

HALTON BOROUGH COUNCIL



*Municipal Building,
Kingsway,
Widnes.
WA8 7QF*

13th February 2007

**TO: MEMBERS OF THE HALTON
BOROUGH COUNCIL**

You are hereby summoned to attend an Ordinary Meeting of the Halton Borough Council to be held in the Runcorn Town Hall on Wednesday, 21 February 2007 commencing at 6.30 p.m.. for the purpose of considering and passing such resolution(s) as may be deemed necessary or desirable in respect of the matters mentioned in the Agenda.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'David W R', is centered on the page.

Chief Executive

-AGENDA-

- 1. COUNCIL MINUTES**
- 2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**
- 3. THE MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**
- 4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

N.B. If the item in which you have an interest is contained in minutes of a Committee or Board coming to full Council it is only necessary to declare an interest in the following circumstances:

- where the specific minute in question is actually discussed at full Council (in which case the interest needs to be declared at the point at which someone mentions the specific item);
- where the item is one of those coming to full Council specifically for a decision (e.g. a recommendation from Executive Board) - these will be listed separately to the rest of the minutes.

- 5. LEADER'S REPORT**
- 6. MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD**
 - a) 7th December 2006
 - b) 21st December 2006
 - c) 25th January 2007
- 7. MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD SUB-COMMITTEE**
 - a) 7th December 2006
 - b) 21st December 2006
 - c) 11th January 2007
 - d) 25th January 2007
- 8. QUESTIONS ASKED UNDER STANDING ORDER NO. 8**

9. MATTERS REQUIRING A DECISION BY COUNCIL

a) Executive Board Sub-Committee - 21st December 2006 (ES62 refers) - The Use of Proceeds of Crime Act 2002 by the Consumer Protection Service

The Executive Board Sub-Committee considered the attached report.

RECOMMENDED: That

- (i) the Scheme of Delegation be amended to show the Borough Solicitor as the delegated person for instituting proceeds for the Council, with Trading Standard Officers/Consumer Protection Officers delegated as investigating officers;
- (ii) in agreeing to the above, it be noted that the Council would be committing to undertake confiscation cases at Crown Court in Consumer Protection Prosecutions where it can be shown that assets are available for confiscation; and
- (iii) a financial investigator, to act on a chargeable consultative basis for other local authority services requiring the use of an accredited financial investigator in appropriate cases, be permitted.

b) Executive Board - 25th January 2007 (EXB76 refers) - Capital Programme 2007/2008

The Executive Board considered the attached report.

RECOMMENDED: That the Capital Programme identified in Appendix 1 to the report for 2007/08 be approved.

c) Executive Board - 8th February 2007 - Local Transport Expenditure Settlement 2007/08 and Local Transport Plan Implementation Programme 2007/08

The Executive Board considered the attached report.

RECOMMENDED: That the implementation programme for 2007/08 at Appendix A to the report be included in the Council's Capital Programme.

d) Monitoring Officer

A report on this matter will be given orally at the meeting.

10. CHANGE TO APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES

Council is advised of the following change in appointments to outside bodies, which has been made in accordance with the Council's Scheme of Delegation (Matters Relating to Council Policy – 17):

Rural Commission – Councillor Nelson appointed
(with Councillor McDermott appointed as substitute)

11. MINUTES OF POLICY AND PERFORMANCE BOARDS AND THE BUSINESS EFFICIENCY BOARD

- a) Children and Young People - Cream Pages
- b) Employment, Learning and Skills - Yellow Pages
- c) Healthy Halton - Grey Pages
- d) Safer Halton - Pink Pages
- e) Urban Renewal - Green Pages
- f) Corporate Services - Salmon Pages
- g) Business Efficiency Board - White Pages

12. COMMITTEE MINUTES

- a) Development Control - Pink Pages
- b) Standards - White Pages
- c) Regulatory - Blue Pages
- d) Appointments - White Pages

13. MOTION RECEIVED IN ACCORDANCE WITH STANDING ORDER NO. 6

The following motion has been received for consideration:

Council Tax

To be moved by Councillor C Inch and seconded by Councillor Redhead:

“The Liberal Democrat group of Halton Borough Council proposes that Council Tax increase should be minimised.

