

Thurrock - An ambitious and collaborative community which is proud of its heritage and excited by its diverse opportunities and future

Planning, Transport, Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Committee

The meeting will be held at **7.00 pm** on **26 January 2023**

Committee Room 2, Civic Offices 3, New Road, Grays, Essex, RM17 6SL.

Membership:

Councillors Alex Anderson (Chair), John Allen (Vice-Chair), Robert Gledhill, Tom Kelly, Kairen Raper and Lee Watson

Substitutes:

Councillors Adam Carter, Shane Hebb, John Kent, Martin Kerin and James Thandi

Agenda

	Page
7. Integrated Transport Block (ITB) Capital Programme 2023/24 & Highways Maintenance Allocation and Programme 2023/24	1 - 36

Queries regarding this Agenda or notification of apologies:

Please contact Kenna-Victoria Healey, Senior Democratic Services Officer by sending an email to Direct.Democracy@thurrock.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

26 January 2023		ITEM: 7
Planning, Transport and Regeneration Overview & Scrutiny Committee		
Integrated Transport Block (ITB) Capital Programme 2023/24.		
Highways Maintenance allocation and programme 2023/24.		
Wards and communities affected: All	Key Decision: No	
Report of: Mat Kiely, Transportation Services Strategic Lead Peter Wright, Highways Infrastructure Strategic Lead		
Accountable Assistant Director: Leigh Nicholson, Assistant Director for Planning, Transport and Public Protection Julie Nelder, Assistant Director for Highways, Fleet & Logistics		
Accountable Director: Mark Bradbury, Director of Place Julie Rogers, Director of Public Realm		
This report is Public		

Executive Summary

This report sets out how the Transportation Services team, within the Place Directorate, will prioritise funding from the Department for Transport (DfT) Integrated Transport Block Capital Programme (ITB) to enhance transport infrastructure and service provision within the Borough in 2023/24.

The report also sets out the Highways Maintenance Block Allocation for 2023/24 for the Highways Maintenance Service within the Public Realm Directorate is to be prioritised in alignment with Thurrock Council Highways Assets Management Strategy and Highways Maintenance Efficiency Programme.

1. Recommendations

Members are asked to note the following recommendations:

- 1.1 **Note and provide comment on the 2023/24 ITB capital programme allocations, policy and prioritisation direction for the DfT ITB Block funding under the key Policy areas of Road Safety Engineering, Safer Routes to School, Area Intervention Programme and EV Charging programme (as detailed in Appendix 1).**
- 1.2 **Note and provide comment on the 2023/24 Highways Maintenance Block Allocation Programme (as detailed in Appendix 2).**
- 1.3 **Note that delegate authority to the interim Director of Place and the Director of Public Realm, will be sought in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Transport and Public Safety to make any required changes to the ITB programme and the Maintenance programme, for 2023/24, within the overall programme budget, as well as other government funding allocations that may arise within the year to ensure delivery of the programme and to ensure spend of the grant allocations.**

2. Transportation Services - Introduction and Background

- 2.1 The DfT annual settlement provides the allocation for ITB schemes. The total ITB capital programme allocation for Thurrock in 2023/24 amounts to £979,000. This funding is allocated to the capital schemes to be implemented within the programme and staff time required to design, manage and deliver the programme.
- 2.2 The ITB programme has the ability to deliver an extensive range of transport improvements which reflect the vision and aims set out within the Council's long term Transport Strategy (2013-26). Tackling congestion, delivering accessibility, improving air quality and making Thurrock's roads safer are core elements of the Transport Strategy which support sustainable growth and regeneration in the Borough.
- 2.3 It is important that the ITB programme is closely aligned with the emerging Local Plan and the interim Transport Strategy (currently being developed) so as to make the most effective use of the funding available to deliver necessary improvements to the transport network.
- 2.4 To achieve this, it is important for the programme to have a clear policy direction. Agreed approaches already exist to inform policy, priority and budget allocation. The existing agreed policy areas are:
 - **TDP1 Road Safety Engineering** – schemes proposals are prioritised as a result of criteria consisting of category of road, vehicle movements

and safety issues. A 5-year CRASH data search is also used to determine priority and location of potential schemes.

- **TDP2 Safer Routes to Schools** – scheme proposals are prioritised as a result of set criteria consisting of accident records, site assessment score and school travel plan status.

- **TDP3 Area Intervention Programme** - scheme proposals are prioritised as a result of Police CRASH data to ensure consistency with other policies. The defined areas for AIP are not similar in geographic size. To eliminate this issue and to ensure that each area has a fair weighting, the accident analysis on PIAs / kilometre.

- **TDP4 Electric Vehicle Charging** – scheme proposals are identified to align with the OLEV strategy for transition to ultra-low emission motoring. A minimum of 20 charging points will be installed each year within key locations. EV Charging will promote sustainable travel and reduce vehicle emissions in Thurrock. The existing programme ensures the supply and installation of charging points throughout the borough along with ongoing maintenance, back office services, customer service and interface and payment services.

Additional detail on the policy approach is provided in Appendix 3.

- 2.5 The report also sets out the 2023/24 DfT Block Allocation Programme £1,383,000, which is prioritised in alignment with Thurrock Council Highways Assets Management Strategy (covered in more detail in Section 5). This is the key document which ties into the Highways Maintenance Efficiency Programme. This approach has allowed us to achieve the highest funding band 3.

