

# London Borough of Lambeth Draft Borough Spending Plan 2003/4

Date	30.01.02
Issue no.	1
Produced by	dah/rg/ep
Status	draft

## Contents

Page No.

<b>1:</b>	<b>Bid strategy</b>	
	Lambeth's BSP for 2002/3	
1		
	The BSP settlement for 2002/3	2
	TfL guidance for 2003/4	3
	Implications of the TfL guidance for 2002/3	5
	Developing the draft BSP for 2003/4 and beyond	7
	Strategic choices taken by Lambeth Council	10
	Other funding streams	14
<b>2:</b>	<b>Draft Borough Spending Plan 2003/4</b>	
	The TfL Business Plan	17
	Setting bid levels	18
	Bid details	19
	Maintenance: Principal roads	21
	Maintenance: non-Principal roads	21
	Road safety	22
	Reducing congestion	22
	Area-based schemes: general	23
	Walking and cycling	24
	Public transport interchanges	26
	Bus route review	27
	Road vehicles	27
	Freight	27

28	Streets for People
	Town centres
28	Regeneration
	28
	Air quality
29	Accessibility
29	

## **Appendix A**

Finance forms (to be included in April version)

## **1: Bid strategy**

This Section of the Draft Borough Spending Plan (BSP) for 2003/4 summarises the BSP for 2002/3 that was submitted in July 2001. It then considers the implications of the draft guidance on BSPs issued by Transport for London (TfL) in December 2001 and the capital funding settlement announced in the same month. It highlights the strategic choices that the Council has taken to date in formulating the draft BSP for 2003/4.

### **Lambeth's BSP for 2002/3**

1.1 The Council's current BSP is for 2002/3 and was submitted to TfL in July 2001. TfL gave the boroughs clear guidance and scenarios for bidding for 2002/3. Bids were made in the BSP for so-called Part 1 funds. These are for borough-based schemes. The funding scenarios set out by TfL and which all boroughs were supposed to comply with were:

- ◆ a Base Case that maintained the previous settlement (for 2001/2) for five years
- ◆ Growth Scenario 1 that enhanced the Base Case by 20% for the first three years
- ◆ Growth Scenario 2 that enhanced the Base Case by 35% for the first two years.

These scenarios established an expectation of significantly enhanced funding levels.

1.2 Lambeth's Base Case bid for 2002/3 was for £1.419m per year for five years. This was for "Part 1" funding and therefore excluded bids for major schemes costing over £5m and "Part 2" funding for multi-authority packages and partnerships. It also excludes the precept for Traffic Technology Services (traffic signals). The five year Base Case bid therefore totalled about £7.1m. Growth Scenario 1 brought the total bid up to about £11.1m, Scenario 2 to £12.3m. The average annual bid over the five year bid period increased from about £1.4m, through £2.2m to £2.5m under these growth scenarios.

1.3 The lead boroughs of partnerships submitted bids for Part 2 funds. Lambeth was not the lead borough for any partnerships and therefore did not bid for any funds beyond Part 1. Part 3 funds were allocated independently of the BSP process and were intended to supplement borough resources.

### **The BSP settlement for 2002/3**

1.4 TfL announces the details of transport grant being made available to the boroughs in its settlement letter. The settlement announced in December 2001 for 2002/3 was £1.132m, a reduction of 20% on the Part 1 settlement of about £1.4m for 2001/2. Table 1.1 shows the bid and settlement for 2002/3 by transport "area" ie the headings under which works will take place.

**Table 1.1:  
Bid and settlement details for 2002/3**

(units: £000s)

transport area	Lambeth bids			TfL settle-ment
	Base Case	Base + Growth Scenario 1	Base + Growth Scenario 2	Group 1 only Dec 2001
maintenance: roads	431	556	606	431
local safety schemes	250	300	300	248
Home Zones	210	260	375	150
20mph zones	100	100	100	100
TTS (signals)	0	0	0	23
gateways	58	58	58	0
cycling	180	180	180	0
walking	70	70	70	20
safer routes to schools	110	110	110	100
awareness campaigns	10	10	10	60
freight	0	0	0	0
interchanges	0	0	0	0
town centre regen.	0	60	110	0
compl. TfL schemes	0	0	0	0
major schemes	0	0	0	0
<b>totals</b>	<b>1419</b>	<b>1704</b>	<b>1919</b>	<b>1132</b>