The rise should be kept in line with inflation to ensure that people on pensions (30% of Halton households) and hard working families are not disadvantaged. Following the poor and unfair Government settlement every effort must be made to reduce any increase.

With this in mind the following proposals are submitted for approval:

Energy Savings	190
The Council proposed a 10% reduction in energy in reference to the appointment of an Energy Officer. This should be implemented as agreed by the Corporate PPB.	
Cost of Energy Officer	(50)
Executive Board	56
This should be re-organised to match the directorate structure. Last year the Opposition position was removed but the Board decided to re-allocate responsibilities and maintain 11 posts. A structure with 6 posts is recommended.	
Councillor Allowances	12
The council should vote to freeze councillors’ allowances to protect front line services.	
Joint Area Review	90
We do not believe the addition of two posts to prepare for the audit next March is a justification for an increase in council tax. Hence these posts if necessary must be self-financed.	
Advertising, Marketing and Promotion	120
A 15% reduction is proposed, to protect council services and employment. The £931,000 the council spent on this area last year is not appropriate in the current climate.	
Citizens Advice Bureau	(60)
Cutting the grant to the CAB will impact those with the most severe hardships and concerns. The CAB provides an essential front line service, which should be protected.	
Totalling at least a 1% reduction	358”

This page is intentionally left blank

REPORT TO: Executive Board Sub Committee

DATE: 21 December 2006

REPORTING OFFICER: Strategic Director, Health and Community

SUBJECT: The use of the Proceeds of Crime Act 2002 by the Consumer Protection Service

WARDS: Boroughwide

1.0 PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

- 1.1 To seek the Board's support for the use of the full 'confiscation regime' and 'offences' under the Proceeds of Crime Act 2002 by the Consumer Protection Service.

2.0 RECOMMENDATION: That

- (1) the use of the full 'confiscation regime' and 'offences' under the Proceeds of Crime Act 2002 by the Consumer Protection Service, as outlined below be, agreed; and**
- (2) Council be requested to agree the necessary Scheme of Delegation changes, as outlined in Section 4.1 below, in support of Recommendation (1) above.**

3.0 SUPPORTING INFORMATION

- 3.1 The Proceeds of Crime Act 2002 (POCA) was introduced by the Government because it recognised that leaving illicitly obtained assets in the hands of criminals was damaging to society in that such assets:
- provided the working capital for further crime, leading to a vicious circle of criminality,
 - enabled those criminals that were jailed to enjoy a life of luxury on their release, and often to run their criminal empires from behind bars, and
 - provided a lavish lifestyle for many criminals, and in doing so sent the wrong message that crime pays, particularly to young people.
- 3.2 In recent years, there has been concern within the Trading Standards profession that courts often imposed low financial penalties on defendants in trading standards prosecutions. In some instances defendants were able to pay immediately as fines were so low. This did nothing to deter future offending, was demoralising for investigators and such low penalties did not remove the financial means from offenders to

prevent them from continuing their criminality. Nor did it send a strong message to other would be offenders that 'crime does not pay'.

- 3.3 To address this concern, some consumer protection/trading standards services have worked in partnership with the Asset Recovery Agency to pursue asset recovery in appropriate cases. Nationally, this year, this arrangement has secured confiscation orders of nearly £1 million, linked to trading standards offences. The confiscation regime under the Proceeds of Crime Act has been successfully used in doorstep crime cases; car clocking cases and against rogue traders and counterfeiters. In recent weeks in the North West, three market traders have been ordered to pay over nearly £850,000 in assets following convictions of selling counterfeit goods and benefit fraud.
- 3.4 The Local Authority Coordinators of Regulatory Services (LACoRS) recognised that this was a powerful enforcement tool that supported the normal prosecution process, but was aware that the Asset Recovery Agency, the Regional Asset Recovery Teams and police forces could not provide all of the support that Trading Standards would need. It therefore secured funding from the Home Office for the training of a number of Trading Standards Officers in each region as "Accredited Financial Investigators" under Parts 2 and 8 of the POCA.
- 3.5 The Council's Consumer Protection Service now has an officer fully trained and accredited under the above provisions of the POCA, one of only 27 officers in local government as a whole, trained to undertake this work. This officer is now capable of using the provisions of the Act in certain criminal investigations where the person under investigation has benefited by over £5,000 from their criminal conduct.
- 3.6 An analysis of criminal investigations under taken by the Consumer Protection Service has revealed that since the introduction of the legislation, 13 local cases could have utilised the confiscation regime under the Act. Currently there are four cases under investigation that would merit financial investigation, one of which represents potential criminally acquired assets in excess of £200,000. However, LACoRS always intended that those local authority financial investigators trained in this way would offer their services within the region, and that requirement can be delivered via the Council permitting this officer to act for other local authority services on a chargeable, consultancy basis.
- 3.7 A "Recovered Assets Incentivisation Fund" (RAIF) has been developed by the Home Office to allow a percentage of confiscated assets to be returned to the agency undertaking the criminal investigation and/or confiscation work. This means that:
 - in confiscation cases where the Council were both the prosecutors of the criminal matter and the financial investigators under the terms of the scheme, there is potential for one third of the recovered assets to be handed back to the Council.