3 Update and Analysis – Policy, Priority & programme

- 3.1 As agreed previously, the ITB programme is informed by an adopted policy and data led approach to intervention. The Transport Development Policies allow the data led approach to be consistently applied to the ITB programme, ensuring that priority areas receive funding to enable measures to be implemented.
- 3.2 In light of the above the funding allocations in the 2023/24 ITB programme have been discussed in detail with the Portfolio Holder and are set out as follows:

2023/24 ITB Capital Funding Allocations	
Road Safety Engineering TDP1	£212,500

Safer Routes to School TDP2	£50,000
Area Intervention Programme TDP3	£350,000
EV Charging Facilities TDP4	£150,000
Emergency Minor Works and Parking requests	£54,500
Passenger Transport	£15,000
Salary costs	£147,000
TOTAL	£979,000

- 3.3 The allocation for each project heading is identified in Appendix A and is based on policy criteria. The allocation for Safer Routes to Schools has been reduced, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder, to enable an increased funding allocation for Road Safety Engineering and AIP, where some SRTS issues can be addressed. Following the successful award of the EV Charging contract, £150,000 allocation to EV Charging identifies the Council's commitment to delivering increased on-street charging opportunities across the borough. OZEV grant funding will also be explored to enhance the EV Charging budget.
- 3.4 The provision of £54,500 within the Emergency Minor Works budget is proposed in the event that there is a severe adverse impact on the network that needs to be addressed as a priority outside of the Policy process. The allocation of £15,000 to Passenger Transport is considered necessary to support small-scale network improvements in that area. No new funding has been allocated to the Public Rights of Way section of the capital programme as underspend from the previous year and maintenance funding can be utilised in that area.
- 3.5 The Transportation Services team will continue to utilise additional funds received by the Council to deliver the A126 Safer Roads Fund programme, Capital Bid schemes and the Active Travel Fund programme within the 2023/24 financial year.

Variation

- 3.6 The Council is likely to continue to receive regular ad-hoc requests for improvements to be carried out on the transport network. Whilst there is limited flexibility within the programme once agreed, in some cases, requests will need to be implemented within the current financial year rather than held

pending a future programme. This might include works to protect the public from risk of injury or where serious deterioration on the network may have occurred.

- 3.7 The responsibility to authorise variations to the ITB and Maintenance allocations, using new funding or carry forward funds, is delegated to the Interim Director of Finance and the Director of Public Realm in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Transport and Public Safety.
- 3.8 Similarly, delegated authority can be used for additional Government funding (such as Safer Roads Funds, Flood and Coastal Resilience Innovation Programme and Active Travel) and schemes can be subject to cost changes as a result of increasing scope or unforeseen revisions to schemes.

4 Highways Maintenance Block Funding

- 4.1 The DfT annual settlement provides the funding for the Maintenance Block Allocation, depending on the HMEP banding achieved. The total funding allocation for Highways Maintenance is expected to be £1,383,000.
- 4.2 Members are advised that the allocations are not 'ring fenced' for spend in the specific areas set out within the programmes therefore, Local Authorities have some flexibility to manage these allocations. As a result, the funding allocations may be amended within the total allocation to meet local needs on the network in accordance with the maintenance strategy. Appendix C provides a summary of how the DfT Block Allocation is allocated across the Council's maintenance programme.
- 4.3 The Maintenance Programme is built around the good practice principals set out in the Code of Practice for Well Managed Highway Infrastructure. The Council's adopted approach to this is via the Highways Maintenance Strategy, which focuses on maintaining and prioritising the asset in the most efficient way. Not just focusing on the financial element, but also the end user. It is therefore generated using a data lead approach.

5 Reasons for Recommendation

- 5.1 Endorsing the recommendations set out in this report will enable the ITB Capital Programme and the Maintenance Block Allocation programme to be implemented to ensure ongoing improvements to transport infrastructure, service provision and to ensure ongoing improvements are undertaken to the borough's adopted highway network.
- 5.2 Supporting and endorsing a consistent policy approach for ITB projects provides a level of assurance and consistency for the policy approach that is taken to identify, prioritise and deliver key elements of the ITB programme in relation to Council priorities.

6 Consultation

- 6.1 The ITB Capital Programme has been developed in line with the priority areas identified and agreed in the Council's Transport Strategy, following extensive community and stakeholder engagement.
- 6.2 Local residents, interest groups and key stakeholders (including Community Forums, Bus User Group, Local Access Forum and Your Place, Your Voice and Local Plan roadshow events.) have been influential in providing regular input for the evidence base that has informed the development of the ITB Capital Programme. Community Forum engagement, Member Enquiries and Resident Enquiries also allow increased engagement and understanding of local issues. Ward Members will be advised of works affecting their respective wards. The ITB programme is to be added to the Council's web page (when completed and approved by Members) to clarify the schemes and measures to be implemented in 2023/24.
- 6.3 The Maintenance Block Allocation Programme has been developed in line with the priorities identified and set in the Council's Highway Maintenance Strategy.
- 6.4 Once approved, the nature and time frames for delivery of the maintenance schemes will be shared with residents and stakeholders accordingly, with further, more detailed communications being carried out in advance of the works starting.
- 6.5 Planning, Transport and Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Committee endorsed the report at the meeting held on 26 January 2023.

7 Impact on corporate policies, priorities, performance and community impact

- 7.1 The ITB Capital Programme and Maintenance Block Allocation Programme will help improve and enhance the transport network across the Borough making it safer, less congested and more accessible, thereby promoting and supporting People, Place and Prosperity within Thurrock.

8 Implications

8.1 Financial

Implications verified by: **Mark Terry**
Senior Financial Accountant

The Council will be allocated £979,000 ITB capital and £1,383,000 Block Allocation for Maintenance for 2023/24.

The cost of implementation will be contained within the funding announced by Government, by utilising carry forward funds or built into future capital programmes.

The recent s114 announcement has no implications on the ITB and Maintenance programmes.

8.2 Legal

Implications verified by: **John Jones**
Director of Legal and Governance

There are no direct legal implications arising from the recommendations included in the body of the report. A Cabinet decision is required to approve the recommendations. The Council is required to use the allocated funds in accordance with Council approved policies and procedures, and also any conditions and requirements set by the relevant government department as to how the funds are to be spent.

