

**HERTFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL**

**CABINET  
MONDAY 15 MARCH 2004 AT 2.00PM**

Agenda Item  
No.

**3**

**APPROVAL OF THE ANNUAL INTEGRATED HIGHWAY WORKS  
PROGRAMME 2004/05**

Report of the Director of Environment

Author: Mike Younghusband

Tel: 01707 356551

Executive Member:- Derrick Ashley

**1. Purpose of report**

To seek endorsement of Hertfordshire's Integrated Highway Works Programme for 2004-05

**2. Summary**

At its meeting on 17 February and 9 March 2004, the Transport Panel considered the schemes being proposed for inclusion in the Integrated Highway Works Programme for 2004/05.

The Transport Panel recommends that the schemes listed at Appendix A and E of this report, having been amended as appropriate to reflect the additional £2.58m of investment endorsed by Full County Council, should be progressed during period 2004/05.

**3. Conclusion**

That Cabinet consider approving Hertfordshire's Integrated Highway Works Programme for 2004-05.

**1. Background**

The annual IWP process has been introduced to give:

- A formal mechanism for giving the required notice of significant key decisions, which the County Council is obliged to publish as part of cabinet style Government;
- Enhanced opportunity to pre-programme multiple activities on a particular section of road, or geographical locality, in order to minimise disruption to the travelling public and affected communities, whilst at the same time

maximising the effectiveness of resources in achieving the various policy, or service objectives;

- A ready means of monitoring and demonstrating the effectiveness of the way in which the County Council is using its financial resources in order to meet its strategic objectives. This is particularly relevant with the advent of the “single capital pot”
- A formal mechanism through which the County Council can declare, in its answers to land search enquiries, details of any planned proposals for minor road improvements in proximity to a property under purchase.

The IWP seeks to develop a continuous rolling programme of scheme development and construction, in which financial, design and construction resources are smoothed out and balanced together with road space availability. To this end the IWP is a 15 month programme, starting in April '04 and running on to June '05. This is reflected in the number and mix of schemes listed on the IWP. It is intended that a proportion of these schemes should be delivered in April – June '05 and funded from the 05/06 budget. These schemes are included in the 04/05 programme so that they can be investigated, designed and ready to implement at the very start of 05/06 to ensure a continuous programme and avoid a lull in operations at the start of the financial year.

## **2. IWP Preparation**

The prioritisation systems for the programmes are set out in the introduction to the IWP and are derived from the LTP, the various operational manuals and summarised in the Asset Management Plan.

The process of formulating the IWP is iterative, with refinements being made between the first and final draft arising from consultation feedback, technical data and budgetary information.

Consultation of the Local Joint Member Panels (LJMPs) was made on the 1<sup>st</sup> draft of the IWP in Autumn 2003. The aim of the first consultation was to enable the LJMP's to comment on priorities within programmes and make their own scheme recommendations for consideration. Officers considered the responses to the 1<sup>st</sup> draft in formulating the 2<sup>nd</sup> draft, which was subject to LJMP consultation in January 2004.

Transport Panel considered the 2<sup>nd</sup> draft and local panel feedback on 17 February. They decided that the Cabinet should be recommended to agree the Integrated Highways Works Programme for 2004 / 05 (as it stands so far) taking into account suggested amendments identified through the local Joint Member Panel consultation process and the suggested allocation of spend.

These recommendations have been incorporated into the Cabinet version of the IWP, which is attached as Appendix A. A commentary on the LJMP feedback and officer recommended actions are included in Appendix B.

### **3. Additional Investment**

Full Council endorsed a further investment of £2.58m in highway related schemes. At the time of preparing this report recommendations are being formulated for the 9 March Transport Panel to consider. Their recommendations will be forwarded as Appendix E to Cabinet as soon as possible after the Panel meeting.

### **4. Funding**

The scale and content of each programme within the IWP has been determined from the LTP funding allocations plus an assessment of other funding likely to be made available by the county council, partners such as the District Councils and other sources such as S106's. Officers will continue to work with partners to seek additional funding opportunities throughout the year.

