

Notice of a Meeting

Growth & Infrastructure Scrutiny Committee Monday, 17 September 2012 at 10.00 am County Hall

Membership

Chairman - Councillor David Nimmo-Smith
Deputy Chairman - Councillor Nicholas P. Turner

Councillors:

Anne Purse	Patrick Greene	G.A. Reynolds
Alan Armitage	Pete Handley	John Tanner
Michael Gibbard	Charles Mathew	

Notes:

Date of next meeting: 19 November 2012

What does this Committee review or scrutinise?

- Transport; highways; traffic and parking; road safety (those areas not covered by the Safer & Stronger Communities Scrutiny Committee); public passenger transport
- Regional planning and local development framework; economic development; waste management; environmental management; archaeology; access to the countryside; tourism
- The planning, highways, rights of way and commons/village greens functions of the Planning & Regulation Committee

How can I have my say?

We welcome the views of the community on any issues in relation to the responsibilities of this Committee. Members of the public may ask to speak on any item on the agenda or may suggest matters which they would like the Committee to look at. **Requests to speak must be submitted to the Committee Officer below no later than 9 am on the working day before the date of the meeting.**

For more information about this Committee please contact:

Chairman	-	Councillor David Nimmo-Smith E.Mail: david.nimmo-smith@oxfordshire.gov.uk
Committee Officer	-	<i>Giacomo Esposito</i> , Tel: (01865) 816382 <i>giacomo.esposito@oxfordshire.gov.uk</i>



Peter G. Clark
County Solicitor

September 2012

About the County Council

The Oxfordshire County Council is made up of 74 councillors who are democratically elected every four years. The Council provides a range of services to Oxfordshire's 630,000 residents. These include:

schools	social & health care	libraries and museums
the fire service	roads	trading standards
land use	transport planning	waste management

Each year the Council manages £0.9 billion of public money in providing these services. Most decisions are taken by a Cabinet of 9 Councillors, which makes decisions about service priorities and spending. Some decisions will now be delegated to individual members of the Cabinet.

About Scrutiny

Scrutiny is about:

- Providing a challenge to the Cabinet
- Examining how well the Cabinet and the Authority are performing
- Influencing the Cabinet on decisions that affect local people
- Helping the Cabinet to develop Council policies
- Representing the community in Council decision making
- Promoting joined up working across the authority's work and with partners

Scrutiny is NOT about:

- Making day to day service decisions
- Investigating individual complaints.

What does this Committee do?

The Committee meets up to 6 times a year or more. It develops a work programme, which lists the issues it plans to investigate. These investigations can include whole committee investigations undertaken during the meeting, or reviews by a panel of members doing research and talking to lots of people outside of the meeting. Once an investigation is completed the Committee provides its advice to the Cabinet, the full Council or other scrutiny committees. Meetings are open to the public and all reports are available to the public unless exempt or confidential, when the items would be considered in closed session

If you have any special requirements (such as a large print version of these papers or special access facilities) please contact the officer named on the front page, giving as much notice as possible before the meeting

A hearing loop is available at County Hall.

AGENDA

- 1. Apologies for Absence and Temporary Appointments**
- 2. Declarations of Interest - see guidance note on the back page**
- 3. Minutes** (Pages 1 - 6)

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 25th June (G13) and note matters arising from them.

- 4. Speaking to or petitioning the Committee**
- 5. LTP3 Review and Update** (Pages 7 - 10)

10.15

Martin Tugwell, Deputy Director (Strategy and Infrastructure Planning) will present a paper (G15) headlining the changes made to the Local Transport Plan 2011-2030 during 2011/12 and which were agreed at full council as part of the Plan's annual review in July. The paper also outlines proposed changes to the Plan's update process for 2012/13.

The committee will be invited to comment on both the changes made to the Local Transport Plan during 2011/12 and the proposed update process for 2012/13.

- 6. Area Stewardship Fund** (Pages 11 - 16)

11.15

Jim Daughton, Highways and Transport Operations Delivery Service Manager, will provide members with a delivery progress report (G16) for 2012/13 of the Council's Area Stewardship Fund. This brief will highlight the spend and the types of schemes by locality and will provide members with an update of the activity being undertaken to ensure the Fund is maximised across all localities going forward.