**TfL guidance for 2003/4**

- 1.5 December 2001 also saw the issue of draft guidance by TfL for the 2003/4 round of bidding. This introduced changes in timetable, approach and terminology. The guidance for 2003/4 was issued early in draft form to ensure London boroughs were aware of a change of programme for submitting capital transport funding bids for 2003/4. A draft BSP must now be submitted in "headline" form by 5 April 2002 (this document), followed by the final version by 28 June 2002.
- 1.6 TfL has not been able to provide feedback on the 2002/3 BSP and the Interim Local Implementation Plan (ILIP) submitted in July 2001. This is a weakness in TfL's current procedures that they acknowledge.
- 1.7 No Local Implementation Plan (LIP) is required by TfL this year. This is despite the fact that ILIPs were required and produced last year and that LIP production is a statutory requirement that provides the necessary policy context for a BSP.
- 1.8 If boroughs are unable to meet the April deadline for draft BSPs, TfL proposes to base its business planning on the settlement for 2002/3. Last year's settlement for Lambeth is considered inadequate by this Council (see below) so the previous bid would be an inadequate basis for the current one.

- 1.9 It has therefore been necessary for the Council to react very quickly to the December 2001 guidance, to consider its priorities and to use the draft bidding process as the means of resolving as many issues as possible prior to final submission in June. Feedback on draft BSPs is promised by TfL. Under the circumstances, it is essential.
- 1.10 The revised TfL timetable required production of this draft BSP by 30 January 2001 in order to meet the Council's committee timetable prior to submission in April.
- 1.11 As explained above, the previous guidance (for the 2002/3 BSP) gave clear indications of what boroughs should bid for and the likely funds available. The draft guidance for 2003/4 is less explicit. However, indicative funding levels from the TfL Business Plan are presented for the years up to and including 2007/8 for five transport areas:
- ◆ principal road and bridge maintenance
  - ◆ road safety
  - ◆ congestion reduction
  - ◆ area-based schemes, including
  - ◆ bus priority.

1.12 Table 1.2 below shows these indicative funding levels.

**Table 1.2:  
Indicative BSP funding in the TfL Business Plan**

(units : £million)

<b>transport area</b>	<b>2002/3</b>	<b>2003/4</b>	<b>2004/5</b>	<b>2005/6</b>	<b>2006/7</b>	<b>2007/8</b>
Maintenance	55	90	90	90	65	65
safety	23	34	34	34	34	34
congestion	12	12	12	12	12	12
area schemes	15	33	38	63	63	63
bus priority	40	60	70	70	70	70
<b>totals</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>229</b>	<b>244</b>	<b>269</b>	<b>244</b>	<b>244</b>

(source: Draft 2003/4 BSP Guidance, TfL, 14 December 2001)

- 1.13 The guidance implies that this information is intended to help frame BSP programmes, using the capital funding settlement for 2002/3 as the starting point and using pro rata adjustments.
- 1.14 TfL held a seminar on 11 January 2002 to explain the background to the draft guidance. TfL confirmed that the guaranteed total grant allocation for 2002/3 from TfL to boroughs, partnerships and packages is £120m. This is equal to half of all the Base Case bids submitted by the boroughs. Of the £237m Base Case bids submitted by the boroughs only £164m was actually submitted by TfL to its own Business Plan process, £120m being the final allocation. This implies that:
- ◆ some boroughs substantially exceeded TfL's strict bid criteria issued last year

- ◆ the funding growth scenarios that TfL required bids for were effectively irrelevant
- ◆ TfL has allocated a greater than planned proportion of available funds to its own (major) schemes, rather than to borough schemes.

The £120m allocated to the boroughs is split almost equally between what are now called Group 1 and 2 programmes.

1.15 Group 1 programmes align with the now superseded Part 1 programmes of last year. They comprise of specific borough works and exclude sub-regional partnerships and packages. They apply to the following transport areas:

- ◆ reducing congestion
- ◆ road safety
- ◆ maintenance
- ◆ specific local schemes.

1.16 Group 2 programmes align with Part 2 and 3 programmes last year and comprise works with a spatial dimension:

- ◆ bus priority
- ◆ walking, cycling, town centre and local area treatments
- ◆ regeneration schemes
- ◆ bridge maintenance.