The likely County Council held budgets, from which funding will be drawn to help deliver the Cabinet Draft IWP is included as Appendix C.

The allocation of HCC managed funding across the programmes is indicated on a District basis in Appendix D.

## **Appendix B**

### **Local Joint Member Panel Feedback on the IWP**

#### **1 Broxbourne**

##### **1.1 The Panel considered Draft 1 and made the following comments:**

###### 1.1.1 Roads to be considered for inclusion in IWP:

Kennedy Avenue  
Howfield Green and the estate roads  
Moorhurst Avenue

###### 1.2.1 Waltham Cross Town Centre – Full JMP support

Officers also suggested a number of alterations to the draft programme.

##### **1.2 Draft 1 Outcomes and officer comments**

As a result of the review of the feedback, the following changes were made:

1.2.1 Kennedy Avenue, Theobalds Lane and Crossbrook Street were added to the carriageway programme.

1.2.2 A package of works on the Four Swannes area was added to the footway programme

1.2.3 Waltham Cross town centre continues to be in the programme

##### **1.3 The Panel considered draft 2 and the above information and made the following comments:**

1.3.1 The Panel made no comments as such on the works but the Members would like to see the Electoral Divisions noted so that they can more easily determine what is happening in their areas.

##### **1.4 Draft 2 officer comments/recommendations**

1.4.1 Officers were conscious of not wanting to present *too* much information in the IWP reports, however, information on electoral divisions could be included in future versions of the IWP if this would be useful.

#### **2 Dacorum**

##### **2.1 The Panel considered Draft 1 and made the following comments:**

2.1.1 The repair of Tring High Street should be a priority based on its deteriorating condition, its key Town Centre position, the regularity of complaints and the cost (and ineffectiveness) of frequent localised repairs.

- 2.1.2 Boundary Way, Hemel Hempstead. Originally constructed as a cul-de-sac serving three or four premises, this has now been extended and now takes major volumes of lorry traffic from the M1 to the Industrial Area. The heavy nature of this traffic makes temporary repairs ineffective and I doubt that the construction depth is adequate for the weight of traffic now being experienced.
- 2.1.3 Bridgewater Road, Berkhamsted A surface problem rather than one affecting the structural integrity of the road, however it does generate a constant stream of temporary repairs and accident claims.

Officers also suggested a number of alterations to the draft programme.

## **2.2 Draft 1 Outcomes and officer comments**

As a result of the review of the feedback, the following changes were made:

- 2.2.1 Tring High Street and Bridgewater Road were added to the carriageway programme.
- 2.2.2 Great Park and Beechfield were added to the footway programme

## **2.3 The Panel considered draft 2 and the above information and made the following comments:**

- 2.3.1 In respect of Tring High Street it was noted that the funding was for limited works to the worst sections. It was felt that attempting to deal with small sections at a time would cause considerable disruption to traders and the public and a disproportionate amount of the budget would go on traffic management and diversions. Members requested that more money be made available or, if that was not possible, that the works be programmed for the end of the IWP period and hopefully use 2005/06 money to increase the amount of work carried out at one time.

## **2.4 Draft 2 officer comments/recommendations**

- 2.4.1 The proposed allocation for Tring High Street is designed to tackle the worst areas in a systematic, planned way, rather than dealing with the defects as they arise on a temporary and ad hoc basis. The complete replacement of this block-paved road would be extremely expensive and the current level of faults does not justify the cost, despite the difficulty of maintaining the road as it stands. Furthermore, if a wholesale replacement of this road were considered, it would best be done through the Tring transport programme so that the layout of the road and its features could be reassessed to ensure it complied with current guidance and catered for all user groups. Such a review is not currently planned – although it is not ruled out – and it would most likely take several years to bring to fruition. The proposed scheme is designed to tackle some of the worst problems in the short to medium term to reduce the amount of reactive maintenance carried out on the road. It should be noted that there is no commitment at this stage to

providing further funds for similar work in future years. It is not recommended that any alterations to the proposed allocation for 04/05 be made at this stage.

