 The issues referred to in section 3 above are reflected in the objectives of the GSRR scheme which are as follows:-

Objective 1 - To contribute to the expansion of Grantham by facilitating the provision of a mixed use development including up to 3,500 homes, employment opportunities and community facilities in accordance with the Grantham Southern Quadrant SPD.

Objective 2 - To provide a relief road that links the A52 and the A1 and thereby improve connectivity and cater for strategic traffic movements, in particular HGVs.

Objective 3 - To support the Transport Strategy for Grantham by helping tackle town centre congestion and contributing to creating a safer, more attractive and assessable environment in Grantham Town Centre by removing strategic through traffic.

Objective 4 - To address the problems of disruption and unplanned delays within Grantham Town Centre associated with a high number of HGV bridge strikes

Objective 5 - To help improve the quality of life for Grantham residents, workers and shoppers by reducing carbon emissions and noise pollution in the town centre.

#### **5 Key milestones in scheme progress to date**

- 5.1 Construction of Phase 1 of the GSRR was completed in July 2016.
- 5.2 Advance utilities works such as the diversion of the 11kV underground electrical cables and 33kV underground electrical cables were successfully completed by Western Power Distribution (WPD) in October and November 2017 for phase 3 (SQLR). Works were carried out under a wayleave obtained by WPD.
- 5.3 Galliford Try has now completed the tree / hedgerow clearance along embankments of the A1 in April 2017 for phase 2 and at the same time completed ground penetration radar surveys during the lane closures, mainly in the area where the new underbridge is to be constructed, to ensure that any unknown utilities are discovered well in advance of construction and reduce risk and the construction programme.

- 5.4 Archaeology for Phase 2 is due to commence on 2 January 2018 after a successful tender process resulting in the works being awarded to Allen Archaeology. This is anticipated to take 9 weeks.
- 5.5 Archaeology for Phase 3 is expected to complete in December 2017. This work has taken 5 months.
- 5.6 Technical Approval is the review of the design by the highway authority for any redesign of the strategic road network. This is to ensure design compliance with the authority's specific needs. The design prepared on behalf of LCC has now undergone a number of iterations for approval with Kier since December 2016. Highways England has now granted technical approval in principal to LCC for the design of Phase 2 of the scheme. They have placed caveats on the approval on the basis that outstanding issues with wider consequential signing are closed out in advance of construction for phase 2 taking place.
- 5.7 The design for phase 3 continues to progress to its final stages with mainly the technically challenging Network Rail (NR) and Environment Agency elements being worked through.

## **6 Land acquisition**

- 6.1 The extent of the freehold land and land over which rights are required to construct the GSRR scheme is shown on the Order Plans (Appendix H). This land is predominantly arable farmland in various ownerships but with the majority of the land belonging to one owner. The use of Compulsory Purchase Order powers is however the only way to guarantee that the land required for the scheme is available to the Council.
- 6.2 Land acquisitions for Phase 2 are proceeding well. LCC may not need to use compulsory purchase powers to acquire the land. However, should issue arise with the agreements, LCC have the fall-back position of utilising these powers.
- 6.3 The majority land owner for Phase 2 has signed a key legal agreement with LCC in September 2017. LCC have now acquired the majority of land required for constructing Phase 2. The legal agreement contains a time frame within which LCC needs to complete construction of Phase 1 and Phase 2 of GSRR.
- 6.4 Heads of terms are agreed in principle by land agents for two other Phase 2 landowning parties and their respective solicitors are drafting legal documentation to be agreed.
- 6.5 An agreement with Highways England to transfer a further necessary triangle of Phase 2 land to LCC is also well advanced.
- 6.6 Land acquisitions for Phase 3 have begun. There are 53 land interests affected by Phase 3 of the GSRR with 5 land owners involved. There are also several tenancies in place which affects negotiations going forward.

- 6.7 Initial engagement of land owners has begun and Heads of Terms ("HOTs") have been agreed in principle with key landowner and stakeholder Network Rail ("NR").
- 6.8 "License Condition 7" process to determine Network Rail's operational use of a triangle of land east of ECML has begun and is due to complete 15 January 2018. The land would then be available for acquisition directly from NR. LCC is already in discussion with NR to progress this acquisition.