1.17 Group 2 schemes may or may not be based on multi-borough collaborations (eg partnerships), unlike Part 2 programmes, which were all collaborative.

#### **Implications of the TfL guidance for 2003/4**

1.18 Lambeth Council complied strictly with the TfL bid criteria last year whilst also clearly indicating in a parallel bid how it would invest an enhanced level of funding at an average rate of £3.1m per year plus two new major interchange schemes for which funds totalling £16m were sought. The importance of additional funding for regeneration in Lambeth was stressed.

1.19 The £1.132m settlement for 2002/3 announced in December 2001 was for Group 1 funding only. The settlement for Group 2 funds may also include grant for Lambeth Council but TfL had not announced this at the time of submitting this draft BSP to the Council's committee process. As noted above, Group 2 funds may be for borough-based schemes as well as collaborative packages.

1.20 The Council notes:

- ◆ a current lack of information on the total settlement for Lambeth
- ◆ what has become an annual re-organisation of bid headings and groupings that adds complexity and creates potential confusion
- ◆ a very low level of funding for borough-based schemes.

It considers that these factors will undermine boroughs' confidence in the BSP process. There is little apparent incentive for boroughs to adhere strictly to the implied funding control totals in current circumstances.

- 1.21 The 2002/3 (Group 1) settlement to date does not reflect the funding growth expectations encouraged by TfL in previous guidance nor is it adequate to deliver the Council's regeneration objectives. Instead, it implies the Council must rely almost entirely on the Mayor's major scheme programmes and collaborative packages to deliver regeneration. This means that the Council has very limited direct control over most critical transport investment in its area.
- 1.22 Lambeth Council considers that the distribution of grant between the Mayor's major schemes and borough schemes is biased against borough schemes, certainly in the Lambeth context.
- 1.23 The Mayor's Transport Strategy (July 2001) shows indicative funding available for new investment in 2003/4 of £460m. This excludes funding for the Underground and net income from congestion charging. The boroughs will receive about one quarter (£120m) of this, the balance being allocated to major projects. In this context, major projects include TfL funding contributions to:
- ◆ cross-London rail links
  - ◆ improved orbital rail links including the East London Line Extension
  - ◆ new cross-River links in the Thames Gateway area
  - ◆ new intermediate mode tram projects such as Cross River Transit.
- 1.23 Of the £120m, only half is for Group 1 funds under direct borough control. The boroughs are therefore allocated little more than 10% of total grant available to implement borough-based schemes. Furthermore, although transport grant to TfL increased by about 30% for 2002/3 (broadly in line with Growth Scenario 2), the allocation to boroughs only increased by about 10%.
- 1.24 Relying too heavily on major schemes increases programme uncertainty locally because major schemes are always subject to on-going funding and political pressures that boroughs have little or no control over.
- 1.25 To date, this Council has strongly supported in principal the Mayor's Transport Strategy and the major schemes it contains. It considers that more trust should be placed in locally controlled programmes by increasing the overall proportion of funding allocated to the boroughs. This BSP reflects this conclusion.

### **Developing the draft BSP for 2003/4 and beyond**

- 1.26 Table 1.3 below translates the TfL indicative programme totals into index form to show proportional increases more clearly. Bus priority has been omitted as this transport area is apparently most likely to be funded via a partnership, as it has been to date.

**Table 1.3:  
Indicative BSP funding**

(index-based:        Index 1:        2002/3=100  
                         Index 2:        2003/4=100)

transport area	2002/3	2003/4	2004/5	2005/6	2006/7	2007/8
Maintenance	100	164	164	164	118	118
safety	100	148	148	148	148	148
congestion	100	100	100	100	100	100
area schemes	100	220	253	420	420	420
<b>index 1</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>166</b>
<b>index 2</b>		<b>100</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>103</b>

1.27 This analysis shows that the bulk of any increase in funding is allocated to area-based schemes. Annual funding for this transport area is expected to have increased by a factor of over 4 by the end of the five year period. Lambeth Council welcomes the increased emphasis on area-based schemes in principle because it allows a more holistic approach, addresses problems more coherently at community level and because it is more likely to yield visible benefits.