### **3 East Herts**

#### **3.1 The Panel considered Draft 1 and made the following comments:**

- 3.1.1 Thorley Green Wedge, members questioned the overriding benefits to be derived from this scheme and requested its review
- 3.1.2 Fairgreen, Sawbridgeworth pedestrian safety, members requested works to be brought forward to 04/05
- 3.1.3 Rye Street, Bishop's Stortford traffic calming, members request a definite programme to be established without delay
- 3.1.4 Buntingford repairs to footpaths and carriageway surfacing, members requested their inclusion within the 04/05 IWP
- 3.1.5 Apton Road, Bishop's Stortford was requested to be progressed without delay
- 3.1.6 Southmill Road, Bishops Stortford, members requested the scope of the scheme be reviewed with further consultation
- 3.1.7 Walkern Road, Watton at Stone, drainage measures, members requested its inclusion in the IWP but District Manager advised cat 2 general maintenance would resolve the current problem.

Officers also suggested a number of alterations to the draft programme.

#### **3.2 Draft 1 Outcomes and officer comments**

As a result of the review of the feedback, the following changes were made:

- 3.2.1 Thorley Green Wedge: in response the comments and feedback there have been changes to this scheme and further options are under consideration. No works on the ground are envisaged in 2004/05.
- 3.2.2 Fairgreen, Sawbridgeworth pedestrian safety: the scheme is still under consideration, more investigation work is required.
- 3.2.3 Rye Street, Bishop's Stortford traffic calming: still some issues around parking and utility company apparatus to be resolved, no firm date as yet but definitely looking to implement this scheme during 04/05
- 3.2.4 Buntingford High Street – carriageway resurfacing added to the programme.
- 3.2.5 Apton Road – comments were noted
- 3.2.6 Southmill Road: this scheme has been reviewed and is no longer on the IWP
- 3.2.7 Walkern Road – to be dealt with locally as a Cat 2.

In addition, the following projects were also added to the IWP following feedback and discussions:

High Street Stanstead Abbots and Fleming Crescent, Hertford were added to the list of proposed carriageway schemes.

Danesbridge Road and High Road, Little Hadham were added to the list of drainage sites for advance preparation/investigation during 04/05.

### **3.3 The Panel considered draft 2 and the above information and made the following comments:**

3.3.1 The second draft IWP was accepted by the panel members as presented without further amendments being required.

### **3.4 Draft 2 officer comments/recommendations**

3.4.1 Noted.

## **4 Hertsmere**

### **4.1 The Panel considered Draft 1 and made the following comments:**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Heading</b>	<b>Suggested Action</b>	<b>Scheme / Location</b>
4.1.1	Rural Trans Plan	Change heading	ITP4131 Decriminalised parking
4.1.2	South West Herts Plan	Change heading	ITP4138 Hertsmere Parking Management scheme
4.1.3	LRM – Carriageway	Add	Aycliffe Road, (Walshford Way to Gateshead Road), Borehamwood
4.1.4	LRM – Carriageway	Add	Dagger Lane, Elstree
4.1.5	LRM – Carriageway	Add	B462 Watford Road (Willow Way to Darnhills), Radlett
4.1.6	LRM – Carriageway	Add	Rudolph Road, Bushey
4.1.7	LRM – Carriageway	Add	Glencoe Road, Bushey
4.1.8	LRM – Carriageway	Add	Gills Hill Lane (top end), Radlett
4.1.9	LRM – Carriageway	Change treatment	Oakridge Lane, Radlett (lower specification)

Officers also suggested a number of alterations to the draft programme.