- 7. Railway Electrification: Implications for County Council** (Pages 17 - 18)

12.15

Martin Tugwell Deputy Director (Strategy and Infrastructure Planning) will outline the OCC implication of the electrification of the Great Western Main Line, following a brief discussion at the committee's previous meeting. (G17)

8. Close of Meeting

13.00

Declarations of Interest

The duty to declare.....

Under the Localism Act 2011 it is a criminal offence to

- (a) fail to register a disclosable pecuniary interest within 28 days of election or co-option (or re-election or re-appointment), or
- (b) provide false or misleading information on registration, or
- (c) participate in discussion or voting in a meeting on a matter in which the member or co-opted member has a disclosable pecuniary interest.

Whose Interests must be included?

The Act provides that the interests which must be notified are those of a member or co-opted member of the authority, **or**

- those of a spouse or civil partner of the member or co-opted member;
- those of a person with whom the member or co-opted member is living as husband/wife
- those of a person with whom the member or co-opted member is living as if they were civil partners.

(in each case where the member or co-opted member is aware that the other person has the interest).

What if I remember that I have a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest during the Meeting?

The Code requires that, at a meeting, where a member or co-opted member has a disclosable interest (of which they are aware) in any matter being considered, they disclose that interest to the meeting. The Council will continue to include an appropriate item on agendas for all meetings, to facilitate this.

Although not explicitly required by the legislation or by the code, it is recommended that in the interests of transparency and for the benefit of all in attendance at the meeting (including members of the public) the nature as well as the existence of the interest is disclosed.

A member or co-opted member who has disclosed a pecuniary interest at a meeting must not participate (or participate further) in any discussion of the matter; and must not participate in any vote or further vote taken; and must withdraw from the room.

Members are asked to continue to pay regard to the following provisions in the code that *“You must serve only the public interest and must never improperly confer an advantage or disadvantage on any person including yourself”* or *“You must not place yourself in situations where your honesty and integrity may be questioned.....”*.

Please seek advice from the Monitoring Officer prior to the meeting should you have any doubt about your approach.

List of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests:

Employment (includes *“any employment, office, trade, profession or vocation carried on for profit or gain”*.), **Sponsorship, Contracts, Land, Licences, Corporate Tenancies, Securities.**

For a full list of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests and further Guidance on this matter please see the Guide to the New Code of Conduct and Register of Interests at Members’ conduct guidelines. <http://intranet.oxfordshire.gov.uk/wps/wcm/connect/occ/Insite/Elected+members/> or contact Rachel Dunn on (01865) 815279 or Rachel.dunn@oxfordshire.gov.uk for a hard copy of the document.

This page is intentionally left blank

GROWTH & INFRASTRUCTURE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

MINUTES of the meeting held on Monday, 25 June 2012 commencing at 10.00 am and finishing at Time Not Specified

Present:

Voting Members: Councillor David Nimmo-Smith – in the Chair

Councillor Nicholas P. Turner (Deputy Chairman)

Councillor Anne Purse

Councillor Patrick Greene

Councillor Pete Handley

Councillor Charles Mathew

Councillor G.A. Reynolds

Councillor John Tanner

Councillor Anthony Gearing (substituting for Councillor Michael Gibbard)

Councillor Jenny Hannaby (substituting for Councillor Alan Armitage)

Officers: Giacomo Esposito, Scrutiny Officer

The Scrutiny Committee considered the matters, reports and recommendations contained or referred to in the agenda for the meeting and agreed as set out below. Copies of the agenda and reports are attached to the signed Minutes.

67/12 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS (Agenda No. 1)

Councillor Alan Armitage sent his apologies and nominated Councillor Jenny Hannaby as a substitute.

Councillor Michael Gibbard sent his apologies and nominated Councillor Anthony Gearing as a substitute.

Councillor Rodney Rose, Deputy Leader of the Council, sent his apologies.

Councillor Hilary Hibbert-Biles, Cabinet Member for Growth & Infrastructure, was unable to attend the meeting due to a recent family tragedy. The committee sent its deepest condolences to Councillor Hibbert-Biles.

68/12 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST - SEE GUIDANCE NOTE ON THE BACK PAGE (Agenda No. 2)

No declarations of interest were made.

69/12 MINUTES

(Agenda No. 3)

Some minor amendments were made to the minutes of the meeting held on 23rd April, after which they were approved and signed.

Councillor Patrick Greene reiterated his request for an update on the issue of trains running underneath railways bridges that are subject to electrification.