## **7 The Orders and Overview of the Statement of Reasons (SoR)**

- 7.1 The Orders to be made are as follows:-

- 7.1.1 LCC will make and promote the Lincolnshire County Council (A52 Grantham Southern Growth Corridor – Grantham Southern Relief Road) Compulsory Purchase Order 2018. This order contains provision for the compulsory acquisition of land for the purposes of both the County Council highway elements of the GSRR scheme and the trunk road elements associated with the A1 junction. The former are included in the order pursuant to the Council's own compulsory purchase powers, the latter are included through the exercise by the Council of Highways England compulsory purchase powers to be delegated to the Council under section 6 of the Highways Act 1980
- 7.1.2 In addition to promoting a Compulsory Purchase Order, LCC is making The Lincolnshire (A52 Grantham Southern Growth Corridor – Grantham Southern Relief Road) (Classified Road) (Side Roads) Order 2018 in order to carry out works to existing highways as well as private means of access and rights of way which are necessary to enable the County Council highways elements of the GSRR Scheme to be built. This Side Road Order is again made under the Council's own statutory powers.
- 7.1.3 LCC is also promoting the The A1 Trunk Road (Grantham Southern Growth Corridor) (Side Roads) Order 2018 to link the new road to the A1 Trunk Road which are also necessary to enable the Scheme to be built along with any consequential alterations to the existing highway network including private means of access and rights of way. This Order is made on behalf of Highways England in exercise of powers to be delegated under section 6 of the Highways Act 1980.
- 7.1.4 There is also a need for the making of The A1 Trunk Road (Grantham Southern Growth Corridor) (Slip Roads) Order 2018 which is necessary to ensure that the slip roads at the A1 junction are created as or otherwise become trunk road on completion. This is an Order which is made by the Secretary of State for Transport and not Highways England and therefore cannot be delegated by Highways England under section 6 of the Highways Act 1980. Discussions are ongoing with the Department for Transport as to whether any part of the order making process can or would be delegated to the Council. In the absence of such a delegation the Council will closely liaise with

the DfT to ensure that the process for the making of the slip roads order is closely aligned with and where possible integrated within the other order making processes.

- 7.2 A SoR has been prepared which sets out the reasons for building the GSRR and explains the need for the Compulsory Purchase Order and other Orders to enable land and any other interest in the land that is not within the ownership or control of the LCC to be acquired to permit the GSRR scheme works to be carried out.
- 7.3 The draft SoR for the GSRR can be found in Appendix I. Although there are elements of the SoR which require further work (indicated in the form of notes within the document) the nature of the justification of the GSRR scheme and the use of compulsory purchase and side roads order powers in relation to the GSRR scheme is clear from the SoR. Although brief summaries are given below of the needs for and justifications of the various orders referred to above, the full justification is set out in the SoR including detail of the highways considerations and the alignment of the GSRR scheme with national and local policy. Members of the Executive must have regard to the SoR at Appendix I as a whole in considering whether the powers available to the Council and delegated to it by Highways England or (potentially) the Secretary of State should be exercised for the purpose of making orders in relation to the GSRR scheme.
- 7.4 The current drafts of the documents comprising the Compulsory Purchase Order can be found at Appendices F, G and H of this Report. The current drafts of the County Council Sire Roads Order with its draft plans can be found at Appendices B and C to this Report. The draft trunk road Side Roads Order can be found at Appendix E to this Report. The draft Slip Roads Order that will be made by the Secretary of State if not delegated is attached at Appendix D to this Report.
- 7.5 All of these Orders are in draft form and are subject to amendment in order to make technical adjustments or to accommodate changes to the Scheme in the light of changing circumstances. By way of illustration it is understood that the design of the current phase 2 (A1 junction) works is adequate to accommodate the recent planning permission granted for a designer outlet village on the King 31 land. However if adjustments were required to the design and the land required changes would need to be made to the Orders.
- 7.6 To give the necessary flexibility to progress the Scheme in an efficient and timely manner a delegation is sought to the Executive Director for Environment and Economy to make necessary changes prior to publication of the Orders and during the process of seeking their confirmation.

## **8 The Need for and Justification of the Compulsory Purchase Order.**

- 8.1 The Draft Compulsory Purchase Order can be found in Appendix F.
- 8.2 The purpose of seeking to acquire land and new rights compulsorily is to enable the GSRR to be constructed. These proposals would enable LCC to

meet its statutory purposes and strategic highway objectives within the shortest realistic timescale in the most appropriate way.

- 8.3 LCC recognises that a CPO for the GSRR can only be made if there is a compelling case in the public interest which justifies the acquisition of private rights and interests in land and the creation of new rights sought to be acquired. A compelling case exists here as set out in the SoR. A CPO is necessary and justifiable in the public interest.
- 8.4 LCC would be making the Order to secure the outstanding interests and new rights required to enable implementation of the GSRR, which is necessary to achieve LCC's objectives for the area. Given the history of the development of the scheme proposals discussions have taken place with land owners affected by the scheme as the precise extent of land ownership could not be established. LCC has held or intends to hold discussions with the owners of relevant interests in an attempt to reach agreement but the CPO remains necessary to ensure that the GSRR can proceed.