8.3 Diversity and Equality

Implications verified by: **Becky Lee**
Team Manager Community Development and Equalities

Transport interventions should support improved quality of life in the Borough and its social and economic regeneration. Transport priorities for congestion & CO2 mitigation, accessibility, safety, air quality and climate change adaptation will have positive impacts including for the health and wellbeing of local residents. Access to services and the safety of residents have been highlighted and will be addressed throughout the plan period.

The ITB and Safer Roads programme is informed through engagement with a wide range of local community stakeholders set out further in section 6.2.1. Feedback from this engagement supports Community Equality Impact Assessment.

The programme takes account of specific areas of the borough and population where implementation will be prioritised to improve road safety, air quality and access to services, taking account of legislative considerations such as the Equality Act 2010. These have been applied to the capital programme.

8.4 Other implications (where significant) – i.e. Staff, Health Inequalities, Sustainability, Crime and Disorder, and Impact on Looked After Children

- None

9 Background papers used in preparing the report (including their location on the Council's website or identification whether any are exempt or protected by copyright):

- Thurrock Transport Strategy

10 Appendices to the report

- Appendix 1 – ITB Capital Programme
- Appendix 2 –Highways Maintenance Programme
- Appendix 3 – Transport Development Policy

Report Author:

Mat Kiely, Transportation Services

Peter Wright, Highways Infrastructure

Capital Programme 2023/24 - proposal Nov 22

Lead	Oracle Status	Project	Project Description	Funding area	ITB Budget allocation	All Carry over	ITB carry over	Proposed Budget	Comments
Ford, Matthew									
Salary Capitalisation									
TDP1 - Road Safety Engineering									
Ford, Matthew	Approved	10424	RSE - London Road West Thurrock	ITB	170,000.00	262,407.00	262,407.00	432,407.00	
Ford, Matthew		NEW	RSE - A13 (Five Bells to Manorway Interchange)	ITB	20,000.00			20,000.00	
Ford, Matthew		NEW	RSE - B186 West Thurrock Way	ITB	22,500.00			22,500.00	
TDP2 - Safer Routes to School									
Ford, Matthew		NEW	SRS - 20mph speed zones around schools	ITB	50,000.00			50,000.00	
TD3 - EV charging facilities									
Ford, Matthew		NEW	PRS - EV Charging Upgrade and Expansion Bid 2	ITB	150,000.00			150,000.00	
TD4 - Area Intervention Programme									
Ford, Matthew	Approved	10431	AIP Area 11 Chadwell South & Area 14 Grays Riverside	ITB	150,000.00	240,000.00	240,000.00	390,000.00	
Ford, Matthew		NEW	AIP - Area 27 - Ockendon West	ITB	100,000.00			100,000.00	
Ford, Matthew		NEW	AIP - Area 04 - SLH West	ITB	100,000.00			100,000.00	Subject Active Travel scheme approval - if not approved, monies reallocated to Area 27
Freight Management									
Minor Works budget									
Ford, Matthew	Approved	10098	PRS - Borough wide Disabled Bays (E1843-T3429)	ITB	1,000.00	16,531.00	16,531.00	17,531.00	
Ford, Matthew	Approved	10234	PRS - Ad-Hoc Parking Requests	ITB	9,000.00	8,523.00	8,523.00	17,523.00	
Ford, Matthew	Approved	10235	TFM - Road Safety Audits - Scheme Development	ITB	10,000.00	10,000.00	10,000.00	20,000.00	
Ford, Matthew	Approved	10237	TFM - Ad-Hoc Minor Works	ITB	34,500.00	84,532.00	84,532.00	119,032.00	
Passenger Transport Unit									
Tung, Navtej		NEW	Capital Infrastructure investment - Bus Stops	ITB	15,000.00				

This page is intentionally left blank

Highways Maintenance Capital Works Programme 2023-24			
Allocations	DfT Maintenance block allocation	DfT	1,106,000
	Incentive fund Band 3 Block	DfT	277,000
	Total Maintenance		1,383,000
	TOTAL		1,383,000
Cost Code	Project	Funding Source	Budget
10022	LTP Maintenance - Bridges		
Sub Total			
10155	LTP Maintenance - Principal Maintenance (Resurfacing / Reconstruction)		
	Arterial Road, West Thurrock		
	Stanford Road, Orsett		
	Devonshire Road, Chafford Hundred		
	East Thurrock Road, Grays		
	The Manorway, Stanford-le-Hope		
Sub Total			350,000
10156	LTP Maintenance - Classified (Resurfacing / Reconstruction)		
	West Road (C Class), Ockendon		
	Daiglen Road (C Class), South Ockendon		
	London Road (C Class), Purfleet		
	High Road (B Class), Orsett		
	London Road 2 (C Class), Grays		
	Chadwell Road (C Class), Little Thurrock		
	Giffords Cross Road (C Class)		
Sub Total			250,000
10157	LTP Maintenance - Unclassified (Resurfacing / Reconstruction)		
	Abbotts Drive, Corringham		
	Victoria Road, Stanford-le-Hope		
	Gloucester Avenue, East Tilbury		
	Warren Lane, Chafford Hundred		
	Love Lane, Aveley		
	Broxburn, South Ockendon		
Sub Total			250,000
10051	LTP Maintenance - Footway & Cycleway Maintenance		
	Balfour Road, Little Thurrock		
	Araglen Avenue, South Ockendon		
	Lodge Lane, Grays		
	Bradleigh Avenue, Grays		
	Arthur Street, Grays		
Sub Total			180,000
10153	LTP Maintenance - Streetlighting		
	Boroughwide - Structural column replacement		
Sub Total			100,000
10097	LTP Maintenance - Other infrastructure (drainage)		
	Boroughwide		
Sub Total			75,000
10180	LTP Maintenance - Traffic Signals		
	PSTN removal phased programme (4G)		
Sub Total			75,000
10192	LTP Maintenance - Other Road Markings		
	Boroughwide		
Sub Total			40,000
10141	LTP Maintenance - Other Safety Barriers		
	Boroughwide		
Sub Total			63,000
	MAINTENANCE TOTAL		1,383,000

This page is intentionally left blank

Transport Development Policies for Integrated Transport Block (ITB) funding allocation

The Council does not enforce speed limits, being a moving traffic offence and enforced by the Police. Neither is it the Council's role to dictate how the travelling public should use the Adopted Highway, seeking to only guide the public to the most appropriate route and is only responsible for ensuring that the Public Highway is safe for use for the travelling public. To achieve this, it actively seeks to reduce the number of Personal Injury Accidents (PIAs) on its network as the key performance indicator.