Martin Tugwell, Deputy Director, Growth & Infrastructure, apologised for the delay and undertook to provide an update on the matter.

The committee agreed that opportunities to travel to relevant venues be explored for future items, particularly for those concerning the county's key growth zones.

Martin Tugwell stated that he had recently met with the Chief Executive of the Earth's Trust, and that a future session for the committee with the group may be useful.

Councillor Charles Matthew expressed concerns that the county council's contract for the Ardley waste centre was creating a conflict of interest by ignoring the council's existing commitments.

Martin Tugwell undertook to provide an update on the matter.

The minutes of the meeting held on 15th May were approved and signed.

70/12 SPEAKING TO OR PETITIONING THE COMMITTEE

(Agenda No. 4)

There were no requests to speak to or petition the committee.

71/12 MASTER PLANNING IN OXFORDSHIRE

(Agenda No. 5)

Daniel Round, Cherwell Strategy & Infrastructure Manager, Environment & Economy joined the meeting.

Before commencing the item on master planning in Oxfordshire, Martin Tugwell provided the committee with an overview of relevant issues concerning the directorate.

There was a discussion about the current status of the Kidlington recycling centre.

Martin Tugwell explained that an unresolved issue around securing the land was having cost and time implications that threatened the feasibility of current proposals. He said that alternative proposals were being considered which built on the current

household waste strategy, however, he emphasised that no decision had yet been made.

Councillor Matthew expressed concerns that this issue had been visible at the planning stages of the proposal.

Martin Tugwell and Daniel Round updated the committee on the county council's approach to master planning work in Oxfordshire. Officers outlined the purpose of master planning for an area, the opportunities presented by undertaking this work, the principles underlying the council's master planning work, and the current position of the council's master planning work in Oxfordshire.

Members praised the approach outlined, saying that it offered an opportunity to look at the bigger picture when planning for an area. However, members also emphasised the importance of the implementation stage that came after any master planning work. They added that it was crucial that lessons were learnt from any work undertaken, particularly as these could then feed into a blueprint for the county's future master planning work.

Martin Tugwell responded that one key lesson learnt had been the need to reduce the length of the planning process, and that master planning for an area helps to tackle this issue by promoting joint working across key partners.

Councillor Pete Handley suggested introducing staggered time zones for the major employers in the county as a way of reducing traffic congestion when people travel into and out of work.

Daniel Round said that officers would consider this when developing transport strategies for the key growth areas as part of an overall master plan.

Members stressed the need for master planning work to consider those areas between the county's major concentrations of growth, otherwise they risked becoming over congested.

Martin Tugwell acknowledged this point, saying that it underpinned the council's job-led approach to growth and highlighted the importance of delivering the county's key infrastructure projects.

The committee stated the importance of including members at an early stage in the master planning process in order to allow their input into key decisions.

Daniel Round responded that the master planning approach enables input from all key stakeholders at the very early stages of planning. It also allows for discussions to take place on an overall direction of growth for an area before decisions are made on individual applications.

The committee agreed that an item on the council's partnership working in relation to Oxfordshire's infrastructure priorities and the levy be brought to a future meeting.

72/12 POLICY ON ROAD ADOPTION

(Agenda No. 6)

Mark Kemp, Deputy Director, Highways and Transport, and Jason Sherwood, Principal Engineer, Highways and Transport, provided the committee with an explanation of the current legal framework and some of the issues this presents the Highway Authority with in terms of road adoption.

Members expressed their frustration at the length of time it takes some developers to adopt a road.

Officers shared members' frustration, explaining that the law prevents the county council from forcing developers to offer up roads for adoption within their developments. However, officers added that there were other mechanisms available to them to help speed up the process, and that they were continuing to improve their use of these alternative methods as well as exploring other options. Officers also emphasised the important role members can play in pushing through the adoption of a road.

Councillor John Tanner left the meeting at 12:00.

The committee agreed that a paper on road adoption consisting of two parts be brought to a future meeting; the first half outlining how the county council can work to improve the situation within existing legislation, the second detailing proposed changes to the current legal system in order to inform the Cabinet so that they could lobby the LGA to consider raising the matter with central Government.

73/12 SUMMER ROAD WORKS

(Agenda No. 7)

Mark Kemp and Colin Bailey, Highways and Transport Asset Manager, Highways and Transport, outlined the programme for carriageway and footway maintenance for 2012/13 financial year, and explained the methods the county council employs when assessing these assets and developing the maintenance programme.