## **9 The Need for and Justification of the Side Roads Orders**

- 9.1 The purpose of the Side Roads Orders is to maintain access to all land and property directly affected by the GSRR Scheme and to make necessary changes to the highway network. In order to build the new road, it is necessary to improve, or stop up existing highways and construct new highways to link into the new road. It will also be necessary to stop up some existing private means of access to land or premises and to replace those where necessary with new means of access. To enable it to carry out those works LCC is promoting the Side Roads Orders.
- 9.2 The draft LCC side roads order can be found in Appendix B and the draft Trunk road side road order can be found in Appendix E.
- 9.3 LCC recognises that the Side Roads Orders for the GSRR can only be made if there is a compelling case in the public interest which justifies the acquisition of private rights and interests and the creation of new rights sought to be acquired. A compelling case exists here as set out in the SoR. The Side Roads Orders are necessary and justifiable in the public interest.

## **10 The Need for and Justification of the A1 Trunk Road Slip Roads Order**

- 10.1 The planning permission granted in respect of the connection with the A1 Trunk Road indicated that direct connections on to and off the A1 would be provided to enable an all movement junction to be created. The junction would ensure that anyone wishing to connect with the GSRR Scheme or to access the Kings 31 development site could do so from both north and south on the A1.
- 10.2 In order to achieve that movement and to meet the requirements of the planning permission as granted the Slip Roads Order is necessary. The Slip Roads as shown in the order have been designed to meet the relevant and

applicable standards and have been assessed by Highways England and have received the necessary technical approval to be acceptable.

- 10.3 The draft Slip road orders can be found in Appendix D. The considerations in relation to the making of this Order are dealt with in paragraph 7.2.4 above.

**11 The need and justification for entering into agreement(s) pursuant to Section 6**

- 11.1 In order to work on the A1 Trunk Road, LCC will need to sign up to agreement under section 6 of the Highways Act 1980 with Highways England and potentially also an agreement with the Secretary of State. This will allow the LCC contractor to work on the trunk road network. A commuted sum will be payable to Highways England to maintain the new infrastructure provided by LCC to deliver the grade separated interchange which cannot be finalised until the design is approved. Another condition imposed on LCC by Highways England is the need to address the loss of lay by provision created by this scheme, which will require the building of additional laybys on the A1 beyond the site of the grade separated junction. These details have still not been finalised with Highways England. LCC also require the section 6 agreements for obtaining delegated authority for publishing of compulsory purchase orders and side roads orders affecting the trunk road

- 11.2 The Draft Section 6 Agreement can be found in Appendix J.

**12 Programme**

- 12.1 The current estimated programme for delivery of the Scheme is as follows:

**End of January 2018** - Orders made and published (subject to sign off from Highways England and Department for Transport for Section 6, Section 14 and Section 10 documents)

**March 2018** - Objection period ends

**March 2018** – Secretary of State's decision made whether to confirm the Orders (Should Public inquiry not be required)

**Summer 2018** – Scheme starts (Should a public inquiry not be required)

**Spring 2020** – Scheme Opens (Should a public inquiry not be required)

**13 Funding of the Grantham Southern Relief Road**

- 13.1 The entire scheme is estimated to costs around £81.5 million of which Construction of the SQLR is estimated to cost around £44 million.

- 13.2 LCC and SKDC, working in collaboration, have already secured three sources of grant totalling £33m which will fund the whole of the King 31 Phase 1 and Phase 2 and an element of SQLR. This comprises the Local Transport Board grant of £11.9m, Single Local Growth Fund grant of £16.1m and Highways England Growth and Housing Fund grant of £5m.
- 13.3 The remainder of the funding is proposed to be provided by Developer contributions through S106 planning agreements for the Southern Quadrant Development (SQD). LCC will forward fund the S106 agreement contributions and the balance will be funded by LCC. It should be noted that the s106 contributions are not yet secured by any agreement or documentation. The overall financial and funding position is set out in the following table.

	Previous Years	2017/18	2018/19	Future Years	Total
	£m (Actual)	£m	£m	£m	£m
<b>Grant LTB, SLGF, GHF</b>	9.315	2.4	7.7	13.585	33
<b>Developer contributions</b>	0	0		28.5	28.5
<b>LCC Contribution + Forward Funding</b>				19.5	19.5
<b>SKDC Contribution</b>				0.5	0.5
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>9.315</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>7.7</b>	<b>62.085</b>	<b>81.5</b>

- 13.4 LCC have submitted an expression of interest for a further £28m of funding through the Homes and Communities Agency's (HCA) Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF) which could help divert some of S106 received to other much needed infrastructure improvements in Grantham. Results of LCC's initial bid will be announced in January 2018 where successful applicants will be invited to move forward with the second phase of applications.