### **4.2 Draft 1 Outcomes and officer comments**

As a result of the review of the feedback, the following changes were made:

4.2.1 Decriminalised parking now shown under District-wide projects.

- 4.2.2 Hertsmere Parking Management scheme is still currently part of SW Herts Area Plan although its status is under review and it could be combined with the Decriminalised parking item, above.
- 4.2.3 Aycliffe Road – worst sections have been dealt with by localised patching; will be monitored but no major works planned for now.
- 4.2.4 Dagger Lane, Elstree – localised carriageway works added to the programme (part of Aldenham Road also included)
- 4.2.5 B462 Watford Road – added to carriageway programme
- 4.2.6 Rudolph Road, Bushey – Inspected but not considered a high enough priority to justify inclusion on the IWP.
- 4.2.7 Glencoe Road, Bushey – added to the carriageway programme
- 4.2.8 Gills Hill Lane – Inspected; most faults are cracks or joint movement. Not added as a separate scheme but an item was added for a programme of joint/crack treatment; it is suggested that Gills Hill Lane be included in that programme.
- 4.2.9 Oakridge Lane, Radlett – proposed scheme reduced to surface treatment rather than reconstruction following site visit in view of the nature of the road and the apparent problems.

In addition Green Street, The Greenway and Winston Way were added to the list of proposed carriageway schemes following feedback and discussions:

### **4.3 The Panel considered draft 2 and the above information and made the following comments:**

- 4.3.1 LRM4616 Oakridge Lane – Members felt that the scheme was not needed due to its low usage.

### **4.4 Draft 2 officer comments/recommendations**

- 4.4.1 This site was visited jointly by officers from the local and strategic teams who agreed with the suggestion made by members in response to draft 1 that a lower specification of work was appropriate for this project, given the nature of the road. However, it is not recommended that the scheme be dropped completely as the relatively low-cost works now proposed will help to maintain the road and help prevent the need for more costly works in the future.

## **5 North Herts**

### **5.1 Feedback from North Herts JMP**

- 5.1.1 The Panel was not able to make any specific comments on Draft 1 of the IWP at the meeting as members required more time to study its contents. Panel members' subsequent comments were fed back through officers for consideration.

Officers also suggested a number of alterations to the draft programme.

## **5.2 Draft 1 Outcomes and officer comments**

5.2.1 As a result of the review of the feedback Green Drift, Royston; London Road service road, Baldock and Bursland, Letchworth were added to the list of proposed carriageway schemes.

## **5.3 The Panel considered draft 2 and the above information and made the following comments:**

5.3.1 The Panel expressed disappointment at the number of schemes that were slipping from 03/04 to 04/05

5.3.2 The Panel raised a number of specific schemes that they did not feel were necessary due to the nature of the roads in question.

## **5.4 Draft 2 officer comments/recommendations**

5.4.1 The comment is noted. Members are reminded that the IWP is a 15-month programme, so some schemes are intended to roll forwards to the following year, although it is acknowledged that a higher number of schemes are being carried forward to 04/05 than would normally be the aim.

5.4.2 These schemes are still at the advanced design stage which, for all maintenance schemes, will include a review of the proposed treatment and, if necessary, a review of the need for the scheme. When these particular sites are reviewed, the JMP's comments will be kept in mind and the need for the schemes will be examined.

## **6 St Albans**

### **6.1 The Panel considered Draft 1 and made the following comments:**

6.1.1 Members expressed concerned with the 2004/2005 IWP draft 1 Scheme programme. The main issue raised was that in their view the list of schemes represented an earlier agreed programme, and did not offer members new schemes.

6.1.2 Members asked officers to provide the level of funding provided for the IWP split across each of the service areas, LTSM, Traffic Calming, Transport Plans etc.

6.1.3 Members asked for a longer list of carriageway schemes for them to consider. In particular they requested a multi-year rolling programme. They consequently felt unable to offer detailed comments on schemes at the meeting, preferring to wait for the additional information. Panel members' subsequent comments were fed back through officers for consideration.

Officers also suggested a number of alterations to the draft programme.