Members sought clarification regarding county council policy on compensation and liability for accidents on its roads. It was agreed that the matter would be further discussed as an item at a future meeting.

Councillor Handley asked for a copy of the criteria the county council uses when inspecting its highways and carriageways.

Mark Kemp undertook to provide this information to Councillor Handley.

74/12 CLOSE OF MEETING

(Agenda No. 8)

The meeting closed at 13:00.

..... in the Chair

Date of signing

This page is intentionally left blank

GROWTH AND INFRASTRUCTURE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 17 SEPTEMBER 2012

LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN 3 - REVIEW

Report by Deputy Director for Strategy and Infrastructure Planning

1. Context

- 1.1. The Local Transport Plan 3 (2011-2030) was adopted by the County Council in 2011 as a 20-year strategy for Oxfordshire's transport system. Owing to the long-term nature of the strategy it was agreed as part of the approval process that the Plan would be regularly reviewed in order to keep it up to date and relevant. Such an approach enables the Plan to take into account changes in policy (both nationally and locally). It also enables the County Council to keep the investment priorities up to date.
- 1.2. The first review of the Plan was undertaken in the first half of 2012, culminating in a report to the County Council's Cabinet on 17 April. That review consolidated amendments that had been made during the course of the preceding twelve months, including amendments driven by changes in the policy environment. The majority of changes made were procedural, clarifying the Council's position and reflecting changes that had been previously considered by the Cabinet.
- 1.3. The light touch approach to the review enabled the updating of the Plan to be completed quickly. However, it is important that substantive changes to the Plan are subjected to scrutiny.
- 1.4. This report provides the Committee with the opportunity to comment on the amendments made to date. It also affords the Committee with the opportunity to comment on the scope of subsequent reviews and in particular to identify issues that it may wish to be considered within them.

2. Annual Review 2012

- 2.1. The report agreed by the Cabinet in April, and which was adopted by Council in July, updated the Plan in three main areas:
 - a) Formalising changes previously agreed by the Cabinet Member for Transport (as per the approved approach for allowing interim changes to the Plan to be made and then confirmed as part of the annual review process). This included the work that had been undertaken to develop the strategy for Science Vale UK subsequent to the initial preparation of the Plan.

GI5

- b) Updating County Council policy in key areas, notably:
- Strengthening the strategic context provided by the Plan, including the 'Oxfordshire Growth Arc': specifically strengthening the role that the transport system has in supporting economic growth and highlighting the linkage with the Local Enterprise Partnership
 - Inclusion of additional text to reflect the Council's rail strategy
 - Updating the local area transport strategies to reflect more recent information
 - Identification of a lorry routing strategy
 - Setting out the Council's policy on road classification following devolution by central Government.
- c) Updating the Transport Capital Programme and associated monitoring framework.

3. Future Reviews

- 3.1. It is essential that the Local Transport Plan continues to set out the longer term ambitions and aspirations for the transport system in Oxfordshire. The framework set out in the Plan provides the context within which detailed 2-5 year implementation plans need to be prepared.
- 3.2. Looking ahead there are three key drivers of change the consequences of which will need to be considered as part of the next review:
- a) Ensuring that the local area transport strategies within the Plan are updated to reflect work currently underway or planned, including
- Work to review the Oxford Transport Strategy, taking into account the opportunities provided by major development opportunities
 - The emerging masterplan for Bicester
 - The emerging masterplan for Banbury
 - The emerging movement strategy for Witney
 - The emerging infrastructure delivery plan for Science Vale UK and in particular proposals required to support delivery of the Enterprise Zone.

Ensuring these strategies are up to date will be important in informing the development of core strategies for the Local Plans: it is those core strategies that then form the context within which the District/City Councils

GI5

develop their proposals for the introduction of the Community Infrastructure Levy.

b) Updating the Plan to reflect specific policy issues, including:

- The publication of the Government's High Level Output Specification for the rail network which included commitments to deliver Great Western Main Line electrification, reinstatement of East West Rail and enhanced capacity at Oxford Station
- Proposals by the Government to include greater local input into future rail franchise specifications
- Greater consideration of the role of bus services as part of the transport system.

c) Updating the Plan to take into account issues of prioritisation and funding availability, including:

- Identification of the County Council's expectations of national delivery agencies, including the Highways Agency and Network Rail
- Identification of the implications arising from the Government's proposed devolution of funding for major transport schemes, including consideration of the issues arising from the establishment of a Local Transport Board
- Taking into account the work (led by the Spatial Planning and Infrastructure Partnership) to update the Local Investment Plan, including the work on prioritisation
- Reviewing the investment priorities set out within the Plan in order to identify specific schemes for inclusion within the Schedule 123 lists of infrastructure required as part of the introduction of the Community Infrastructure Levy.