## 14 Contract Letting

- 14.1 The Executive Director for Environment and Economy currently has delegated authority to award the main works contract for phase 2 to Galliford Try through the Midland Highways Alliance Medium Schemes Framework 2.
- 14.2 LCC are looking into procurement options for phase 3 and are engaging with contractors interested in bidding for the contract to construct phase 3.
- 14.3 Contract documents are being progressed by design consultants WSP.
- 14.4 The intention is to go out to tender at the end of Summer 2018 depending on the routes available at the time. The options currently being considered

are through a restricted tender and through the Midland highways alliances' new Medium Schemes Framework 3.

- 14.5 Options will be considered in detail once details of the new framework are finalised.
- 14.6 Approval is sought in principle for the Council proceeding to procure and award a contract for the construction of the SQLR for which no approval has previously been given. The detail of the process to be followed and the terms of the contract would be determined under delegated authority by the Executive Director for Environment and Economy.

## **15. Legal Issues:**

### State Aid

- 15.1 State Aid advice has been obtained on all Phases of the GSRR and these have been considered as part of any land deals being taken forward.
- 15.2 In respect of the SQLR (phase 3 of GSRR) the advice is that the construction of the road does not constitute State Aid. Principally this is because the GSRR is a road which when built will be open to all potential users free of charge and without discrimination: and it will provide benefits to those in the area generally (e.g. by reducing traffic through Grantham itself and facilitating the strategic movement of traffic). The fact that the road may be constructed with a view also to facilitating growth and the fact that land may be brought into development as a result of its construction does not affect this position.
- 15.3 State Aid could potentially arise if elements of the design and construction were put in place solely to benefit an individual undertaking such as a landowner with development plans. This may be the case with, for example, the construction of a roundabout giving access to the development site. No State Aid will arise, however, if the landowner(s) in question contribute financially to the scheme in an amount equal to or in excess of the cost of those elements of the works. In the case of the SQLR, the section 106 contributions to be made by landowners will be more than sufficient to outweigh the costs of works which may be said to benefit them exclusively.
- 15.4 This will be kept under review as the scheme progresses to ensure that all necessary s106 contributions are secured.

### Human Rights

- 15.5 The Council has addressed the implications arising from the GSRR Scheme in respect of the Human Rights Act 1998. The Human Rights Act 1998 incorporated the European Convention on Human Rights (the "Convention") into domestic law. The Convention includes provisions in the form of Articles, the aim of which is to protect the rights of the individual.

15.6 In resolving to make the Orders, the Council has carefully considered the rights of property owners under the Convention against the wider public interest.

15.7 *Article 1 of the First Protocol to the Convention.*

This protects the right of everyone to the peaceful enjoyment of possessions. No one can be deprived of possessions except in the interest and subject to the relevant national and international laws.

15.8 *Article 6.*

This entitles those affected by the Scheme to a fair and public hearing. This includes property rights and can include opportunities to be heard in the consultation process.

15.9 *Article 8.*

This protects private and family life, home and correspondence. No public authority can interfere with these interests except if it is in accordance with the law and is necessary in the interests of national security, public safety or the economic well-being of the country.

15.10 *Article 14.*

This protects the right to enjoy rights and freedoms in the Convention free from discrimination on any ground such as sex, race, colour, language, religion, political or other opinion, or national or social origin.

15.11 The European Court of Human Rights has recognised that “regard must be had to the fair balance that has to be struck between competing interests of the individual and of the community”. Both public and private interests are to be considered in the exercise of the Council’s powers and duties as a local authority. Any interference with a Convention right must be necessary and proportionate.

15.12 In light of the significant public benefit which would arise from the implementation of the Scheme, the Council has concluded that it would be appropriate to make the Orders. It does not regard the Orders as constituting any unlawful interference with individual property rights.

15.13 In addition to the publicity and consultation on the planning application for the Scheme, all known owners and occupiers of land within the Order Land have been contacted regarding the Scheme. Further representations can be made by way of objections to the Orders in the context of any public inquiry that the Secretary of State decides to hold in connection with the Orders. Those parties, whose interests are acquired under the CPO, will be able to claim compensation under the relevant provisions of the Compensation Code.

## Equality Act 2010

15.14 Under section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, the Council must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:

- \* Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Act
- \* Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it
- \* Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

The relevant protected characteristics are age; disability; gender reassignment; pregnancy and maternity; race; religion or belief; sex; and sexual orientation

15.15 Having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to:

- \* Remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic
- \* Take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it
- \* Encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low

15.16 The steps involved in meeting the needs of disabled persons that are different from the needs of persons who are not disabled include, in particular, steps to take account of disabled persons' disabilities

15.17 Having due regard to the need to foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to tackle prejudice, and promote understanding

15.18 Compliance with the duties in section 149 may involve treating some persons more favourably than others

15.19 The duty cannot be delegated and must be discharged by the decision-maker. To discharge the statutory duty the decision-maker must analyse all the relevant material with the specific statutory obligations in mind. If a risk of adverse impact is identified consideration must be given to measures to avoid that impact as part of the decision making process

An impact analysis has not been undertaken specifically in relation to the making of a Compulsory Purchase Order, Slip Road Orders and Side Roads Orders. These relate ultimately to land transactions and are subject to statutory processes and are therefore considered to be neutral in their impact on persons with a protected characteristic.

