
By: Mick Sutch, Head of Planning and Transport Strategy
To: Highways Advisory Board – 5 May 2009
Subject: Scheme Prioritisation System
Classification: Unrestricted

Summary: This report outlines the proposed method of assessing and prioritising Integrated Transport schemes for delivery in 2010/11, to be recommended for approval by the Cabinet Member for Environment, Highways and Waste. This matter will be included in the next edition of the Forward Plan.

1 Background

- 1.1 In 2006, Kent County Council adopted its second Local Transport Plan (LTP2). The LTP2 is KCC's strategy for transport for the period 2006-2011. A key part of the LTP2 is outlining how funds provided by central government will be spent by KCC in order to provide the best possible transport improvements for the people of Kent.
- 1.2 In LTP2 a new approach was used for assessing integrated transport schemes; all proposals went through the same assessment process and received points depending on how well they delivered against national, regional and local transport policies. The system was called PIPKIN, and it has been used to assess over 500 scheme proposals for construction in 2008/09 and 2009/10 totalling over £40m. The funding allocation for schemes to be constructed over these two years is £27m. This shows the need for a robust assessment system to ensure the most worthwhile schemes are delivered.
- 1.3 PIPKIN was a useful guidance tool to assist in prioritising integrated transport schemes, but at the end of the 2009/10 assessment period, the Cabinet Member asked that PIPKIN be revised to address a concern that safety schemes were not receiving a high enough weighting in PIPKIN. This opportunity presented the chance to revise the prioritisation system as a whole. An improved method of assessing schemes is now being proposed, called the Scheme Prioritisation System.
- 1.4 The Scheme Prioritisation System has been developed to achieve two things:
 - Enable KCC officers to **assess** every scheme proposed resulting in a score. This allows comparison between one scheme and another, with the highest scoring schemes being the ones that contribute the most to national, regional and local transport targets.
 - Provide a score for every scheme which can be ranked to **prioritise** the proposals. This acts as a guide for officers and Members on which schemes should be funded and constructed, and which are less worthy of a share of the limited budget.

2 Progress to Date

- 2.1 The new system has been devised following consultation with the Cabinet Member, Members of an Informal Members Group (IMG), and officers responsible for generating and assessing Integrated Transport proposals. It is based on the national, regional and local priorities set out in LTP2, and revolves around the four shared

priorities agreed by the Local Government Association and Government in 2005: Tackling congestion; improving accessibility; increasing road safety; improving air quality.

- 2.2 Seven different options were tested, as outlined in Appendix 1. These involved different weightings, scores and bonus points in order to illustrate the variations that different scores and rankings achieved. Using the schemes submitted for construction in 2009/10, 100 schemes were assessed using the seven different options.
- 2.3 Following two IMG meetings, the following option received the unanimous support of Members present:
- Increasing road safety, tackling congestion and improving accessibility should each receive a 30% weighting in the scheme assessment. Improving air quality should receive a 10% weighting.
 - Bonus points awarded to personal injury crashes should be increased by 50% in comparison to the points received in PIPKIN.
 - JTBs should be able to boost their priority schemes by nominating the top 8 schemes in their district. These will receive additional points: the number 1 priority will receive 8 points, decreasing to number 8 priority receiving 1 point.

3. Recommendations

- 3.1 Subject to the views of this Board, it is proposed to recommend to the Cabinet Member for Environment, Highways and Waste that the proposed Scheme Prioritisation System be approved for assessing and prioritising schemes to be constructed from 2010/11 onwards.

Background Documents:

Policy for Stopping Up Order (under Section 116(1)(a) of the Highways Act 1980)
Section 116 of the Highways Act 1980.

Appendices:

Appendix 1: Briefing Note for IMG on Prioritisation of Integrated Transport Schemes (18 March 2009)

Contact: Vicki Hubert – Senior Transport Planner

✉ vicki.hubert@kent.gov.uk
☎ 01622 221615

Appendix 1

IMG on Prioritisation of Integrated Transport Schemes Briefing Note for 18 March 2009

Following the meeting on 26 January, officers were asked to test modifications to the draft Scheme Prioritisation System (SPS - successor to PIPKIN) to give more weight to road safety and to the views of the Joint Transportation Boards (JTBs).

Options

The following options were tested:

- Option A: Original draft SPS proposal
- Option B: Bonus points added for JTB preferences (1-8)
- Option C: Increasing weighting for reducing casualties to 30% (reducing Air Quality to 10%)
- Option D: Increasing Bonus Points for Crash Remedial Schemes by 50%
- Option E: Additional 50% added for JTB preferences (1.5-12)
- Option F: Combination of Options B, C and D
- Option G: Combination of Options C, D and E

Tests

The options were tested on schemes put forward for the 2009/10 programme:

- The top five SPS schemes (under Option A)
- Crash Remedial Schemes (CRMs)
- Road Crossing Schemes
- Cycling Schemes

Conclusions

Option A

Compared to PIPKIN, Option A gives greater priority to strategic schemes over more local schemes (more likely to be schemes funded through Members' grant and supported by JTBs). CRMs do better in SPS than PIPKIN too. 'Safety' schemes (such as traffic calming) which do not support a reduction in the crash record fare less well, as do short lengths of cycle schemes which are not part of a wider network.

Option B

Bonus points for JTB preferences (1-8), improved rankings **up to 18 places** over Option A

Option C

Increasing the weighting for Reducing Casualties improves rankings **up to 11 places** compared to Option A

Option D

Increasing Bonus Points for Crash Remedial Schemes by 50% improves rankings **up to 15 places** over Option A

Option E

Additional 50% added for JTB preferences (1.5 -12) improves rankings **up to 26 places** over Option A

Option F

Combination of B, C and D improves rankings up to **25 places** over Option A

Option G

Combination of C, D and E improves rankings up to **31 places** over Option A

Effects on Types of Scheme (ignoring JTB preferences)

Crash Remedial Schemes

As expected, these fares far better under Options C, and D (and F and G) over draft SPS and PIPKIN.

Road Crossing Schemes

Non-CRM schemes generally fare worse with all options of SPS than PIPKIN, but would possibly be supported by Members' Grant and JTBS.

Cycle Schemes

Generally have a lower ranking in SPS compared to PIPKIN, although some community schemes (linking up cycle routes etc) fare better. Ranking generally falls further under Options C and D.