4. Next Steps

4.1. As was this case in the preceding 12 months, it is proposed that minor amendments to the Plan will be approved by the Cabinet Member for Transport under delegated powers, with major issues considered more formally as part of the annual review process

4.2. The extent and nature of the drivers for change are substantial and likely to require a more fundamental review of the Plan in the coming months. As part of the review process it is proposed that members of this scrutiny committee are actively engaged in the work. The views of the Committee are sought on the preferred approach for ensuring an appropriate level of engagement.

RECOMMENDATION

1. **The Committee is RECOMMENDED to:**
 - (a) Note this report and provide comment on the amendments made to date on the LTP3
 - (b) Comment on the scope of subsequent reviews of LTP3 and in particular to identify issues that the Committee may wish to be considered within them
 - (c) Provide a steer on the Committees preferred approach for ensuring an appropriate level of engagement in future reviews

MARTIN TUGWELL
Deputy Director for Strategy and Infrastructure Planning
September 2012

Background papers: Cabinet Papers LTP3 Review, April 2012, Council Papers LTP3 July 2012.

Contact Officer: John Disley, Planning and Transport Policy Service Manager (interim) T: (01865) 810460, john.disley@oxfordshire.gov.uk

GROWTH AND INFRASTRUCTURE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

17 September 2012

AREA STEWARDSHIP FUND

UPDATE ON DELIVERY PROGRESS FOR 2012/13

**Report by
Deputy Director for Environment & Economy (Commercial)**

Introduction

1. Area Stewardship forms a part of the strategy for the Highways and Transport (H&T) Service. It's intention is to:
 - Deliver high quality, consistent frontline engagement with local communities
 - Act as the liaison point with elected members across all 3 tiers of local government
 - Understand the needs of the community and the highway network
 - Develop programmes of work for highway improvements
 - Operate "Pride in the Patch" and "One Team" delivery
2. In order to facilitate the delivery of this strategy, an Area Stewardship Fund (ASF) was established with an initial 18 month funding period. This funding was allocated to meet the prioritised needs of the community. Additional funding has been made available to support this initiative for 2012/13, with an in year budget of £2.4m.

Allocation of Funds and Governance

3. Funding has been allocated using the 14 localities model, with higher funding allocated to the 6 priority areas. As part of this on-going process, it is anticipated that as the fund develops towns and parishes could add their own funds to help meet specific local needs. This will further enhance the opportunities the ASF could deliver.
4. Each of the 14 localities has a defined group of County Councillors and allocated Lead Members. Each group has been tasked with prioritising their funding allocation. The Highways Area Steward works with Locality Member Group, engaging the necessary technical and professional support from within the H&T service. Once projects have

GI6

been identified and developed, they are then prioritised considering such factors as cost, delivery, scheme suitability and other stakeholder considerations.

5. Whilst there are no specific limitations on how the ASF can be spent, it must be used for highway related schemes, which includes Public Rights of Way.
6. The Locality Member Group may wish to consider a number of potential areas to utilise their allocation of the ASF, including maintenance areas which have seen budgetary pressure or low cost schemes where clear public interest has been expressed. Examples of the potential use for the ASF include:
 - Carriageway repairs
 - Environmental enhancement projects
 - Drainage/Gully emptying
 - Footway repairs
 - Signing and lining
 - Minor improvement schemes
 - Grass/verge maintenance
 - Dropped crossings
 - Minor bridge repairs
 - Noxious weed control

TIMELINES

7. A fundamental objective of the delivery strategy is to ensure that the ASF is spent and delivered in a timely and appropriate fashion. At the outset, it was intended that the programme should be in place and ready for price estimating as early in the financial year as possible. This objective is aligned with our aspiration to deliver the works programme by each December to reduce the risk of non-delivery associated with adverse weather.

