ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMME

1. Executive summary

- The County Council has recently made the decision to request commuted sums to fund their increased maintenance liabilities created by all third party funded projects within the highway, including those funded by the City Council. The potential for funding commuted sums for maintenance will now have to be considered for all EIP Projects within the highway.

- There is currently £36,907 remaining in the programme for this financial year. Appendix A of this report outlines the projects currently offered for funding from this programme and the Committee are requested to allocate this remaining funding to enable selected projects to move forward into development.

- The County Council has approved a joint highways budget with the City Council to fund minor schemes within the highway. North Area Committee has been delegated a £7000 share of the County Council’s £25,000 total contribution, subject to match funding by the City Council.

- Should the North Area Committee wish to do so, it can prioritise these minor highway schemes and provide match funding from its Environmental Improvement Programme (EIP) budget.

2. Recommendations

2.1 The West / Central Area Committee is recommended:

2.1.1 To allocate £7000 from the 2011/12 programme budget to match fund the County Council’s contribution to deliver minor highway schemes prioritised from the listed in Appendix B of this report.
2.1.2 To decide which suggested schemes to fund from the remaining 2011/12 programme budget from the list in Appendix C of this report.

3. Background

3.1 The £25,000 County contribution for the Joint Highways Budget, recently agreed by the County Council’s Cabinet, was delegated to the Cambridge Area Joint Committee (CAJC). A list of unfunded minor schemes was also presented to this Committee for consideration.

3.2 This budget requires funding contributions from the City Council and it was agreed by the CAJC that it should be further delegated to the Area Committees to select schemes, taking into account the current unfunded minor schemes listed in their area. The current list of North Area schemes can be found in Appendix B of this report.

3.3 The CAJC resolved to delegate the £25,000 budget in favour of the Area Committees with the higher number of Wards. £7000 was therefore delegated to East and North and £5500 to West / Central and South.

3.4 The Area Committees have the option to approve matched funding contributions for these schemes from their allocated City Council Environmental Improvement Capital Programme Budget, in order to secure the County Council contribution and deliver the schemes.

3.5 The County Council’s Third Party Funding Policy has existed for some time, but to date has been applied mainly to Parish Councils, not to the City Council.

3.6 In order to achieve consistency in its third party funding policy across the County, the County Council now requires the City Council to fund any additional maintenance liabilities arising from City Council projects in the highway, in the same way as other third parties.

3.7 These are to be provided in the form of commuted sums for assessed increases in annual maintenance over a twelve year period.

3.8 All new features introduced within the highway will have an associated maintenance liability. The assessment will also take into account any features that are removed, giving a balance of the maintenance liability.
4. Implications

4.1 There are currently no projects adopted as part of the 2011/12 programme that would lead to an increased maintenance liability for the County Council.

4.2 The projects delivered through the joint highways budget with the County Council will not lead to any contributions for increased maintenance liabilities, as the schemes would be jointly promoted and delivered with the County Council.

4.3 In order to accurately determine increased maintenance liabilities, a project must be developed in detail. As such commuted sums can only be quantified during the later stages of the delivery.

4.4 The Brimley Road Traffic Calming scheme is a prime example of this issue. Until consultation has taken place, the proposed highway measures are unknown, making budgeting for maintenance contributions very difficult.

5. Background papers

These background papers were used in the preparation of this report:

COUNTY COUNCIL NETWORK MANAGEMENT LEAFLET No. 6 (September 2010)
THIRD PARTY FUNDING OF HIGHWAY MEASURES

6. Appendices

APPENDIX A
West / Central Area Committee Budget Table.

APPENDIX B
Current unfunded Minor schemes list for joint funding consideration.

APPENDIX C
Current suggested list of EIP projects for adoption.
7. Inspection of papers

To inspect the background papers or if you have a query on the report please contact:

Author’s Name: Andrew Preston
Author’s Phone Number: 01223 457271
Author’s Email: andrew.preston@cambridge.gov.uk
### APPENDIX A

#### Environmental Improvements Programme 2011-2012

**Total Budget Available to 31/3/12** £226,900

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADOPTED PROJECTS</th>
<th>Complete</th>
<th>Total Spend Previous Years £</th>
<th>Forecast Spend 2011/12 £</th>
<th>TOTAL SCHEME COST £</th>
<th>Approved Budget £</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chesterton High St Hanging Baskets 2011</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to Riverside/Abbey Road conflict reduction scheme</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>101,700</td>
<td>101,700</td>
<td>101,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal Way Planting</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>6,265</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>6,765</td>
<td>8,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodhead Drive/Milton Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortlock Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>39,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downhams Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rackham Close</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>23,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water St/Water Lane Bollards</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert Close bed refurbishment</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,444</td>
<td>1,444</td>
<td>1,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazelwood planting refurbishment</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,902</td>
<td>2,902</td>
<td>2,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perse Way Landscaping</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,447</td>
<td>2,447</td>
<td>2,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franks Lane Landscaping</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= **total cost to implement adopted projects** 189,993

**Uncommitted Budget** 36,907

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHEMES UNDER DEVELOPMENT*</th>
<th>Total Spend to Date £</th>
<th>Total Estimated Cost £</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= **total estimated cost of projects in development** 0 0

**Uncommitted Budget** 36,907

*Projects agreed by Ctte to be investigated, but no budget committed. Costs shown are estimated and will depend on detailed design and site investigation. N.B. The estimated costs shown above are merely given as a rough guide until the projects can be designed and costed.