In terms of the scheme itself, all design complies with national design standards including the relevant requirements and guidance in relation to accessibility. This includes the proposed bridge over the ECML and River Witham.

#### Joint Strategic Needs Analysis (JSNA) and the Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy (JHWS)

15.20 The Council must have regard to the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) and the Joint Health & Well Being Strategy (JHWS) in coming to a decision

Consideration has been given to the JSNA and the JHWS and as can be seen from the Objectives of the scheme set out in paragraph 4.1 above and the air quality information in paragraphs 3.5 to 3.7 the GSRR scheme has significant benefits for both the health and wellbeing of people in Grantham.

#### Crime and Disorder

15.21 Under section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998, the Council must exercise its various functions with due regard to the likely effect of the exercise of those functions on, and the need to do all that it reasonably can to prevent crime and disorder in its area (including anti-social and other behaviour adversely affecting the local environment), the misuse of drugs, alcohol and other substances in its area and re-offending in its area

There issues have been considered but there are not considered to be any direct implications for crime and disorder.

## **16 Conclusion**

- 16.1 The GSRR Scheme has been promoted through significant number of policy documents published by both the County Council and SKDC. The need for the GSRR Scheme and the benefits it will bring are widely recognised and that has been reflected in the grant of planning consent. The proposal fits well within the applicable policy and is supported at both local and national level
- 16.2 For the reasons set out in the Report and in the draft Statement of Reasons LCC a compelling case exists in the public interest for the GSRR Scheme and for the making of a Compulsory Purchase Order and Side Roads Orders in order to give effect to the GSRR Scheme .
- 16.3 Further work is necessary on the Statement of Reasons and the Orders before they are finalised for publication. The delegations requested from the Executive will allow the GSRR to be progressed at critical points in an efficient and effective manner and ensure that funders have the confidence that LCC can deliver this ambitious project.

#### **4. Legal Comments:**

Section 239 (1) and 239 (3) of the Highways Act 1980 enables a highway authority to acquire land required for the construction and improvement of a highway. Sections 14 and 125 of the Highways Act 1980 confer power on the Council as highway authority to make side roads orders.

The Highways Act 1980 contains similar powers for Highways England in relation to trunk roads. Section 6 of the Highways Act 1980 contains powers for Highways England to authorise the County Council to exercise the powers of Highways England in relation to trunk roads and empowers the County Council to exercise such powers where authorised to do so. Circular 2/97 states that the Secretary of State will not confirm a Compulsory Purchase Order until he is satisfied that planning permission for the scheme, to which the Order relates, has been granted. Planning permission has been granted for the GSRR scheme. Counsel's advice is that, on the basis of the information which has been provided to him, and provided it can then be justified then the scheme appears to be a robust one in justifying the use of compulsory purchase powers.

The legal considerations that the Council must take into account in reaching a decision are set out in the Report.

The proposal is consistent with the Policy Framework and within the remit of the Executive if it is within the budget.

#### **5. Resource Comments:**

The currently approved Council Budget includes the total funding available as set out in section 13 of this report including the forward funding of future S106 contributions. The recommendations within this report will need to be undertaken within this approved funding.

### **6. Consultation**

#### **a) Has Local Member Been Consulted?**

No

#### **b) Has Executive Councillor Been Consulted?**

Yes

#### **c) Scrutiny Comments**

The decision has not been subject to pre-decision scrutiny

#### **d) Have Risks and Impact Analysis been carried out??**

See the body of the Report

## e) Risks and Impact Analysis

See the body of the Report

## 7. Appendices

These can be found at the following:

<http://lincolnshire.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=121&MId=4964&Ver=4>