1.28 TfL has yet to resolve how bus priority work will be carried forward but it is expected that it will be via the current lead-borough/partnership arrangement, with Boroughs only bidding for local bus priority measures to complement the main network (no longer referred to as LBP). Logically, similar assumptions should be made about all relevant package and partnership programmes, which, for Lambeth, comprise:

- ◆ Bus Priority
- ◆ London Cycle Network
- ◆ Cross River Partnership
- ◆ SELTRANS
- ◆ London Lorry Ban
- ◆ Structural maintenance of bridges
- ◆ London Carfree Cities
- ◆ Central London Partnership: walking routes.

Lambeth is not the lead borough for these partnerships and looks to the nominated lead boroughs to submit bids accordingly. The Council co-operates fully and enthusiastically within these partnerships.

1.29 Another welcome change this year is the invitation to bid for non-Principal road maintenance. However, this is not currently allowed for in the TfL Business Plan so the Council has formulated its own programme, based on objective condition surveys.

1.30 There is no specific mention in the guidance about footpath maintenance but this Council now allocates a proportion of road maintenance funds for footway maintenance (this time for both Principal and non-Principal roads) as was done for the 2002/3 BSP for Principal roads. This aligns with a policy of placing pedestrians at the top of the road user hierarchy.

1.31 The transport areas boroughs are invited to bid for and which will be funded as indicated in the TfL Business Plan are:

- ◆ specific Borough works delivered by individual Boroughs:
  - road and bridge maintenance
  - road safety:
    - 20mph zones
    - local safety schemes
    - safer routes to school
  - reducing congestion:
    - CPZs
    - Borough signal works
    - green travel
  
- ◆ area-based schemes:
  - Streets-for-People:
    - Home Zones
    - traffic calming
    - environmental improvements
  - interchanges
  - walking
  - cycling
  - town centres.
  - regeneration area schemes
  - freight
  - air quality in connection with AQMAs
  - accessibility
  
- ◆ local bus priority measures.

1.32 Boroughs can include an element of revenue funding in capital bids for specific schemes to cover design costs or to pump-prime a scheme that will eventually become self-financing. Boroughs can also bid for funds to support travel awareness campaigns. This Council seeks revenue funding for:

- ◆ CPZ design work
- ◆ an on-going programme of awareness campaigns
- ◆ a new consultation exercise designed to allow public input to a process for reviewing bus routes in Lambeth in conjunction with London Buses
- ◆ additional school crossing patrols.

1.33 A Task Force at TfL is generating “flagship” schemes for:

- ◆ walking
- ◆ cycling
- ◆ town centres.

New flagship schemes are to be funded via Group 2 bids from sub-regional partnerships and cross-borough packages when the Task Force has reported. No information is currently available from TfL for these funding areas. It is likely to be available after this document has entered the committee process at Lambeth and is

therefore another unresolved issue. This aspect will be addressed in the final BSP submission in June.

- 1.34 TfL indicates that funds may also be available outside the TfL Business Plan framework. This is the only available source of funding for maintenance of non-Principal roads but may also be available for other projects. Lambeth Council sees major regeneration opportunities focused on modernised town centre transport interchanges in Brixton, Streatham and, subsequently, elsewhere. These will require major scheme funding as scheme costs would exceed £2m (the new lower threshold for major schemes). There are expected to be significant opportunities in these schemes to lever in private sector funds associated with development proposals.

### **Strategic choices taken by Lambeth Council**

- 1.35 The policy framework for the BSP is based on last year's ILIP and the major on-going consultation programme that was intended to inform the LIP in 2002. The consultation work will now inform the Council's own Transport Strategy, due to be ready in October 2002.
- 1.36 One successful element of the consultation programme for the LIP involved workshop sessions based on five town centre areas. The exercise comprised "mind-mapping" to gain a comprehensive understanding of people's perceptions about transport problems followed by themed discussion groups that generated preferred solutions and priorities for the main problem areas. The exercise took place in November and December 2001 and was attended by over 120 local residents. It complemented publication by the Council of a major consultation document: The Lambeth Local Implementation Plan – Key Issues Paper: Transport, The Way Ahead. Some 1000 copies were distributed and some 150 completed feedback forms have been received.
- 1.37 Consultation showed that although some transport problems are common to all parts of the Borough, there are also specific issues relating to specific areas. These should influence this BSP, the Council's Transport Strategy and any future LIP. The Council therefore wishes all its local centres to feature in its forward capital transport investment programme.
- 1.38 Consultation also confirmed that much of the money invested to date by the Council in capital transport schemes funded via TfL and its predecessor organisation is "invisible" to residents because it is spread too thinly over the Borough and because the scale of funding is too low. The Council therefore supports the developing TfL preference for larger area-based schemes but seeks a compatible level of funding that will make a visible difference and benefit whole communities. It hopes to direct this funding predominantly towards Home Zones, town centre and regeneration area schemes. In this way, it is hoped to address residential areas, shopping centres and business and employment areas respectively.
- 1.39 The LIP consultation programme is not yet complete as it assumed a BSP/LIP submission in July 2002, as in previous years. Every effort will be made to fully incorporate the results and findings in the final BSP submitted in June.
- 1.40 There are other influences on the BSP and LIP. The Council has the opportunity to capitalise on major transport infrastructure schemes that would assist and affect