- where the Council's investigator undertakes financial investigation work for another local authority, the potential return would be one sixth of the recovered assets.

3.8 However, the Home Office has ring-fenced the use of what it calls "incentive monies" and has advised that it will monitor the use of such monies to assess issues of propriety and regularity. Annually, we will be expected to account for any use of incentive payments received by providing details of:

- how funds have been used
- how much has been allocated to each initiative / project
- how this has contributed to improving asset recovery performance or tackling crime
- what are the particular asset recovery outcomes?

3.9 There will of course be no shortage of legitimate ideas for the use of such monies, including:

- recouping legitimate officer costs that are not covered by a specific agreement with a third party, and ploughing these costs back into the Consumer Protection Budget so that Halton's consumers do not lose out from our involvement in this work
- directing some of the monies back into assets recovery work
- directing some of the monies to support consumer protection criminal enforcement functions, including funding intelligence resources

3.10 The Safer Halton Policy and Performance Board received a similar agenda item to this on 14 November and fully supported the use of the provisions of the Proceeds of Crime Act, as detailed above.

4.0 POLICY IMPLICATIONS

4.1 The Council's scheme of delegation of officer powers requires amendment to include the Proceeds of Crime Act 2002. The Borough Solicitor should be the delegated person for instituting legal proceeds for the Council, whilst Trading Standards Officers / Consumer Protection Officers should be delegated as the investigating officers.

4.2 In agreeing to the above, the Council would be committing to undertake confiscation cases at Crown Court in consumer protection prosecutions where it can be shown that assets are available for confiscation.

4.3 The Council is being asked to permit the financial investigator to act on a chargeable consultative basis for other Local Authority services requiring the use of an Accredited Financial Investigator in appropriate cases.

5.0 OTHER IMPLICATIONS

5.1 There are positive financial implications associated with this work, which will support the Consumer Protection Service's move to an "external funding first" culture. However, receipt of incentive monies is likely to be

piecemeal and unpredictable and there are risks (see below). It will probably take up to three years to get a better idea of potential incentive funding streams. The Service will therefore undertake an annual review of incentive money received, and report the findings to this Board.

6.0 RISK ANALYSIS

- 6.1 If assets recovery work does prove to be an effective enforcement tool, more authorities may consider training their own officers as financial investigators. This may reduce the number of external referrals we receive over time. In addition, obtaining a confiscation order is one thing, obtaining the money is quite another as incentivisation monies will only be distributed when the order is satisfied.
- 6.2 There are risks for any criminal enforcer/investigator especially when dealing with the more unsavoury characters of society. The risks to the financial investigator will therefore be assessed in the usual way, though for the most part the financial investigation is a desktop exercise.

7.0 EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY ISSUES

- 7.1 There are no equality or diversity issues flowing from this report.

8.0 LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS UNDER SECTION 100D OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972

- 8.1 There are no background papers under the meaning of the Act.

REPORT: Executive Board

DATE: 25 January 2007

REPORTING OFFICER: Acting Strategic Director – Children and Young People

SUBJECT: Capital Programme – 2007/2008

WARDS: Boroughwide

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 This report provides a summary of the funding available for the schools capital programme 2007/2008; it outlines the process for prioritisation for capital repairs and the proposed programme.