Appendix A	Plan showing the route of the GSRR
Appendix B	Draft Lincolnshire County Council (A52 Grantham Southern Growth Corridor – Grantham Southern Relief Road) (Classified Road) (Side Roads) Order 2018
Appendix C	Draft plans to the Lincolnshire County Council (A52 Grantham Southern Growth Corridor – Grantham Southern Relief Road) (Classified Road) (Side Roads) Order 2018
Appendix D	Draft The A1 Trunk Road (Grantham Southern Growth Corridor) (Slip Roads) Order 2018
Appendix E	Draft The A1 Trunk Road (Grantham Southern Growth Corridor) (Side Roads) Order 2018
Appendix F	Draft Lincolnshire County Council (A52 Grantham Southern Growth Corridor – Grantham Southern Relief Road) Compulsory Purchase Order 2018.
Appendix G	Draft Schedule to the Lincolnshire County Council (A52 Grantham Southern Growth Corridor – Grantham Southern Relief Road) Compulsory Purchase Order 2018.
Appendix H	Draft plans to the Lincolnshire County Council (A52 Grantham Southern Growth Corridor – Grantham Southern Relief Road) Compulsory Purchase Order 2018.
Appendix I	Draft Statement of Reasons to accompany the Compulsory Purchase Order, Slip Road Orders and the Side Roads Order
Appendix J	Draft Section 6 Agreement with Highways England

## 8. Background Papers

Document title	Where the document can be viewed
GSRR Outline Business Case	<a href="https://www.lincolnshire.gov.uk/transport-and-roads/major-projects/grantham-southern-relief-road/a52-grantham-southern-relief-road-outline-business-case/131948.article">https://www.lincolnshire.gov.uk/transport-and-roads/major-projects/grantham-southern-relief-road/a52-grantham-southern-relief-road-outline-business-case/131948.article</a>
Grantham Transport Strategy	<a href="http://uk.sitestat.com/lincolnshire/lincolnshire/s?Home.transport-and-roads.strategy-and-policy.grantham-transport-strategy.80479.articleDownload.8909&amp;ns_type=pdf&amp;ns_url=https://www.lincolnshire.gov.uk//Download/8909">http://uk.sitestat.com/lincolnshire/lincolnshire/s?Home.transport-and-roads.strategy-and-policy.grantham-transport-strategy.80479.articleDownload.8909&amp;ns_type=pdf&amp;ns_url=https://www.lincolnshire.gov.uk//Download/8909</a>
S08-0448: original King 31 planning permission;	<a href="http://www.southkesteven.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=8170#/">http://www.southkesteven.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=8170#/</a>
S13-0775: original SQLR planning permission:	<a href="http://www.southkesteven.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=8170#/">http://www.southkesteven.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=8170#/</a>
S14-1389: approval of pre-commencement details relating to conditions 2, 3, 8, 18 and 22 on planning permission S08-0448;	<a href="http://www.southkesteven.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=8170#/">http://www.southkesteven.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=8170#/</a>
S14-3560: approval of details reserved by condition 3 on planning permission S08-0448;	<a href="http://www.southkesteven.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=8170#/">http://www.southkesteven.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=8170#/</a>
S15-2101: Section 73 application to amend conditions 2 and 11 of planning permission S13-0775;	<a href="http://www.southkesteven.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=8170#/">http://www.southkesteven.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=8170#/</a>
S16/0796: approval of proposed new GSJ on A1.	<a href="http://eplanning.lincolnshire.gov.uk/ePlanning/">http://eplanning.lincolnshire.gov.uk/ePlanning/</a>
S15-0727: non-material amendment to roundabout geometry on planning permission S08-0448;	<a href="http://www.southkesteven.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=8170#/">http://www.southkesteven.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=8170#/</a>

This report was written by Alen Chanamuto, who can be contacted on 01522550393 or [Alen.chanamuto@lincolnshire.gov.uk](mailto:Alen.chanamuto@lincolnshire.gov.uk).

# Agenda Item 9



## Policy and Scrutiny

### Open Report on behalf of Richard Wills, Director responsible for Democratic Services

Report to:	<b>Highways and Transport Scrutiny Committee</b>
Date:	<b>22 January 2018</b>
Subject:	<b>Highways and Transport Scrutiny Committee Work Programme</b>

#### **Summary:**

This item enables the Committee to consider and comment on the content of its work programme for the coming year to ensure that scrutiny activity is focused where it can be of greatest benefit. The work programme will be reviewed at each meeting of the Committee to ensure that its contents are still relevant and will add value to the work of the Council and partners.

Members are encouraged to highlight items that could be included for consideration in the work programme.

#### **Actions Required:**

Members of the Committee are invited to:

- 1) Review, consider and comment on the work programme as set out in Appendix A to this report.
- 2) Highlight for discussion any additional scrutiny activity which could be included for consideration in the work programme.

#### **1. Background**

Overview and Scrutiny should be positive, constructive, independent, fair and open. The scrutiny process should be challenging, as its aim is to identify areas for improvement. Scrutiny activity should be targeted, focused and timely and include issues of corporate and local importance, where scrutiny activity can influence and add value.

Overview and scrutiny committees should not, as a general rule, involve themselves in relatively minor matters or individual cases, particularly where there are other processes, which can handle these issues more effectively.

All members of overview and scrutiny committees are encouraged to bring forward important items of community interest to the committee whilst recognising that not all items will be taken up depending on available resource.