In order to achieve this, the Highways authority has developed a number of policies to provide treatment on the network to reduce PIAs on a data led approach and prioritised in accordance with the number and severity of accidents being the main consideration.

In July 2019, the Council's Cabinet approved the introduction of two policies that sought to address 2 accident problems on the network under the headings of TD Policy No.1 - Road Safety Engineering (RSE) and TD Policy No. 2 - Safer Routes to School (SRtS). RSE was identified to treat main routes in the borough (level 1 and 2 routes in the Council's Road Network Hierarchy), with SRtS focussing on roads around all of the boroughs 52 schools. The introduction of these programmes has however, identified a significant proportion of the highway that would not be reviewed as it was either classified as a low category road or away from nearby schools. As such, a new policy is required to include these roads within an assessment and priority procedure, whereby action can be taken to redress any safety risk for the travelling public.

TD Policy No. 3 - Area Intervention Programme (AIP) Policy

This policy is designed to treat roads that fall within the Level 3 Residential Street Classification of the Road Network Hierarchy or not within the TDP1 and TDP2 policies. These roads tend to be low trafficked routes that serve a residential access and individually tend to not see a significant amount of issues in relation to congestion and safety.

However, collectively a number of residential streets in an area may see an increase in issues, particularly if main routes become congested resulting in drivers seeking alternative routes. This can have a negative effect on these routes, which often sees drivers "rat-running" in a manner that is not in keeping with the area, such as speeding. Often this causes conflict due to high levels of on-street parking causing localised congestion and safety conflicts with other road users arise as a result.

As stated, these individual low cat roads do not see high levels of accidents upon them; however, it is often that in these locations even a fairly minor incident will have significant impact on the local area. Where major routes would likely have clusters of accidents in a single location, lower category roads would see a spreading of accidents over a collection of roads that would not identify a requirement for intervention. Nevertheless, when assessing these accidents under an area investigation process, there can be correlation that could result in intervention being an appropriate and proportionate response.

It is also noted that these roads tend to be designed to not support higher levels of traffic flow and may require intervention to remove conflicts and reduce the impact of vehicle movements. This

requires assessment to include other improvements such as parking provision, access, public transport, etc. rather than solely focussing on direct accident remediation.

Priority locations

In much the same way the RSE programme identifies key routes to focus allocation of resources, this programme will seek to “package up” Level 3 roads that are in proximity to each other to define assessment areas.

The plan, in appendix 1, identifies the proposed areas (minus the RSE defined roads). A full list of roads included into each area is provided in Appendix 1 that accompanies the plan and will be reviewed annually to include any additional new roads adopted by the Highways Authority. All privately maintained highway will be excluded from the assessment. In total, there will be 28 areas within the assessment criteria

Assessment criteria

It is appropriate to utilise the Police CRASH data for the priority ranking, to ensure consistency with other policies and to ensure the data led approach is a prominent feature. However, it is identified that the defined areas are not similar in geographic size and some areas will see positive or negative bias. In order to eliminate this and to ensure that each area has a fair weighting, the accident analysis will provide assessment on PIAs / kilometre. There should still be a ranking system depending on severity of accident and it is identified that Fatalities should carry significantly more weighting than serious and slight accident classifications; i.e. fatally accidents are multiplied by a factor of 8, with serious by x4 and slights by x1.

Therefore the equation that will be applied is: $R = \left(\frac{3F + 2Se + 1Sl}{L (Km)} \right) \times 1000$

Where: R = Area accident score; F = No. of fatalities; Se = No. of Serious casualties;

Sl = No. of Slight casualties; L = Kilometres of road in area

It is also identified to utilise a 5 years data set from the Police database to determine the priority list for treatment. This will be in the form of the latest data collated by the Police and it is identified that each area will use the same date parameters during investigations process. This is crucial to the delivery of scheme in a timely manner, but at the discretion of the Assistant Director, additional accident data could be included in the priority area if determined is appropriate for the need of the investigation and development of schemes.

Review and consultation

The review of the accidents may require further study to understand the issues within each area that may be unique to that particular area. As such, an extensive investigation programme will be made that will involve community engagement processes. It is envisioned that consultation will be invaluable to ascertain a local perspective of issues, so that solutions can be worked on accordingly.

As this process can take some time to complete, it is identified that feasibility and design will take up to 12 months to complete, with implementation programmed in accordingly thereafter. Some measures can be implemented quickly, with other measures demanding longer development time to complete. As such it is identified that the whole project life for each area will take between 18 and 36 months to fully be implemented.

Road Safety Engineering Prioritisation

It is important to identify a methodology for prioritising and delivering the Road Safety Engineering element of the Council's ITB Capital Programme and to ensure a level of consistency and focus for these schemes. The Transport Development Team apply set criteria in order to prioritise and deliver these schemes on an annual basis.

The scheme proposals are prioritised as a result of set criteria consisting of category of road, vehicle movements and safety issues. A five-year CRASH database search is also used to determine priority each year and location of potential schemes.

The schemes that are to be implemented in 2019/20 are identified in Table 1.