2.0 RECOMMENDED THAT:

(1) **Full Council be recommended to approve the capital programme identified in Appendix 1 for 2007-2008.**

3.0 SUPPORTING INFORMATION

3.1 The main source of funding for the schools capital programme is the DfES capital allocation. For 2007/2008 capital funding available is as follows:

DESCRIPTION	ALLOCATION
Capital Grant (SCE {C})	£1,160,540
Capital SCE {R})	£354,597
LEA Revenue Repairs (to be confirmed)	£422,870
TOTAL	£1,938,007

3.2 As agreed by Executive Board on 8th June 2006 £1,101,358 of this funding has been allocated to the capital improvement schemes at Brookfields and Cavendish. In addition, in November 2006 the DfES approved an advance of £700,000 from 2008/2009 capital funding to allow the completion of the scheme without further phasing. The funding for this project has been further enhanced through the addition of £47,000 capital saved from the capital programme in 2006/2007.

- 3.3 Last year AutoCAD (detailed floor plans) plans were completed in a format that will enable their use by schools in relation to Asset Management. It will be necessary to update plans at schools where improvement works have been carried out. The budget provision required to update plans is £5,000.
- 3.4 To continue the work started last year to provide fire compartmentation in some school buildings it is proposed to carry out further works. The budget provision required for this work is £15,000.
- 3.5 A contingency of £139,982 has been identified for 2007/2008. This budget is used to cover the costs of the retentions from previous capital repairs schemes along with emergency capital and health and safety work.
- 3.6 Property Services carry out an annual short survey of all schools plus a more detailed survey for one quarter of Halton schools each year. These surveys identify the key capital repairs requirements. This information is then prioritised through use of the condition score matrix. (see Appendix 3 for details). This matrix has been agreed with the Asset Management Steering Group. The detailed capital repairs programme is identified in Appendix 2. The costs shown against each project are currently provisional. Based on these estimated costs it is likely that all projects can be funded in 2007/2008, however, should the costs following tender be less than the estimated costs further projects will be brought forward from the reserve list.

4.0 POLICY IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 The Capital Programme identified above will allow the Council to continue to meet its requirement to enhance the learning environment through capital projects allocated in accordance with the priorities identified in the Asset Management Plan.

5.0 RISK ANALYSIS

- 5.1 To ensure the Council can respond to emergency capital repairs and/or health and safety issues identified during 2007/2008 a contingency of £139,982 has been budgeted for.
- 5.2 As the costs identified in Appendix 2 are currently only estimates once final costs have been obtained should there be insufficient funds projects the highest scoring projects (lowest priority) will be deferred to 2008/2009.

6.0 Financial Implications

- 6.1 Paragraphs 3.1 to 3.2 outline the main financial consequences of the capital repairs project. In addition, schools identified with a capital repairs project must contribute towards the costs of the scheme, in line with previously agreed criteria. Only schools still contributing to a previous Local Authority capital project are exempt. If a school is unwilling to agree to pay the contribution it is removed from the capital programme.
- 6.2 There are no additional revenue associated consequences of the capital repairs programme in many cases schools will benefit from reduced revenue costs as a result of the completion of the capital repair.

7.0 LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS UNDER SECTION 100D OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972

Document	Place of Inspection	Contact Officer
Schools Capital Announcement – DfES 20/12/2005	Finance and Resources Division	Ann McIntyre
Asset Management Steering Group Minutes –	Finance and Resources Division	Ann McIntyre

This page is intentionally left blank

DRAFT CAPITAL PROGRAMME SUMMARY 2007/2008**Appendix 1**

FUNDING	
Estimated Capital Programme	836,649
Plus school contribution	178,784
Estimated Total	1,015,433

DESCRIPTION	ESTIMATED COSTS	COMMENT
Asset Management Data	5,000	Update CAD (Computer Aided Design) plans
Fire Compartmentation	15,000	Continuation of compartmentation works.
Capital Repairs	855,451	See Appendix 2 for full details. Estimated costs only - should prices received exceed estimate the number of projects approved in 2007/8 will need to be decreased.
Contingency	139,982	Funding required to cover costs of retentions from previous years, emergency capital and health and safety work.
Estimated Total	1,015,433	