### **6.2 Draft 1 Outcomes and officer comments**

As a result of the review of the feedback, the following changes were made:

- 6.2.1 A number of sites have been added to the IWP since Draft 1. With particular reference to carriageways, six new sites have been added in the St Albans area and many schemes shown as “Ranked” on Draft 1 are now “Supported” for funding. This represents a substantial increase in the proposed programme for the area.
- 6.2.2 The budgets have not yet been formally set; the IWP has been prepared by officers using the current best estimates of funding likely to be available. In particular there are still issues to be resolved around the use of the LTP funding.
- 6.2.3 The carriageway programme is prioritised using a model to predict the deterioration of the roads and suggest timings and treatments to give the best value for the available money. All the suggested schemes put forward by the model for St Albans in 04/05 appeared on the Draft 1 IWP although they were shown as “Ranked” as it was unclear at that stage how many might be funded. To give the Panel Members an insight into this process, the suggested treatments for the following two years (05/06 and 06/07) were provided to them, subsequent to the meeting, through the District Manager. These are not intended as firm proposals at this stage as the data available to the model is currently being refined and the model will be re-run for future years with the most up to date data. However, it was hoped that this information would give the Members an insight into the process and demonstrate that Hertfordshire Highways is actively looking towards long-term, multi-year programmes for this type of work in the future.

As mentioned above, Yeomans Avenue, Ashley Gardens, Cooters End Lane, Chiswell Green Lane, Park Street Lane and Telford Road were added to the list of proposed carriageway schemes following feedback from Members and discussions with local officers.

### **6.3 The Panel considered draft 2 and the above information.**

The second draft IWP was accepted by the Panel without significant further comments in view of the changes made following draft one. Members request that exception and changes continue to be reported to them as the programme progresses.

Members raised several issues relating to specific sites.

#### **Draft 2 officer comments/recommendations**

It is intended to continue to provide members with regular updates on scheme programme and delivery as work progresses.

These issues will be investigated locally and answers fed back to the panel.

## **7 Stevenage**

### **7.1 The Panel considered Draft 1 and made the following comments:**

- 7.1.1 No.1 priority for NHTP is St. Nicholas School, Six Hills Way - Panel have funded £5k from 2003/04 discretionary budget for further feasibility works.
- 7.1.2 Clovelly Way - Panel decided to fund from 2003/04 discretionary budget - hence can be deleted from IWP 2004/05 listing.
- 7.1.3 Rectory Lane to be considered as an NHTP project in replacement for Clovelly Way.
- 7.1.4 Footways schemes – Members agree with the priority as listed
- 7.1.5 Accident Remedial scheme for High St/Bell Lane - designers to take into account SBC parking strategy proposals
- 7.1.6 Asked for footway sections in Grace Way, Lonsdale and Archer Rd be considered for funding

Officers provided a list of six additional carriageway sites for consideration.

### **7.2 Draft 1 Outcomes and officer comments**

As a result of the review of the feedback, the following changes were made:

- 7.2.1 Comments noted and passed to officers managing the transport plan
- 7.2.2 Noted
- 7.2.3 Comments noted and passed to officers managing the transport plan
- 7.2.4 Noted
- 7.2.5 Comments noted and passed to officers managing the scheme
- 7.2.6 The three footways identified in 7.1.6 above were included in draft 2 of the IWP as supported for funding.

Two additional carriageway sites were also included in draft 2 of the IWP.

### **7.3 The Panel considered draft 2 and the above information and made the following comments:**

- 7.3.1 The Panel welcomed this 2nd draft and saw it as a positive development/improvement as compared with the 1st draft.
- 7.3.2 The Panel were pleased to see the extra c/way maintenance schemes, pleased that all previous footway schemes reported in draft 1 as reserves are now included, and particularly pleased that footway sites that they previously requested i.e. Archer Rd, Grace Way & Lonsdale Rd are now also included.
- 7.3.3 The Panel welcomed the Rural/Area studies (SEU schemes) for High St, Chells Way & Monkswood Way. With regard to High St, they wanted to make double sure that the Designers be informed to take account of SBC's parking strategy, and to see if any of the street lighting proposals can be incorporated and done as part of the eventual Rural/Area study scheme for High St.