Investigation and research will identify which of the remaining locations are identified as priorities and added to the ITB programme over the next 5 years. CRASH data may identify additional areas that need to be considered for future years. These will be assessed and prioritised for inclusion in the ITB programme as required.

TABLE 1

Year	Scheme	Budget
2019/20 schemes	A128 Brentwood Road & Bulphan	130,000
	VAS Upgrade - South Ockendon	50,000
	Lodge Lane red route and speed control	50,000
Future Road Safety Engineering proposals	A126 (A13 to Dock Road, Tilbury)	
	A128 (Bulphan to A13)	
	A1012 (A13 to A126)	
	A1013 (A1306 Grays to A13 SLH)	

A1014 The Manorway	
A1090 (Purfleet)	
A1306 (A13 to Treaceel Mine RAB)	
B149 Woodview	
B186 (A1306 West Thurrock to South Ockendon)	
B1335 (A1306 to B186)	
B1420 (A1014 to A13)	
Arisdale Avenue	
Daiglen Drive	
Corringham Road	
Brentwood Road (CSM)	
Long Lane	
Devonshire Road	
Princess Margaret road	
East Tilbury Road	
Purfleet By-Pass	

This page is intentionally left blank

Safer Routes to Schools Prioritisation

It is important to identify a methodology for prioritising and delivering Safer Routes to Schools (SRTS) schemes to inform the Council’s ITB Capital Programme and to ensure a level of consistency and focus for these schemes. The Transport Development Team apply set criteria in order to prioritise and deliver these schemes on an annual basis.

The Safer Routes to School scheme proposals are prioritised as a result of set criteria consisting of accident records (total accident factor score 300m radius), site visit assessment score and School Travel Plan status, where schools are accredited a Gold, Silver or Bronze allocation. The requirement to have an effective School Travel Plan has increased over time and the Transport Development team apply a set score to the School Travel Plan element (Gold =4, Silver =3 or Bronze =2).

Each school is awarded a score as a result of these criteria in order to identify which schools will be treated. This assessment criteria is used by the Road Safety Active Travel Co-ordinator within the Road Safety Team, to focus and manage the treatment and delivery of SRTS schemes for the next 5 years.

At present out of 51 school we have 10 schools with travel plans. These schools will therefore gain extra priority in the SRTS programme. Remaining schools will be assessed based on the remaining criteria and will be encouraged to develop a School Travel Plan.

In total, 10 schools have been assessed for implementation in 2019/20, although additional schools can be included if funding allows. The existing priority list for SRTS schemes is identified in Table 1 below.

TABLE 1

Ref. No.	Type of School	School	Unitary Wards	Speed (mph)	Travel Plan Status (Gx4, Sx3 & Bx2)	Accident Severity Fatal (x 3 = Accident Factor)	Accident Severity Serious (x 2 = Accident Factor)	Accident Severity Slight (x 1 = Accident Factor)	Accident Factor Score (300m Radius)	Site Visit Score	Total Score	Scheme Delivery Year (Yr1, Yr2, Yr3, Yr4, Yr5)
19	Primary	Kenningtons Primary Academy	Aveley And Uplands	30	Silver 3	0	2	3	7	7.64	43.91	1

APPENDIX 2

11	Primary	Dilkes Academy	Belhus	30	Bronze	2	1	0	7	10	7.64	35.27	1
32	Primary	Thameside Primary School	Grays Thurrock	30	Bronze	2	0	2	3	7	8.91	31.82	1
2	Primary	Arthur Bugler Primary School	Stanford East And Corringham	30	Gold	4	0	0	0	0	7.64	30.55	1
46	Secondary	The Hathaway Academy	Grays Thurrock	30			-	3	16	22	7.27	29.27	1
8	Primary	Chadwell St Mary Primary School	Chadwell St Mary	30			0	3	10	16	7.09	23.09	1
47	Secondary	The Ockendon Academy	Ockendon	30	Bronze	2	0	2	0	4	7.27	22.55	1
10	Primary	Deneholm Primary School	Little Thurrock Blackshots	30			0	2	10	14	7.64	21.64	1
15	Primary	Harris Primary Academy Mayflower	South Chafford	20	Bronze	2	0	1	2	4	5.09	18.18	1
25	Primary	Shaw Primary Academy	Belhus	30			0	2	7	11	7.09	18.09	1
26	Primary	Somers Heath	Belhus	30			0	1	9	11	6.73	17.73	2

APPENDIX 2

18	Primary	Horndon on the Hill Church of England Primary	Orsett	30	Bronze	2	0	0	0	2	2	6.55	17.09	2
35	Primary	Tudor Court Primary School	Chafford And North Stifford	30			0	0	1	7	9	7.45	16.45	2
17	Primary	Holy Cross Catholic Primary School	Belhus	20			0	0	1	8	10	5.64	15.64	2
37	Primary	West Thurrock Academy	West Thurrock And South Stifford	30			0	0	2	4	8	6.73	14.73	2
31	Primary	Stifford Clays Primary School	Stifford Clays	20			0	0	1	3	5	9.64	14.64	2
21	Primary	Little Thurrock Primary School	Little Thurrock Rectory	30			0	0	0	7	7	7.09	14.09	2
30	Primary	Stanford Le Hope Primary School	Stanford Le Hope West	30			0	0	0	7	7	6.73	13.73	2
36	Primary	Warren Primary School	South Chafford	20			0	0	0	7	7	6.73	13.73	2