DRAFT PROPOSED PROGRAMMED MAINTENANCE FOR SCHOOLS 2007-2008

Appendix 2

SCHOOL	LOCATION	WORKS	Estimated Cost 07/08	Estimated Cost of Fees	Estimated Total Cost	Risk	Fabric effect	User Effect	Total Score
West Bank	External	2no Fire Escapes	50,000	7,500	57,500	1	1	1	3
Bankfield	Throughout	Electrical Repairs	40,000	6,000	46,000	1	1	1	3
Ashley School	Throughout	Low surface temp rads	10,000	1,500	11,500	1	2	1	4
Astmoor Primary	Kitchen	Renew Windows	10,000	1,500	11,500	2	1	1	4
Simms Cross	Floor Ducts	H & C Water Pipework	50,000	7,500	57,500	1	2	2	5
Hallwood Park	Throughout	Electrical Rewire	75,000	11,250	86,250	1	3	1	5
The Heath	Throughout	Electrical Rewire	40,000	6,000	46,000	1	3	1	5
West Bank	Throughout	Electrical Rewire	25,000	3,750	28,750	1	3	1	5
Wade Deacon	1st Flr Corridor	Electrical Rewire	15,000	2,250	17,250	1	3	1	5
Oakfield		Windows	54,636	8,195	62,831	2	1	2	5
All Saints Upton		Roofing	109,222	16,383	125,605	3	1	1	5
Astmoor Primary		Roofing	120,000	18,000	138,000	3	1	1	5
Ditton CE	Throughout	Auto Fire Alarm	19,863	2,979	22,842	1	3	2	6
Westfield Primary		Boilers & Pipework	90,000	13,500	103,500	3	2	1	6
Wade Deacon		Screed Replacement	15,000	2,250	17,250	2	3	2	7
			723,721	108,558	832,279				
Reserve List									
Grange Infants		Roofs	32,000	4,800	36,800	2	3	2	7
Weston Point		Renew Windows	32,000	4,800	36,800	2	3	2	7
Chesnut Lodge		Boilers & Pipework	150,000	22,500	172,500	3	2	1	6
The Heath		Boilers & Pipework	150,000	22,500	172,500	3	2	1	6
Daresbury Primary		Windows	12,000	1,800	13,800	2	3	2	7
Ditton CE Primary		Windows	30,000	4,500	34,500	2	3	2	7
Moorfield Primary		Windows	40,000	6,000	46,000	2	3	2	7
Simms Cross		Renew roof coverings	70,000	10,500	80,500	2	3	2	7
			516,000	77,400	593,400				
		TOTAL	1,239,721	185,958	1,425,679				

This page is intentionally left blank

PROGRAMME MAINTENANCE CONDITION SCORE MATRIX

ELEMENT	RISK FACTOR	FABRIC EFFECT	USER EFFECT	TOTAL SCORE
External walls	1	1	1	3
Main/distribution boards	1	3	1	5
Rewire power/lighting circuits	1	3	1	5
Storage tanks	1	2	2	5
Windows	2	1	2	5
Roofs	3	1	1	5
Fire alarm	1	3	2	6
Emergency lighting	1	3	2	6
Boilers	3	2	1	6
Security	2	3	2	7
Heating Emitters	3	3	2	8
External redecoration	3	2	3	8
Controls	3	3	3	9

Note: 1= Significant ; 2= Some ; 3 = Little Effect

Note: Should the total score be equal then the risk factor score has a higher priority

<u>Fabric Effect</u>	If element fails it will have significant (1) / some (2) / little effect (3) on the fabric of the building.
<u>User Effect</u>	If element fails it will have significant (1) / some (2) / little effect (3) on the users of the building.
<u>Risk/Health and Safety Factor</u>	<p>If element fails it will pose high (1) / medium (2) / low risk (3) to users of the building / general public.</p> <p>High risk can be defined further as causing major or fatal injury.</p> <p>Medium risk can be defined further as causing serious injury where first aid is required.</p> <p>Low risk can be defined further as that where no significant or only slight injury would occur.</p>

This page is intentionally left blank

REPORT TO: Executive Board

DATE: 8th February 2007

REPORTING OFFICER: Strategic Director, Environment

SUBJECT: Local Transport Expenditure Settlement
2007/08 and Local Transport Plan
Implementation Programme 2007/08

WARDS: Borough-wide

1.0 PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to advise the Executive Board of the announcement made by the Secretary of State for Transport on 18th December 2006 that gave details of the 2007/08 Local Transport Capital Expenditure Settlement and the classifications awarded to the Council's second Local Transport Plan 2006/07-2010/11(LTP2) and first Local Transport Plan 2001/02-2005/06 (LTP1) Delivery Report.
- 1.2 The settlement includes an additional £392,000 awarded for the high performance achieved in both LTP2 and the LTP1 Delivery Report. The DfT performance assessments place Halton in the top quartile of the 82 local transport authorities in England.
- 1.3 Appendix A to the report provides details of the proposed LTP2 capital expenditure programme for 2007/08. The Executive Board is asked to endorse the expenditure programme and recommend it to the Council for approval and inclusion in the Council's Capital Programme.