## **Committee Scope**

As part of its terms of reference, the Highways and Transport Scrutiny Committee will work to review and scrutinise the following services and their outcomes:

- Transport Commissioning, including Bus Network Support
- Highway Network Management and Highways maintenance
- New transport investments including highways improvements

There will inevitably be service specific subjects that the scrutiny committee will want to consider, either through policy development, project updates, or through pre-decision scrutiny.

## **Purpose of Scrutiny Activity**

Set out below are the definitions used to describe the types of scrutiny, relating to the items on the Committee Work Programme:

Policy Development - The Committee is involved in the development of policy, usually at an early stage, where a range of options are being considered.

Pre-Decision Scrutiny - The Committee is scrutinising a proposal, prior to a decision on the proposal by the Executive, the Executive Councillor or a senior officer.

Policy Review - The Committee is reviewing the implementation of policy, to consider the success, impact, outcomes and performance.

Performance Scrutiny - The Committee is scrutinising periodic performance, issue specific performance or external inspection reports.

Consultation - The Committee is responding to (or making arrangements to) respond to a consultation, either formally or informally. This includes pre-consultation engagement.

Budget Scrutiny - The Committee is scrutinising the previous year's budget, or the current year's budget or proposals for the future year's budget.

Requests for specific items for information should be dealt with by other means, for instance briefing papers to members.

## **Identifying Topics**

Selecting the right topics where scrutiny can add value is essential in order for scrutiny to be a positive influence on the work of the Council. Members may wish to consider the following questions when highlighting potential topics for discussion to the committee:-

- Will Scrutiny input add value?  
*Is there a clear objective for scrutinising the topic, what are the identifiable benefits and what is the likelihood of achieving a desired outcome?*
- Is the topic a concern to local residents?  
*Does the topic have a potential impact for one or more section(s) of the local population?*
- Is the topic a Council or partner priority area?  
*Does the topic relate to council corporate priority areas and is there a high level of budgetary commitment to the service/policy area?*
- Are there relevant external factors relating to the issue?  
*Is the topic a central government priority area or is it a result of new government guidance or legislation?*

## **Scrutiny Review Activity**

Where a topic requires more in-depth consideration, the Committee may commission a Scrutiny Panel to undertake a Scrutiny Review, subject to the availability of resources and approval of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board. The Committee may also establish a maximum of two working groups at any one time, comprising a group of members from the committee.

## **2. Conclusion**

The Committee's work programme for the coming year is attached at Appendix A to this report. A list of all upcoming Forward Plan decisions relating to the Committee is also attached at Appendix B.

Members of the Committee are invited to review, consider and comment on the work programme as set out in Appendix A and highlight for discussion any additional scrutiny activity which could be included for consideration in the work programme. Consideration should be given to the items included in the work programme as well as any 'items to be programmed' listed.

## **3. Consultation**

### **a) Have Risks and Impact Analysis been carried out?**

Not Applicable

### **b) Risks and Impact Analysis**

Not Applicable

#### **4. Appendices**

These are listed below and attached at the back of the report	
Appendix A	Highways and Transport Scrutiny Committee – Work Programme
Appendix B	Forward Plan of Decisions relating to the Highways and Transport Scrutiny Committee

#### **5. Background Papers**

No background papers within Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972 were used in the preparation of this report.

This report was written by Daniel Steel, Scrutiny Officer, who can be contacted on 01522 552102 or by e-mail at [daniel.steel@lincolnshire.gov.uk](mailto:daniel.steel@lincolnshire.gov.uk)

## Highways and Transport Scrutiny Committee

<b>22 JANUARY 2018 – 10:00am</b>		
<b>Item</b>	<b>Contributor</b>	<b>Purpose</b>
<b>Revenue and Capital Budget Proposals 2018/19</b>	Andy Gutherson, County Commissioner Economy and Place, Paul Rusted, Infrastructure Commissioner	<b>PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY Executive – 06 February 2018</b> Budget Proposals for 2018/19
<b>Roundabout Sponsorship</b>	Paul Little, Highway Asset Manager	Review of the current policy arrangements on Roundabout Sponsorship.
<b>National Infrastructure Commission Consultation</b>	David Hickman, Growth & Environment Commissioner	To brief Members on LCC's response to the consultation.
<b>Grantham Southern Relief Road (GSRR) - Land Acquisition, Orders and Contracts</b>	Alen Chanamuto, Senior Project Leader (Major Schemes)	Consideration of the decision made by the Executive on 03 January 2018.