2012/13 CURRENT POSITION BY LOCALITY

8. Varying progress is being made towards spending the full 2012/13 ASF. Some localities have either fully committed their allocation or are well on the way to doing so. In other localities, more emphasis is required to prioritising and committing spend for this financial year. The following outlines the current position by locality:

GI6

	Locality	2012/13 Allocation £	Delivered/Committed £	Available £	Available %
West Oxfordshire	Charlbury/Chipping Norton/Woodstock	£120,390	£47,221	£73,169	61%
	Burford/Carterton	£242,000	£57,885	£155,685	73%
	Witney/Eynsham	£122,425	£40,235	£82,190	67%
South Oxfordshire	Didcot	£244,000	£200,875	£22,626	10%
	Thame	£111,285	£108,436	£2,849	3%
	Henley	£120,000	£95,153	£16,706	15%
	Wallingford	£114,507	£94,779	£19,728	17%
Cherwell	Kidlington	£124,102	£26,564	£97,538	79%
	Bicester	£247,947	£247,947	£0	0%
	Banbury	£245,046	£72,318	£172,728	70%
Vale of White Horse	Abingdon	£234,000	£153,000	£86,872	36%
	Faringdon	£116,532	£80,300	£36,232	31%
	Wantage & Grove	£125,779	£84,000	£41,779	33%
Oxford	City	£244,000	£70,424	£129,576	65%
TOTALS		£2,413m	£1,379m	£1,034m	42%

DELIVERY CAPACITY FOR UNCOMMITTED FUNDING

11. Whilst considering the risks of underspend and/or non-delivery, we need to consider delivery capacity as we move through the financial year.
12. Smaller value works attract a lower level of risk due to the nature of the work involved and the process they need to follow prior to delivery on the ground. This type of work, which includes such things as minor refurbishments, weed killing and dropped crossings, will continue to be delivered and programmed via the operational workforce where on-going programmes of work are in place.
13. With higher value schemes, a more involved process is required prior to delivery on the ground. Sufficient time is required for site walk and talks, feasibility studies, design, price estimating, Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO's) and to comply with our obligations under the Traffic Management Act (TMA). In addition, the overall highways delivery

GI6

programme needs to be able to accommodate, notwithstanding the risks associated with adverse weather.

14. The delivery of the Area Stewards Fund schemes need to be programmed alongside the rest of the Councils schemes. To accommodate the additional £1m of maintenance funding the current programme is back loaded and so late decisions on ASF schemes may mean that delivery within the financial year is not possible as resource is already allocated elsewhere.
15. At the time of writing, capacity and time exists to mitigate these risks, provided we expedite schemes for approval from the remaining ASF funds not currently committed.

ENCOURAGING LOCALITIES TO COMMIT SPEND

16. Following initial launch where the purpose of the ASF was explained and the overall process outlined, a number of key activities have been on-going to encourage commitment of outstanding funds. These include:
 - ASF and process 'Locality Meeting' and workshops
 - Individual meetings with Area Stewards and every elected member, and on-going 1-2-1's
 - Attendance and briefings at Parish Council meetings
 - Monthly reports on progress
 - Personal reminder e-mail from Councillor Rose
 - On-going discussions to help identify work or approve priced work
 - Further 1-2-1 sessions where submissions or sign offs were not forthcoming
 - Briefing packs
17. To further help facilitate the drive for fund commitment, a price book has been developed which outlines the indicative lump sum costs and timescales associated with a typical work type. This will serve as a quick reference guide for members when considering various proposals. This document is a tool to assist in assessing the cost of construction work, aimed at helping Members identify schemes that they can afford and making choices between the options they want to consider.

We have established a system so that we can be certain of the cost associated with each item delivered under the ASF. This system clearly identifies category of spend and is the basis for monitoring trends and regularly updating the price book in terms of accuracy and completeness.

GI6

18. The next round of 'Locality Meetings' (scheduled throughout September 2012) will also be used to discuss the Fund in more detail, focusing on each individual locality. Officers from E&E will attend each locality meeting to help stimulate scheme suggestions where there is sufficient underspend/non-committal.