2.0 RECOMMENDATION: That

- a) **the 2007/08 Local Transport Capital Expenditure Settlement and the classifications awarded to the Council's second Local Transport Plan and Delivery Report of the first Local Transport Plan be welcomed;**
- b) **the implementation programme for 2007/08 at Appendix A, be recommended to Council for inclusion in the Council's Capital programme.**

3.0 SUPPORTING INFORMATION

- 3.1 In March 2006 Halton submitted its second Local Transport Plan (LTP2), covering the years 2006/07 to 2010/11. DfT has classified each of the final second local transport plans as excellent, good, fair or weak. Halton's final local transport plan has been assessed as being **Excellent**.

- 3.2 Halton's first Local Transport Plan (LTP1) covered the years 2001/02 to 2005/06. As part of the LTP process local transport authorities were required to produce Annual Progress Reports (APRs) for each financial year. In 2006 DfT required local transport authorities to produce a five year Delivery Report that covered all five years of LTP1 as well as the previously unreported 2005/06 financial year
- 3.3 Each of the LTP1 Delivery Reports has also been classified as being excellent, very good, good or satisfactory. In Halton's case, delivery was assessed as being **Excellent**.
- 3.4 The LTP Guidance indicated that as last year up to 25% of an authority's 2007/08 integrated transport block allocation might be varied for performance on delivery and the quality of the second LTPs. For Halton an additional 12.5% allocation for 2007/08 is to be received due to an **Excellent** LTP2 and similarly a further 12.5% will be received due to an **Excellent** LTP1 Delivery Report. This 25% uplift is to be applied to the remaining four years of the LTP2 period. See table below.
- 3.5 It should be noted that Halton was one of only thirteen local authorities in the country to achieve a top grading for both LTP2 and the LTP1 Delivery Report. In the North West, only the Halton and Merseyside LTPs achieved Excellent in both categories.
- 3.6 Halton's total settlement for 2007/087 is £4.15 million. This covers all items of transport capital expenditure apart from major schemes. The settlement includes no funding for Mersey Gateway nor for Halton's £31m major scheme bid for major maintenance on the Silver Jubilee Bridge. Although the SJB scheme is included in the DfT approved 3 year programme with expenditure starting in 2008/09, final approval of the bid is still awaited from DfT.
- 3.9 The integrated transport minor works guideline announced last year for 2007/08 was £1.566m and with the performance enhancement of an additional 25% the final allocation for integrated transport is **£1.958m**. The Government has announced that this performance enhancement will continue through the remaining three years of the LTP2 period, although figures at this stage have to remain indicative. See table below.
- 3.10 The capital highway maintenance funding allocation for 2007/08 is **£2.192m** and includes £594,000 for major structural maintenance on the Silver Jubilee Bridge complex. Following the spending review the Government plans to make a three-year settlement for maintenance for the remainder of the LTP2 period. Therefore no maintenance figures beyond 2007/08 are shown in the table below:

LTP2 Capital Funding Allocation			
Year	Integrated Transport	Maintenance	Total
	£ms	£ms	£ms

2006/07	2.111	2.274	4.385
2007/08	1.958	2.192	4.150
2008/09	1.885	N/a	N/a
2009/10	1.831	N/a	N/a
2010/11	1.767	N/a	N/a

- 3.11 The settlement is in response to the Council's LTP2 submission and therefore the schemes to be implemented have been drawn from the detailed programmes included in the LTP2 submission in line with the capital budget agreed by the Council. The proposed schemes to be implemented in 2007/08 are detailed in Appendix A. The individual schemes within the highway maintenance groups will be those prioritised through the established technical appraisal processes.
- 3.12 Discussions are currently underway with Merseyside partners over funding for a joint Transport Innovation Fund bid following DfT turning down the bid for pump priming monies. Access to the Mersey Gateway Variable Demand Traffic Model should more than comfortably cover the extent of the Council's contribution but should additional funding be required it will be top sliced from the LTP allocation with schemes reduced accordingly.
- 3.13 The Urban Renewal Policy and Performance Board of 24th January 2007 considered a similar report on the Local Transport Expenditure Settlement.