APPENDIX 2

24	Primary	Quarry Hill Academy	Grays Thurrock	20			0	1	4	6	7.45	13.45	2
9	Primary	Corringham Primary School	Corringham And Fobbing	30	Bronze	2	0	0	0	0	6.73	13.45	3
6	Primary	Bonnygate Primary School	Ockendon	30			0	1	4	6	7.27	13.27	3
27	Primary	St Josephs Catholic Primary	Stanford East And Corringham	20			0	2	3	7	6.18	13.18	3
43	Secondary	Orminston Park Academy	Aveley And Uplands	30			0	2	1	5	7.64	12.64	3
49	Special Schools	Beacon Hill Academy	Ockendon	30			0	2	3	7	5.64	12.64	3
5	Primary	Benyon Primary School	Ockendon	30			0	0	5	5	6.91	11.91	3
4	Primary	Belmont Castle Academy	Grays Riverside	30			0	1	2	4	7.82	11.82	3
29	Primary	St Thomas of Canterbury Catholic Primary School	Grays Thurrock	20			0	0	4	4	7.64	11.64	3
34	Primary	Tilbury Pioneer Primary School	Tilbury St Chads	30			0	0	4	4	7.64	11.64	3

APPENDIX 2

40	Secondary	Grays Convent High School	Grays Thurrock	20/30			0	0	4	4	7.45	11.45	3
42	Secondary	Hassenbrook Academy	Stanford Le Hope West	30			0	1	2	4	6.91	10.91	4
39	Secondary	Gable Hall School	Corringham And Fobbing	20			0	0	4	4	6.00	10.00	4
41	Secondary	Harris Academy Chafford Hundred	South Chafford	20			0	1	2	4	5.45	9.45	4
51	Primary	Harris Primary Academy Chafford Hundred	South Chafford	20			0	1	2	4	5.45	9.45	4
13	Primary	Giffards Primary School	Stanford East And Corringham	30			0	0	2	2	7.27	9.27	4
44	Secondary	St Cleres School	Stanford Le Hope West	30			0	0	3	3	6.18	9.18	4
12	Primary	East Tilbury Primary School	Tilbury	30			0	0	3	3	6.18	9.18	4
48	Secondary	William Edwards School	Stifford Clays	30			0	0	1	1	7.27	8.27	4
1	Primary	Abbots Hall Primary School	Stanford East And	20			0	1	0	2	6.18	8.18	4

APPENDIX 2

28	Primary	St Marys Catholic Primary	Tilbury Riverside And Thurrock Park	30			0	3	7	13	5.27	18.27	2018
20	Primary	Lansdowne Primary Academy	Tilbury Riverside And Thurrock Park	30	Bronze	2	0	3	4	10	6.91	33.82	2018
3	Primary	Aveley Primary School	Aveley And Uplands	20			0	1	2	4	6.55	10.55	2018
23	Primary	Purfleet Primary Academy	West Thurrock And South Stifford	30			0	3	3	9	6.55	15.55	2018
38	Primary	Woodside Academy	Little Thurrock Blackshots	30	Gold	4	0	0	1	1	7.64	34.55	2018

To summarise; safer routes to school scheme proposals are prioritized based on combination of accident records (total accident factor score) and site visit assessment score. To encourage school involvement, School Travel Plan status (Gold, Silver or Bronze) will play a major role when determining to include the school in priority list or not.

This page is intentionally left blank

8 December 2020		ITEM: 6
Planning, Transport, Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Committee		
Electric Vehicle Charging		
Wards and communities affected: All	Key Decision: N/A	
Report of: Matthew Ford, Transport Development Manager		
Accountable Assistant Director: Leigh Nicholson, Assistant Director of Planning, Transportation and Public Protection		
Accountable Director: Andy Millard, Director of Place		
This report is Public		

Executive Summary

Thurrock has one of the most significant growth-led regeneration agendas in the country. It is vital to ensure future growth is supported by the right transport infrastructure, providing sustainable travel options for our communities and businesses whilst addressing climate change, reducing congestion and improving air quality.

This report sets out the proposals for the provision of Electric Vehicle (EV) charging facilities, both off-street and on-street provision within Council owned assets and on the adopted highway.

The report identifies the budget requirement and the procurement options for the Council and sets out a recommended approach to secure the installation and expansion of EV charging infrastructure up to 2035.

1. Recommendations:

1.1 The Committee is asked to note and comment on the recommendations that will be considered by Cabinet and to:

- 1) Support the procurement of a single contract over a maximum period 15 years. The initial contract period will be 10 years with an option to extend for one further period of 5 years (10+5);**
- 2) Support the creation of a policy to inform the roll out of the charging infrastructure, based upon a demand led approach for on-street and off-street parking provision and the upgrade/expansion of existing Council assets and in town centre locations and transport hubs;**

- 3) **Note the budget and contract value for the full 15 year period to the value of up to £9m based on the following income areas:**
- a. **Allocation of budget on the DfT Integrated Transport Block funding of minimum £75,000 per annum (total allocation over 15 year project life is estimated at being a minimum of £1.125m);**
 - b. **Contributions secured pursuant to Section 106 of the T&CPA1990 (based on Local Plan projections for infrastructure improvements), and;**
 - c. **Office for Low Emission Vehicle (OLEV) grant funding of up to 75% of the capital costs for installation of EV facilities.**
- 4) **Note the approach to delegated authority for awarding contract(s) to the Director of Place in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Highways and Transport.**

2. Introduction and Background

- 2.1 At present there are only 3 EV charging points (which are located in Grays and South Ockendon) and the Council does not have an established provider of charging points. The existing facilities are in excess of 8 years old and currently provide facilities via a combination of 3Kw 3-pin “household” and a 7Kw 7-pin “Mennekes” socket systems.
- 2.2 EV technology has moved on over the last 10 years and is projected to continue into the future. This growth has resulted in the existing charging infrastructure becoming obsolete, with a requirement to provide alternative socket provision and increase Kw power outputs.
- 2.3 It is vitally important that new housing and commercial growth in the borough is supported by the right forms of transport infrastructure and residents and business are provided the opportunities to use cleaner and more sustainable modes of transport. EV’s will play a key role in the Council’s ambitions to tackle climate change and it is necessary to expand and improve the charging infrastructure within the borough to promote the use of EVs on the network as a cleaner and sustainable mode of transport.
- 2.4 In order for Local Authorities to provide the necessary infrastructure to meet the Government’s aspirations on reducing CO2 emissions and banning Internal Combustion Engines by 2035, the Office for Low Emission Vehicles (OLEV) have provided a funding source to provide up to 75% of the costs for Local Authorities on a match-funding basis. This funding is limited on a first come, first served basis and it is unknown whether the funding will continue past its current allocation.
- 2.5 The Council receives a settlement each year from the DfT in the form of an Integrated Transport Block allocation (ITB). The ITB programme seeks to deliver an extensive range of transport improvements which reflect the vision

and aims set out within the Council's long term Transport Strategy (2013-26). Tackling congestion, delivering accessibility, improving air quality and making Thurrock's roads safer are core elements of the Transport Strategy which support sustainable growth and regeneration in the Borough.