RANGE OF PROJECTS DELIVERED/COMMITTED

19. A wide variety of schemes have been approved and committed, with a number already delivered on the ground. These include both maintenance and improvement works as well as new works in certain areas. Examples include:
- Traffic management scheme improvement
 - New and refurbished footways
 - Parking restriction extensions or minor modifications
 - Dropped kerbs to improve access in town centre for the disabled and parents with children
 - Verge improvements in urban areas
 - Surveys to consider future transport strategy improvements
 - Winter maintenance facilities
 - Contributions to bus shelters
 - Siding out of existing footways and paths
 - Maintenance of vegetation on minor routes
 - Verge protection
20. It is important to consider the impact of whole-life costing when considering potential schemes for the ASF. For electrical items, consideration will need to be given to a whole-life cost at the outset providing 30 year maintenance cover. Hard construction will be different, where on-going maintenance liability would be expected to be minimal in the years immediately following construction.

This Committee is asked to:

- i) Note the progress made during 2012/13;
- ii) Use the Locality Meetings in September to further consider potential schemes in their 'patch' where underspend exists

NAME : Mark Kemp
Deputy Director of Environment, Economy and Customer Services
Commercial

Background papers:
Contact Officer: Jim Daughton

August 2012

**GROWTH AND INFRASTRUCTURE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
17 SEPTEMBER 2012**

**GREAT WESTERN MAIN LINE RAILWAY ELECTRIFICATION:
IMPLICATIONS FOR OXFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL**

Report by Deputy Director (Commercial) Environment and Economy

Background

1. Network Rail is committed to delivering electrification of the Great Western Main Line by 2015. Erection of the overhead catenary will require changes to be made to bridge clearances along the route. The detail of the programme is being developed by Network Rail, however it is estimated that work will be required at some 28 locations along the Great Western Main Line, including the section up to Oxford.

Implications for Oxfordshire County Council

2. Whilst the majority of the bridges affected are owned by Network Rail there will be implications for the County Council – in the majority of cases as the highway authority, but in some instances as bridge owner too, (e.g. Steventon Station Railway Bridge)
3. Recent Government announcements to extend the electrification project beyond Oxford to the north will increase the number of bridges requiring works. However, the timing of the northwards electrification has yet to be confirmed.
4. Improved clearances may be achieved in a number of ways – for example lowering of the existing track, or raising the level of bridges. In some instances the works required may be no more than raised parapets on the existing bridges (in order to provide protection from the overheard wires).
5. In the majority of cases there will be implications of the bridge works on the County Council's highway network. Depending on the nature of the works required by Network Rail to the bridges these could include raising of the highway, installation of safety barriers, installation of traffic management (including potentially traffic signals) and/or other works to the highway. In addition, construction works may require temporary stopping up of the highway, with resultant diversions for traffic.
6. It is expected that Network Rail's approach will be to limit its liability to paying for works and/or replacement on a 'like-for-like' basis. However, in order to provide the clearances required for electrification the bridge works may require betterment compared with the existing situation. At this stage it is unclear as to who will be liable for the cost of any betterment.

GI7

7. In some instances the need to undertake works associated with the electrification project may provide an opportunity for the County Council to undertake highway improvement works at the same location.
8. The situation is complicated by the fact that whilst the driver for the project is Network Rail's electrification project, in many instances technical approval for bridges carrying the highway and any alterations to the highway approaches rests with the County Council as the Highway Authority. The County Council is also responsible for considering and approving temporary closures of the highway to enable any bridge works to take place.
9. Whilst the detail of the programme of bridge works is still being developed, it is clear that there will be resource and financial implications for the County Council.
10. It is currently unclear whether Network Rail will compensate the County Council for any of our staff costs involved in helping facilitate their electrification scheme or whether they will be paying any commuted sums for any additional highway maintenance liabilities that may arise as a direct result of their scheme such as the on-going maintenance of additional traffic signals or antiskid surfacing.

Next steps

11. A project team is being established within the Environment and Economy Directorate to manage the County Council's involvement in this programme. Some initial meetings have already been held with Network Rail to discuss their proposals at some individual bridge sites. A further meeting is being sought with Network Rail to better understand the programming and potential cost implications for the County Council. As the programme of work develops the project team will liaise with local members affected by the programme.

RECOMMENDATION

1. **The Committee is RECOMMENDED to:**
 - (a) Note the contents of this report

MARK KEMP
Deputy Director (Commercial) Environment and Economy
September 2012

Background papers: None

Contact Officer: Highways and Transport Asset Manager Colin Bailey, T (01865) 816040 colin.bailey@oxfordshire.gov.uk