- 7.3.4 The street lighting refurbishment budget - again the Panel want the proposals for High St (currently being developed) to be given consideration for funding from this budget.
- 7.3.5 Northern Herts Transport Plan - the Panel welcomed the change in status for Six Hills Way from reserve in draft 1 to now being included.

#### **7.4 Draft 2 officer comments/recommendations**

- 7.4.1 Comments noted
- 7.4.2 Comments noted
- 7.4.3 The lighting and safety engineering programmes are still being developed and prioritised, however officers managing both programmes have been made aware of the panel's desires to see these schemes proceed and to gain any available synergies.
- 7.4.4 As 7.4.3
- 7.4.5 Noted

### **8 Three Rivers**

#### **8.1 The Panel considered Draft 1 and made the following comments:**

- 8.1.1 ARP4006 London Road Rickmansworth – Panel were concerned that towards the top end the road is in a very poor condition. Can we ensure that this gets picked up as part of this works
- 8.1.2 Footways in Silk Mill Road - bad condition please include
- 8.1.3 Broomfield Rise, Abbots Langley, carriageway in poor condition
- 8.1.4 Members had a number of comments on the names used in the descriptions of the locations, in particular that several localities were described as Oxhey when they should be Oxhey Hall or similar concerns.

Officers also suggested a number of alterations to the draft programme.

#### **8.2 Draft 1 Outcomes and officer comments**

As a result of the review of the feedback, the following changes were made:

- 8.2.1 Comments on London Road have been passed on to the Design Team project manager to ensure that the section in question is considered.
- 8.2.2 Silk Mill Road footways have been added to the IWP.
- 8.2.3 Broomfield Rise, Abbots Langley, Inspected but not considered a high enough priority to justify inclusion on the IWP
- 8.2.4 Additional information has been added to the sites mentioned where necessary to help clarify the location. Locality information is imported automatically into the IWP database using information drawn from the national road gazetteer. Unfortunately, the local area name in the gazetteer does not always correspond exactly with that in accepted usage. However, it is felt that having this information is useful as it

helps to differentiate between roads with similar names in different towns within the same district.

In addition, following feedback and discussions, Upper Highway, Breakspear Road and White Hill were added to the list of proposed carriageway schemes and an item was added for a programme of carriageway joint/crack treatment at various sites in the district.

### **8.3 Feedback on IWP Draft 2**

8.3.1 Unfortunately the Three Rivers JMP was unable to find a suitable date for a meeting after the publication of the draft 2 IWP but before the Transport Panel. Their most recent meeting, on 14<sup>th</sup> January, was before draft 2 was ready and, consequently, they have not yet had the chance to view the revised IWP as a Panel.

### **8.4 Draft 2 officer comments/recommendations**

8.4.1 Since it was not intended to seek further suggestions on changes at this stage the Three Rivers JMP has not been disenfranchised in this regard although it would have been desirable to be able to report their revised comments to the Transport Panel and hence Cabinet. They will have the opportunity to review the finalised list at their next meeting and officers will take account of their comments following that meeting as far as practically possible.

## **9 Watford**

### **9.1 The Panel considered Draft 1 and made the following comments:**

9.1.1 Members expressed satisfaction at being able to introduce comment into the process.

9.1.2 Members endorsed the original officer submission of 40 plus schemes for footway schemes and expressed the view that this reflected the needs in the borough. They expressed concern that these needs would not be completely met.

9.1.3 Members accepted that the T & E schemes did not score highly enough to be included since there were a large number of committed schemes which will absorb the bulk of the funds in this budget head. However, the issue of the Leggatts Way pedestrian crossing was raised as a special case since it had been included in a previous programme some 2/3 years ago but had never been implemented. The Panel supported this view.

9.1.4 There was a strong feeling that the proposed work programme, particularly for footways, would not meet the demands placed on the network and that this was leading to a significant deterioration in the condition of the both the footways and roads in the borough.