4.0 POLICY IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 The capital expenditure settlement is to deliver the strategies contained in the Council's second Local Transport Plan. The final LTP2 and the LTP1 Delivery Report were the subject of extensive consultation and approved by the Executive Board at its meetings of 2 March and 22 June 2006 respectively.

5.0 OTHER IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 The report details the indicative levels of funding to be allocated during the life of LTP2, which will be used to deliver the proposed interventions, described within the LTP2 capital programme.
- 5.2 The Local Transport Plan is targeted at improving transport opportunities for those without access to private cars and has therefore positive impacts on Social Inclusion and Sustainability issues.

6.0 RISK ANALYSIS

The additional 25% performance funding allocated to the integrated transport block was achieved by gaining 12.5% for an **Excellent** LTP2 grading and 12.5% for an **Excellent** LTP1 Delivery Report. Whilst the 25% enhancement is carried forward into the indicative allocations for

the succeeding three years, it will be essential to maintain performance levels to avoid any risk of losing the enhancement when the final allocations are made after the spending review.

7.0 EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY ISSUES

Accessibility and connectivity are essential issues for equality and diversity. Hence every effort is made to ensure that there is no obstruction to movement around the Borough. Particular emphasis is given to improving access to educational facilities and employment opportunities.

8.0 LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS UNDER SECTION 100D OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972

Document	Place of Inspection	Contact Officer
Letter from DfT 18 th December 2006	Highways and Transportation Department Rutland House, Runcorn	Alan West Ext. 3003

LTP2 IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAMME 2007/08 (£000's)

Local Transport Plan	£000
Bridge and Highway Maintenance	
Bridge Strengthening - Calvers	150
Silver Jubilee Bridge Complex	
• A533 Desoto Road Railway Bridge	120
• A533 Widnes Pedestrian Subway	30
• A533 Widnes Approach Viaduct	284
• A533 Brook Place Bridge	67
• Associated structures	68
Other Bridges	60
HBC Staff Costs for Bridges	147
Seconded Framework Staff for Bridges	72
Retentions on contracts from 2005/06	20
Carriageway Reconstruction Major – PRN Minor	250
Carriageway Reconstruction MLI	150
Carriageway Reconstruction - other roads	110
Carriageway Major Drainage	45
Footway Reconstruction PRN	80
Independent Footpath Network	75
Footway Reconstruction MLI	100
Footway Reconstruction - other roads	45
Cycleways	30
Street Lighting Improvements	150
HBC Staff Costs for Highway Maintenance	100
Seconded Framework Staff for Highway Maintenance	39
<u>Total Bridge and Highway Maintenance</u>	<u>2192</u>
Integrated Transport Highway Management	
LSS PR Safety Schemes – Barriers	17
LSS – Watkinson Way	89
Walking (Quality Corridor)	158
Walking (Outside Corridor)	33
Cycling (Quality Corridor)	161
Cycling (Outside Corridor)	49
Bus Improvements – Quality Corridor and Halton Lea North	170
Direct Contribution to Regeneration	40
A56 Eastern Expressway Improvements	130
Upton Lane Distributor Match Funding	60
HBC Staff Costs for Highway Management	199
Seconded Framework Staff for Highway Management	75
<u>Total Highway Management</u>	<u>1181</u>
Integrated Transport Traffic Manager and Street Lighting	
Variable Message Signing	167
Traffic Signal Upgrades	27
HBC Staff Costs for Traffic Manager and Street Lighting	18
<u>Total Traffic Manager and Street Lighting</u>	<u>212</u>

Integrated Transport Transportation	
Local Safety Schemes – Minor Works	65
School Travel Plan Support	19
Bus Shelter Improvements	33
Integrated Transport Improvements	70
Accessibility Buses	145
Access Improvements	33
Public Rights of Way	63
Greenways	40
HBC Staff Costs for Transportation	97
<u>Total Transportation</u>	<u>565</u>
Total Local Transport Plan	4,150