<b>12 MARCH 2018 – 10:00am</b>		
<b>Item</b>	<b>Contributor</b>	<b>Purpose</b>
<b>Highways 2020 Update</b>	Paul Rusted, Infrastructure Commissioner	Update on progress towards replacement arrangements for Highways 2020.
<b>Effective Highways Communication</b>	Satish Shah, Network Manager	Review of the work being undertaken to enhance service users' experience with regards to the Highways and Transport services.
<b>Re-consideration of the Speed Management in Lincolnshire Scrutiny Review (20mph Limits and Zones)</b>	TBC	Consideration of the previous Speed Management in Lincolnshire Scrutiny Review (2014) Recommendation 5 (20mph Limits and Zones)
<b>Major Route Network Consultation</b>	Ian Kitchen, Transport Policy Manager	
<b>Permit Scheme Annual Report</b>	Mick Phoenix, Network Management Commissioner; Mandi Robinson Network Regulation Compliance Manager	Review of the first year of the Highway Permit Scheme which has been in place since October 2016 to aid minimise the disruption caused by works on Lincolnshire's road network.
<b>Quarter 3 Performance Report (1 October to 31 December 2017)</b>	Paul Rusted, Infrastructure Commissioner	Review of the Key Performance and Customer Satisfaction Information.

23 APRIL 2018 – 10:00am		
Item	Contributor	Purpose
<b>Winter Maintenance – End of Year Report</b>	Vincent VanDoninck, Policy and Strategic Asset Manager	Review of 2017/18 winter maintenance period.
<b>Review of Sleaford Transport Strategy</b>	Andy Gutherson, County Commissioner Economy and Place	Consideration of the progress made against the Sleaford Transport Strategy objectives and outcomes.
<b>Coastal Highway</b>	Andy Gutherson, County Commissioner Economy and Place	Review of the first phase of work and initial report on possible options.
<b>Lincolnshire Connected Electrification of Vehicles</b>	Vanessa Strange, Accessibility and Growth Manager; Ian Kitchen, Transport Policy Manager	Consideration of future requirements for electric vehicle infrastructure.

11 JUNE 2018 – 10:00am		
Item	Contributor	Purpose
<b>Highways 2020 Update</b>	Paul Rusted, Infrastructure Commissioner	Update on progress towards replacement arrangements for Highways 2020.
<b>Quarter 4 Performance Report (1 January to 31 March 2018)</b>	Paul Rusted, Infrastructure Commissioner	Review of the Key Performance and Customer Satisfaction Information.

16 JULY 2018 – 10:00am		
Item	Contributor	Purpose
<b>CCTV Pilot Scheme for Parking enforcement outside schools</b>	Matt Jones, Parking Services Manager	Review of progress on the CCTV Pilot Scheme.

10 SEPTEMBER 2018 – 10:00am		
Item	Contributor	Purpose
<b>Highways 2020 Update</b>	Paul Rusted, Infrastructure Commissioner	Update on progress towards replacement arrangements for Highways 2020.
<b>Quarter 1 Performance Report (1 April to 30 June 2018)</b>	Paul Rusted, Infrastructure Commissioner	Review of the Key Performance and Customer Satisfaction Information.

22 OCTOBER 2018 – 10:00am		
Item	Contributor	Purpose
<b>Provisional Engagement with Network Rail</b>	Network Rail	Annual engagement session with Network Rail which will include details of network performance and discussion of any key issues or concerns in Lincolnshire.

10 DECEMBER 2018 – 10:00am		
Item	Contributor	Purpose
<b>Quarter 2 Performance Report (1 July to 30 September 2018)</b>	Paul Rusted, Infrastructure Commissioner	Review of the Key Performance and Customer Satisfaction Information.

Items to be programmed

**Highways**

- New Highways Operating Model VfM Assessment
- Network Management Plan

**Transportation**

- Total Transport Update and Overview of Bus Subsidy Workings
- Lincolnshire Connected (LTP5) / Public Transport Strategy
- Changes to the Section 19 and 22 permits: not for profit passenger transport
- PSV (Public Service Vehicle) operator licences Updates

For more information about the work of the Highways and Transport Scrutiny Committee please contact Daniel Steel, Scrutiny Officer on 01522 552102 or by e-mail at [daniel.steel@lincolnshire.gov.uk](mailto:daniel.steel@lincolnshire.gov.uk)

**Forward Plan of Decisions relating to the Highways and Transport Scrutiny Committee**

DEC REF	MATTERS FOR DECISION	DATE OF DECISION	DECISION MAKER	PEOPLE/GROUPS CONSULTED PRIOR TO DECISION	DOCUMENTS TO BE SUBMITTED FOR DECISION	HOW AND WHEN TO COMMENT PRIOR TO THE DECISION BEING TAKEN	RESPONSIBLE PORTFOLIO HOLDER AND CHIEF OFFICER	KEY DECISION YES/NO	DIVISIONS AFFECTED
	N/A								