transport in Lambeth (eg Cross River Transit/London Tram, Congestion Charging, Orbirail, East London Line Extension). The costs and scope of these schemes tend to dwarf borough-based works funded via the BSP. However, Borough schemes that complemented the major schemes could add value by spreading the benefits.

1.41 The outline timetable for major transport infrastructure schemes in the Mayor's Transport Strategy that are of particular importance in Lambeth is as follows.

**Table 1.4:**  
**Major transport infrastructure schemes affecting Lambeth**

<b>Major scheme (Mayor's Strategy)</b>	<b>Period of works</b>	<b>Comments</b>
East London Line Extension (southern)	2002-2006	An "early priority" for the Mayor and part of Orbirail initiative. Not competing directly with other Orbirail schemes. Powers for northern extension already granted. Key interchanges in Lambeth are Streatham and Tulse Hill. Works planned to be completed within BSP period.
Cross River Transit/London Tram	2004-2007 (first scheme)	Competing directly with other intermediate mode schemes. May not be first intermediate mode scheme even if selected. Strongly supported by Lambeth Council. Key interchanges in Lambeth would be Brixton, Stockwell, Oval, Lambeth North, and Waterloo. Works could potentially be completed within the BSP period but may well extend beyond.

1.42 These anticipated major schemes are highly relevant in Lambeth within the BSP period and, together with the proposed congestion charging scheme, will tend to benefit the north of the Borough more than the south. This means that some town centres in the southern part of the Borough could miss out on investment if capital funding was entirely focused on complementing the Mayor's earliest major

schemes. To add to these tensions, there remains uncertainty about the timetables for these major schemes and the commitment of Government funding that will be necessary for the implementation of most of them.

1.43 Under the bidding regime implied in TfL guidance (see above), the overall amount that Lambeth is likely to be awarded each year for Borough-based schemes remains small. Taking the TfL guidance literally and basing future settlements on pro rata increases on the 2002/3 settlement of £1.132m using the indexing in Table 1.2, annual settlements for Borough-based schemes are unlikely to exceed £1.9m a year on average over the next five years.

1.44 Whilst this represents a big percentage increase on recent settlements, these remain small amounts in absolute terms. Typical scheme costs are:

- ◆ a high quality Home Zone £1 to 2m
- ◆ area traffic management scheme in the safety programme £0.2 to 0.5m
- ◆ 1km of structural highway maintenance (reconstruction, including footways) £0.75m

It is clear that an annual spend of under £2m spread over the still very numerous transport areas nominated for bidding by TfL will not address the “invisibility” issue noted above nor significantly assist delivery of much-needed regeneration in Lambeth.

1.45 The tensions are obvious:

- ◆ trying to spread current and indicative levels of Borough-based funding across local and strategic programmes will reduce each to trivial levels
- ◆ concentrating on complementing major schemes could starve large parts of Lambeth of visible transport investment for years to come but would potentially gain major benefits for areas arguably in most need of regeneration (eg Brixton)
- ◆ concentrating on complementing major schemes means the Council is not in charge of its own programme and is subject to the uncertainties that all large infrastructure schemes in the UK now seem to increasingly suffer
- ◆ concentrating on numerous small isolated schemes would reduce the opportunities to maximise the benefits and minimise the disbenefits of the major schemes, schemes that provide the only opportunity to make step changes in transport service quality
- ◆ concentrating on significant local town centre-based schemes is the more obviously democratic approach, better relates to the extensive consultation work that the Council is undertaking, complies with TfL’s emphasis on large area-based schemes but would not fully exploit the opportunities presented by the Mayor’s major schemes.