- 9.1.5 Members were aware of the feedback process, detailed in the *Background* section, above, and were satisfied that their views would be represented via the feedback and officers of the local team.
- 9.1.6 The overall view of the members is that while they believed they wanted carriageway schemes there was an essential requirement to have more footway schemes.
- 9.1.7 Members accepted that to replace footways in tarmac is more economic in both construction and maintenance costs.
- 9.1.8 With regard to other works in the district, the drainage problem on the A412 St Albans Road, by the Shell Garage at the Dome roundabout has been raised as a high priority due to its location and severity.

Officers also suggested a number of alterations to the draft programme.

## **9.2 Draft 1 Outcomes and officer comments**

As a result of the review of the feedback, the following changes were made:

- 9.2.1 Comments noted.
- 9.2.2 While it is not possible to support all proposed schemes, either in Watford or countywide, within the likely available budgets, the second draft IWP shows ten new Supported footway schemes, over and above those promised in last year's programme. Four of these are completely new, the others were shown as Ranked in draft 1. There have been similar positive changes in other areas of the programme This represents a substantial increase in the proposed programme for the area
- 9.2.3 Leggatts Way pedestrian crossing has been added to the IWP for advance preparation in 04/05 with a view to delivery in future years.
- 9.2.4 See 9.2.2 above.
- 9.2.5 It is hoped that the changes to the IWP as a result of the feedback process vindicate Members views on the subject.
- 9.2.6 In addition to the changes referred to in 9.2.2, above, a number of carriageway sites have been added or moved from Ranked to Supported since Draft 1 was published.
- 9.2.7 This will be kept in mind by officers planning the works.
- 9.2.8 The St Albans Road drainage site at the Dome Roundabout has been added to the IWP for works during 04/05.

## **9.3 The Panel considered draft 2 and the above information and made the following comments:**

- 9.3.1 The Panel welcomed the increase in funding and thus the total schemes and expressed the hope that Transport Panel and Cabinet would accept this version of the programme. If there was additional funding it would of course be gratefully received.
- 9.3.2 The Panel were very concerned about the duplication of scheme titles in the draft 2. They felt this was poor presentation and caused confusion.

- 9.3.3 The Panel expressed concern that there was no allocation for Whippendell Road, which in their opinion was a major route in Watford that was in an unacceptable condition. It was agreed that there were numerous complaints received on the condition and resolved to request that the Transport Panel transfer the funds from LRM4592, LRM4596 and LRM4639 to Whippendell Road. Only in the event of this not being possible should the existing schemes proceed.
- 9.3.4 One of the Borough Members drew the Panel's attention to the significant settlement that was occurring to the houses along Clarke Road and made a special request to have investigation work in the Road because significant settlement is occurring to the adjoining housing stock. There is a fear that, like these houses, the road sits on the old rubbish tip, which is apparently the problem with the houses.

#### **9.4 Draft 2 officer comments/recommendations**

- 9.4.1 Comments noted.
- 9.4.2 Officers apologised for this at the Panel meeting and explained that this was due to a glitch in the system that had been spotted but could not be resolved in time for the JMP. The main report was unaffected but the summary of schemes at the front of the report contained duplicate entries. This affected reports to several other JMPs.
- 9.4.3 Whippendell Road was jointly inspected by officers from the local and strategic teams as part of the feedback process from draft 1. The other schemes mentioned were identified through the deterioration modelling process as sites where a 'stitch in time' now represents the best value for money in line with the Asset Management approach to highway maintenance. Whippendell Road is in a poor condition and has deteriorated past the point where an early, cheap intervention will deliver the best value. Transferring the amount of money earmarked for the other three schemes would not be sufficient to treat a significant portion of Whippendell Road while, but it would deny those other roads the benefits of the early intervention. It is consequently not recommended that funds be diverted from the schemes mentioned to Whippendell Road. However, it is recommended that Whippendell Road should continue to be monitored so that intervention can be planned at the most appropriate point in future years when the maximum benefit can be obtained from the significant amount of money that will be needed to refurbish the road.
- 9.4.4 In view of the significant settlement and possible demolition of some of the adjacent properties it should be possible to carry out the low-key investigation work suggested within existing budgets. However, it should be noted that many of the county's roads are historic and are not built to modern standards. It is not always necessary or desirable to rebuild or strengthen such roads unless they are showing signs of distress.