- 2.6 The total Integrated Transport Block capital programme allocation for Thurrock for 2019/20 amounted to £971,000. It is proposed to redirect a minimum of £75,000 per annum from the ITB going forward towards the roll out of EV charging points. The ITB allocation must be supported by the OLEV grant to enable the proposed level of EV charging to be implemented. The ITB allocation alone will not deliver the required infrastructure and the 75% OLEV allocation must be secured to allow the proposed EV charging improvements to be implemented. The Council can also seek contributions from developers for electric vehicle infrastructure to supplement the ITB budget and aim to secure further match funding opportunities or direct infrastructure funding for facilities in these new development areas so that the costs can be reduced.
- 2.7 With the opportunity to use government funding to subsidise the installation of EV charging facilities it is important that the council establishes a contractual arrangement / partnership to ensure the expansion of charging points in the Borough and to ensure easy access for users.
- 2.8 Subject to government funding being secured, the current budget is estimated to be split as follows:

Contract Period	Projected Budget Allocation per annum	Potential OLEV Funding	Fixed Council funding (ITB)	Estimated Contributions from Developments per annum (£106)	Maximum contract value over period
Fiscal years 1 – 5 (2021-2026)	£300,000	£225,000 75%	£75,000 25%	£0 0%	£1.5m
Fiscal years 6 to 10 (2026 - 2031)	£525,000	£975,000 75%	£75,000 11%	£100,000 14%	£2.65m
Fiscal years 11 -15 (2031–2035)	£575,000	£0 0%	£75,000 12.5%	£500,000 12.5%	£2.875m

Table 1.0 – Estimated funding provision per annum

- 2.9 The contract value is estimated to be circa. £7m in accordance with the above table. However, an upper threshold of £9m would be required, should additional funding sources be provided over the life of the project so to safeguard the integrity of the contract.
- 2.10 The EV Charging Point Contract should be seen within the emerging Thurrock Transport Strategy to promote sustainable travel and reduce vehicle emissions within Thurrock. It will also allow the borough to align with the OLEV strategy for 'unprecedented long-term commitment for the transition to ultra-low emission motoring in the UK.'

3. Issues, Options and Analysis of Options

New partnership / contract outcomes and deliverables

3.1 The contract would need to include the following elements:

- Supply and installation of charging points for on street and off street parking areas throughout the borough;
- Ongoing maintenance;
- All back office services;
- Customer service;
- User interface and payment services

3.2 A suite of Key Performance Indicators and data requirements would need to be developed to accurately measure both the performance of the contractor(s) and the overall success of the programme. Measures would need to be flexible as priorities change over the term of the contract. These KPIs should include, but not be limited to the following:

- Urgent repairs - x% of urgent installations completed within the required timescale;
- Non urgent repairs - x% of non-urgent installations completed within the required timescale;
- Complaints – Number of complaints;
- Contractual meetings - x% of contractual meetings attended;
- Social value - x% Social Value targets delivered;
- Installations per year

Service Model

3.3 A range of different options were considered for both the model and procurement route, including maintaining separate service output, single provider, or part supplier and part in-house operation.

3.4 It is considered that a Sole Provider option will likely be the best option to deliver the scheme over the course of a 15-year programme, which includes the supply, installation and maintenance of EV charging points across the whole of the borough (with the aim of delivering a minimum of 20 installations per year). However, through the tender process, if splitting the contract to supply and installation and then a separate contract for the management of the contract proves to be more cost effective, this will be explored.

3.5 The proposed service arrangement will bring forward a project that is to provide net zero cost to the Authority where the end user will be charged for using the facility. This is consistent with the existing commercial EV charging operations across the UK.

The 'Sole Provider' options has the following advantages:

- Minimal ongoing maintenance costs (dependant on tender outcome);
- Continuity of service;
- Only one organisation to manage;
- Data returns from one source;
- One procurement process;
- Single point of contact, supporting appropriate service allocation, data sharing and monitoring;
- Relatively scalable to meet future budget changes;
- Flexibility with regards to future planning

3.6 It has been considered whether any element of the service could be brought in- house, however it would take a significant amount of time to undertake the insourcing exercise, carry out the additional procurement activity and set up an IT system to manage the back office systems. A large Private Sector provider would be more likely to be able to meet the Council's requirement to flex resources over the term of the contract as priorities and funding changes. In light of the above, it is considered that the desired outcome (expansion of EV charging infrastructure) would be less achievable through the 'in house' route.

3.7 It is therefore recommended to run the contract through an open market tender exercise to ensure the best chance of cost effectiveness and innovation.

Procurement Route

3.8 It is proposed to tender for a single contract over a maximum period 15 years. The initial contract period will be 10 years with an option to extend for one further period of 5 years (10+5). The contract value for the full 15 year period will be of the order of £9,000,000.

3.9 There are a number of benefits of a longer term contract as compared to a shorter term contract, which can be seen as follows:

- Potential for lower annual cost as start-up costs can be recovered over a longer period;
- As both parties are in contract for an extended period of time, there is more room to build trust, allowing for stronger working partnerships;
- The longer the contract period, the better the supplier understands the Council's business and business processes. This will allow greater integration of business, IT and financial processes alongside increased effective stakeholder involvement from both parties;
- Long-term relationships provide the opportunity for both parties to engage in a process of continual improvement of both products and services provided.