1.46 It could be argued that TfL should fully fund its own schemes in collaboration with the affected Boroughs to cover all impacts and that BSP bids need not divert funds

to complementary schemes. This is unlikely to work. It would involve TfL in greatly expanded consultation exercises, extend major scheme contracts such that they became unmanageable and extend TfL's brief into areas the Boroughs would prefer to retain and TfL prefer to avoid. The Council is content with the implied split of responsibility exemplified by the TfL guidance on major interchange improvement schemes where boroughs concentrate on funding improved linkages for pedestrians and cyclists, for example, between the interchange and local centres and TfL on the principal scheme works. Boroughs would also be responsible for implementing and enforcing local defensive measures, such as CPZs, to optimise mode split benefits and protect local amenity.

1.47 More capital funding for Lambeth is the obvious way of addressing these tensions. This would enable major schemes to be complemented by local schemes and implement local schemes elsewhere. It is considered that Lambeth merits such treatment because of the extent of deprivation in the Borough and because it is earning the right to a more favourable settlement by greatly improving scheme delivery. More capital funding for Lambeth would also ensure that its relationship with TfL is more likely to be that of a partner, as sought by TfL. Current funding settlements represent a relationship but not a partnership.

1.48 Lambeth Council has therefore based this draft BSP on its growing ability to deliver programmes and its desire to:

- ◆ add value to major schemes that feature in the Mayor's Transport Strategy and could improve transport services and facilities in the Borough and offer a step change in transport quality
- ◆ add value to work undertaken via other funding streams
- ◆ ensure appropriate defensive measures are implemented to complement the congestion charging scheme and protect areas that could be adversely affected
- ◆ reflect the transport needs of all parts of the Borough
- ◆ reflect corporate themes:
  - people first: customer care and public involvement
  - a clean Borough, a green Borough
  - good homes, strong communities, low crime
  - value for money
- ◆ above all, encourage regeneration of this most deprived area of London.

1.49 In light of the settlement for 2002/3 announced in December 2001 and the numerous unresolved issues discussed above, the Council has decided that this draft BSP for 2003/4 should more closely reflect its ambitions for its area and its growing ability to resource and manage substantial transport investment programmes.

1.50 The indicative funding available from TfL in future is noted. But using the current Group 1 settlement for 2002/3 factored by the indicative funding profile will not produce a programme that meets the Council's regeneration ambitions nor its

capabilities. Consequently, the Council has compiled a programme that reflects its aspirations for 2003/4 and beyond. It reflects TfL's indicative funding profile from 2003/4 onwards (see Table 1.3, index 2 above)

### **Other funding streams**

1.51 Lambeth Council argues above that:

- ◆ the proportion of available funds allocated directly to the boroughs should be greater
- ◆ Lambeth 's share of borough funding should increase to bring its transport system closer to the standards of more affluent boroughs and help address deprivation in the Borough.

1.52 However, the Council understands that the total size of the BSP "cake" will always be limited and that there is a need to supplement and integrate the BSP stream with funding from other sources. It is important to integrate BSP-based funds with these other programmes to ensure best value for money is achieved.

1.53 Lambeth Council will shortly be deciding budget allocations to its Environment Department. This will determine the level of funding supplied to Lambeth Transport from Lambeth Council for funding Borough schemes, maintenance and services. The allocation will be critical in determining the number of schemes Lambeth Transport will be charged with delivering for 2002/3. It will also help attract funding from and contribute to partnership-based projects. The total level of this funding is expected to be of the order of £1.75m. This is a substantial "match-funding".

1.54 The final BSP will give full details of SRB/Neighbourhood Renewal and Business Improvement District funding programmes and will demonstrate how the detailed BSP programme integrates with these initiatives.

1.55 A current scheme on which the Borough is committing substantial funding is Vauxhall Cross. The Borough developed proposals 4 years ago at an initial cost of £1m. In 2000, the Borough and the Cross River Partnership gained SRB funding for the scheme. TfL was formed in 2000 and, with encouragement from the Borough, became the lead partner in July 2001. TfL seeks completion of highways works in 2003 prior to introduction of the congestion charging scheme. These works include closure of Bondway and South Lambeth Place to create a bus station.

1.56 There is on-going development of the transport interchange design and its external connections. Current proposals include:

- ◆ a new bus station on Bondway close to the rail station
- ◆ better links between the rail station , the underground station and buses
- ◆ comprehensive, safe surface level pedestrian crossings
- ◆ dedicated cycle facilities
- ◆ improved environment and lighting.