## **10 Welwyn Hatfield**

## **10.1 The Panel considered Draft 1 and made the following comments:**

- 10.1.1 Members expressed concern at the small number of footway and carriageway schemes Ranked or Supported for 04/05.
- 10.1.2 Members viewed an additional list of sites prepared by officers from the local team as potential schemes. They endorsed this list and the way officers were proposing to prioritise it.

Officers also suggested a number of alterations to the draft programme.

## **10.2 Draft 1 Outcomes and officer comments**

As a result of the review of the feedback, the following changes were made:

- 10.2.1 A number of new schemes have been added to the IWP since Draft1; in addition most maintenance schemes previously shown as Ranked are now Supported. This represents a substantial increase in the proposed programme for the area.
- 10.2.2 The list prepared by officers from the local team was used as the basis for the feedback and review of the IWP. Many of the sites referred to in 10.1.2 above were drawn from that list.

## **10.3 The Panel considered draft 2 and the above information and made the following comments:**

- 10.3.1 The Panel reviewed and accepted the revised list without making further comments.

## APPENDIX C

<b><u>Local Transport Plan</u></b>	£'000
Road Refurbishment – Principal Roads	7,990
Bridge Refurbishment	1,275
Maintenance Total	9,265
Safety	1,940
LEARN	675
SW Herts	800
Mid Herts	1,505
West Herts	650
Northern Herts	700
Eastern Herts	700
Lea Valley	1,670
Rural	900
Urban Plans	900
Cycling	405
Integrated Transport Total	10,845
St Albans Safety Project	500
<b><u>County Capital</u></b>	
Road Refurbishment – Principal Roads	2,600
Road Refurbishment – Local Roads	2,250
Sustainable Transport Projects	1,258
Street Lighting Refurbishment	400
Disabled Crossings Upgrade	200
	6,708
<b><u>Revenue</u></b>	
Roads, footways, cycleways & drainage refurbishment – Principal Roads	1,177
Roads, footways, cycleways & drainage refurbishment – Local Roads	9,630
Advanced Preparation	857
Accident Prevention	1,450
Safer Routes to School	138
Traffic & environment	842
	14,094



**APPENDIX D**  
**VALUE OF INTEGRATED HIGHWAYS WORKS PROGRAMME**  
**£'000**

	South West Herts Area			Mid West Herts			Northern Herts		Eastern Herts & Lea Valley		TOTAL
	Hertsmere	3 Rivers	Watford	Dacorum	St Albans	W&H	North Herts	Stev'ge	East Herts	Broxb'rne	
Road Refurbishment – Principal Roads	916	778	984	621	266	381	763	72	106	867	5754
Road Refurbishment – Local Roads	638	677	147	1051	821	650	1133	106	315	484	6022
Footway & Cycleway Refurbishment	260	475	412	315	755	415	147	55	389	79	3302
Drainage	92	187	362	6	89	272	77	12	324	21	1442
Bridge Refurbishment	115	330	0	225	95	0	0	200	305	0	1270
Traffic & Environment	17	40	10	67	304	75	0	0	0	0	513
Safety	687	6	675	559	60	361	413	197	674	62	3694
LEARN & SRTS	22	0	56	129	60	0	465	168	0	0	900
SW Herts	365	220	1497	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2082
Mid Herts	0	0	0	0	1258	639	0	0	0	0	1897
West Herts	0	0	0	650	0	0	0	0	0	0	650
Northern Herts	0	0	0	0	0	0	608	260	0	0	868
Eastern Herts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	700	0	700
Lea Valley	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1195	511	1706
Urban Plans	604	0	0	0	326	0	0	0	0	0	930
Cycling	0	18	150	0	119	177	151	0	75	0	690
Rural	0	0	0	325	150	150	230	0	100	0	955