3.10 The final contract would need to include adequate break clauses and the Council's legal and procurement teams would oversee any such clauses to

ensure suitability. A suite of robust key performance indicators and data requirements will also be developed to accurately measure both the performance of the contractor and the overall success of the programme. Measures would need to be flexible as priorities change over the term of the contract.

- 3.11 Due to the value of the service provision, the Council is required to procure these contracts in accordance with the Public Contracts Regulations 2015 and also to comply with the Council's Contract Procurement Rules. Officers have considered a number of options for re-procurement via either an Open Procurement Process advertised through 'Find a Tender' (which from 1st January 2021 replaces the Official Journal of the European Union), or by accessing purchasing consortium frameworks.
- 3.12 Whilst there are many benefits to using framework agreements, it is considered that in this case an Open Procurement Process is the most appropriate way forward. Principle reasons for an Open Process would be that the Council wishes to attract a larger number of bidders that would not necessarily be included on any framework agreement and that as framework agreements can last for up to four years, they may not include suppliers who have come to the market more recently. Whether the procurement route is a framework agreement or an Open Process, key criteria of price, quality and social value would be included as part of any final contract award decision.
- 3.13 Timetable for Procurement and Award

Action	Date
Issue Tender	8 th January 2021
End of Clarification Period	29 th January 2021
Tender Return	12 th February 2021
Evaluation Period Ends	12 th March 2021
Standstill Period Concludes	26 th March 2021
Award of Contract	29 th March 2021
Contract Commencement	29 th April 2021

4. Reasons for Recommendation

- 4.1 This report is submitted to PTR O&S for consideration and endorsement to proceed with a new budget allocation within the Integrated Transport Budget to provide EV charging facilities across the borough. The total estimated value

of budget allocation within the DfT grant funding of up to £75,000 per annum for a 15 year period.

- 4.2 The report also seeks endorsement to undertake a new tender process to secure a strategic partnership agreement for the roll out of facilities with a contract value of up to £9m over the 15 year period of the contract. The tender processes will seek to provide a model for delivery whereby the Council can seek a partnership model for joint investment and provide a model of limited costs to the Authority in relation to maintenance and running costs.
- 4.3 A new policy would be required to base the rollout on a demand led approach whereby facilities will only be provided from established data led approach and evidence of user demand, with an emphasis of providing facilities for all major town centres within Thurrock and in those areas where on plot and/or off-street parking provision is limited.
- 4.4 Delegated authority to award the contract would enable the award to take place with sufficient lead in time to begin upgrades of existing facilities and work on a new supplier/partnership with a dedicated budget provision and ability to then secure match funding from government initiatives.

5. Impact on corporate policies, priorities, performance and community impact

- 5.1 The contract aims to meet corporate priorities through the delivery of high-quality services in all elements. The following three examples show how priorities will be delivered through the contract:

Priority	Delivered By
Improve existing EV charging infrastructure throughout the borough.	Clearly this is the fundamental scope of the Service. The service aims to increase the accessibility and capacity of EV charging points for residents.
Support climate change and encourage and promote sustainable travel.	The popularity of sustainable modes of travel is growing and with this the infrastructure to support this also needs to grow.
To meet government aspirations.	The government are aspiring to cease the sale of single fuel vehicles from 2035, therefore the demand for charging points will likely increase substantially.

6. Implications

6.1 Financial

Implications verified by: **Mark Terry**
Senior Financial Accountant

The budget requirement from the Council is identified as being £75,000 per annum and is to be provide from the Integrated Transport Block funding from the Department for Transport and will be included in the Parking Management area of the programme.

Additional funds will be secured via the bid process with OLEV on a case by case basis and is currently set at up to 75% of the costs per installation. This funding is currently available with no end date other than once the funds have been allocated to Authorities and committed. Once this funding source has ended, this will not prejudice the project delivery but will reduce the level of scheme per annum. Provision of electricity will be net zero cost to the Authority as the end user will be charged for using the facility

Further funding has been identified via the contributions route of Section 106 of the T&CPA1991. This will be secured through the planning process and allocated to projects in specific areas and ring fenced accordingly.

6.2 Legal

Implications verified by: **Courage Emovon**
Principal Lawyer / Manager – Contracts Team

This report is seeking approval from PTR Overview and Scrutiny Committee for agreement to undertake a tender process for EV charging points within the Borough as noted in the report.

The proposed procurement routes for the Contract must comply with the Council's Contract Procedure Rules and the Public Contract Regulations 2015. The open tender process mentioned in this report is provided for under Regulation 27 of the Public Contract Regulation and referred to as the Open Procedure.

Legal Services should be fully involved at every stage of the proposed tender exercise and will be on hand and available to assist and advice on any legal issues that may arise.

6.3 Diversity and Equality

Implications verified by: **Roxanne Scanlon**
**Community Engagement and Project
Monitoring Officer**

The contract would deliver EV charging infrastructure across the whole borough providing our communities with improved opportunities to more sustainable modes of travel. A Community and Equality Impact Assessment will be carried out to identify specific actions to include in the specification so to ensure the needs of target areas and groups of people with protected characteristics are met, as well as ensuring ease of access to services. Bidders' achievement of similar outcomes for a range of target groups and areas will be tested as part of the tender process.

7. **Other implications** (where significant) – i.e. Staff, Health, Sustainability, Crime and Disorder)
 - None
8. **Background papers used in preparing the report** (including their location on the Council's website or identification whether any are exempt or protected by copyright):
 - None
9. **Appendices to the report**
 - None

Report Authors:

Matthew Ford
Transport Development Manager

This page is intentionally left blank