22 September 2011
### MINOR TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS  (No source of funding currently identified)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Restriction</th>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>AJC consideration of representations/progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fortescue Road</td>
<td>Extend ‘No Waiting’ Restrictions further into Fortescue Rd at its junction with Mansel Way to improve road safety.</td>
<td>Arbury</td>
<td>Request from Arbury Councillor no specific proposals agreed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northfield Avenue</td>
<td>20 mph speed limit</td>
<td>King’s Hedges</td>
<td>Request from Ward Councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benson Road area residents parking</td>
<td>Change to scheme boundary</td>
<td>Arbury</td>
<td>Request from Ward councillor No firm proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Histon Road</td>
<td>Change to existing waiting restrictions</td>
<td>Arbury</td>
<td>Request from Ward councillor-no firm proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New request: Molewood Close</td>
<td>‘No Waiting’ restrictions on blind bend outside No.32 to improve road safety.</td>
<td>Arbury</td>
<td>Request from resident. Pursuing Ward Councillor support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New request: Brimley/Montgomery Road</td>
<td>Permanent closure, no through road, issue of rat running. (Also on EIP new suggestions list)</td>
<td>Arbury</td>
<td>Request from resident/Ward Councillor. No firm proposal agreed further consultation required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New request: Northfield Avenue</td>
<td>Interactive signage</td>
<td>Kings Hedges</td>
<td>Request from school Governor/Ward Councillor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NEW SCHEME SUGGESTIONS FOR THE 2011/12 PROGRAMME

PROJECT 1 - Brimley Road Traffic Calming
promoted by Cllr Todd-Jones

Concerns have been expressed over the level of speeding traffic in Brimley Road, especially at school start and finish times. Residents assume this traffic to be avoiding the speed table installed on Alex Wood Road. There are various options to mitigate this issue, from the installation of speed cushions to the full closure of Brimley Road.

An area wide consultation is proposed, to first establish the level of concern and secondly determine which option local residents favour. Speed surveys will also be carried out to provide tangible evidence of the level of the speeding issue. The budget for this scheme has been set to allow for the potential cost of installing speed cushions.

A commuted sum for maintenance will be required for this scheme, its value will depend on the final measures proposed.

Estimated Budget - £30,000 plus a commuted sum

PROJECT 2
Kendal Way Verge Parking Prohibition
Introduction of a traffic regulation order to prohibit verge and footway parking on Kendal Way.

This is subject to approval and development with the County Council, with particular regard to Parking Policy.

Any commuted sum for additional maintenance will be low in value and included within the proposed project budget.

Estimated Budget - £3000

PROJECT 3
Milton Road Verge Parking Prohibition
Introduction of a traffic regulation order to prohibit verge and footway parking on Milton Road.

This is subject to approval and development with the County Council as part of their ring road and radial routes review.

Any commuted sum for additional maintenance will be low in value and included within the proposed project budget.

Estimated Budget - £4,500
APPENDIX C

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMME

PROJECT 6 - Buchan Street Area Planting
promoted by Cllr Price

This scheme, within areas of City Council owned Housing, proposes to provide environmental improvements through the provision of new and improved landscaping areas. The areas included and their associated estimated costs are as follows:

- Buchan Street Shops Car Park - £750
- Adjacent to No. 5-7 Lauriston Place - £975
- Side of No. 3 Lauriston Place - £655
- Rear of No.9 Lauriston Place - £1,470
- Side of No. 4 Lauriston Place - £240
- Parking Bay next to No. 4 Lauriston Place - £200
- Bed near No. 9 Sandwick Close - £555
- No. 1 – 4 Sandwick close - £655
- Side of No. 3 Caledon Way - £938
- Entrance Bed No. 6 Abercorn Place - £526
- Rear of No. 3 Moncrieff Close - £775
- No. 2 – 4 Moncrieff Close - £1,600
- No. 17 Strathcarron Court - £1,230
- Side of No. 1 Kaldor Court - £970
- Bed to rear of No. 2 & 3 Kaldor Court - £425

Estimated Total Cost - £11,964