1.57 The landmark interchange building will follow completion of the bus station. The original “pod” design has been rejected on cost grounds. A competitive appointment process started in January 2002 for an architect to design the bus station building and roof canopy to create the desired landmark impact and assist regeneration of the area. The Council sees strong links between modern transport interchanges and regeneration. The budget limit for this work is now £3m. A public exhibition of architects’ proposals was held on 8 and 9 February. Overall scheme costs are currently estimated at £12m.

1.58 The current timetable is:

- ◆ Preliminary works started 14 January 2002 to divert underground services, change junction layouts, install new traffic signals and temporary signing to allow road closures
- ◆ Phase 1 includes the establishment of the Bondway bus station and highways improvements that benefit bus passengers, pedestrians and cyclists and starts April 2002
- ◆ Phase 2 includes environmental enhancements and construction of bus station buildings and starts October 2002.

1.59 The next Section of this draft BSP sets out the Council’s proposed programme of investment to 2007/8.

## **2: Draft Borough Spending Plan 2003/4**

This Section of the BSP contains the “headline” bid details required by TfL by April 2002. Scheme-related information is not generally provided but each transport area is discussed separately to justify and explain bid levels. Reference is made to area-based priorities.

### **The TfL Business Plan**

2.1 Lambeth Council seeks to comply with the Mayor’s key priorities in formulating its BSP programmes. The TfL Business Plan interprets the Mayor’s priorities by identifying seven important outcomes (source: TfL seminar 11 January 2002):

- ◆ less congestion  
*10 to 15% reduction in weekday traffic levels in central London*
- ◆ improved buses  
*significantly increased, better quality and more reliable bus services throughout London*
- ◆ safer streets  
*meet target of 40% reduction in the number of people killed/seriously injured on London’s roads (equivalent to 1800pa)*
- ◆ better quality roads  
*bring TLRN and borough roads up to a good state of repair*
- ◆ support regeneration

*through major projects including CrossRail, DLR extensions, intermediate modes and Thames crossings*

- ◆ a more liveable city  
*flagship projects for walking, cycling and town centres*
- ◆ improved access and social inclusion  
*through enhanced door-to-door service, bus network extensions and simpler, more affordable fares.*

2.2 The Mayor has nominated 10 key priorities in his Transport Strategy. The Strategy has been the subject of public consultation; the Business plan has not. However, the latest TfL guidance stresses the need to adhere to the Business Plan.

### Setting bid levels

2.3 The implied control totals in the TfL guidance apply to specific transport areas and the overall total. This reflects specific annual allocations to transport areas that will not necessarily match the requirements and profile of individual boroughs. In Lambeth, the following growth profile emerged from an iterative process of compiling costed programmes based on need and comparing them with TfL funding growth profiles for the whole of London, adjusting the Lambeth programmes to ensure that the profiles for total spending matched. Growth is reflected in the area-based schemes, other transport areas being maintained at constant in real terms.

**Table 2.1:**  
**Growth profile used for BSP programmes**

(index-based, 2003/4=100, assumes constant prices)

<b>transport area</b>	<b>2003/4</b>	<b>2004/5</b>	<b>2005/6</b>	<b>2006/7</b>	<b>2007/8</b>
maintenance	100	100	100	100	100
safety	100	100	100	100	100
congestion	100	100	100	100	100
area schemes	100	104	129	105	105
<b>totals (TfL profile)</b>	<b>100 (100)</b>	<b>103 (103)</b>	<b>118 (118)</b>	<b>103 (103)</b>	<b>103 (103)</b>

2.4 TfL's Business Plan (see table 1.3) indicates level funding for maintenance (although falling from 2006/7), safety and congestion reduction areas. Growth from 2003/4 is concentrated in the area-based sector. The Lambeth bid therefore complies with the TfL Business Plan profile in all respects.

2.5 Area-based schemes show the greatest growth in both cases. TfL assumes growth could exceed four times current (2002/3) spending. In Lambeth, growth is set to rise to about five times current (2002/3) levels.

### Bid outline

2.6 On this basis, the BSP submitted for 2003/4 and beyond is as set out overleaf. Note that:

- ◆ the Basic Bid is built on the Growth Scenario 2 bid for 2002/3 increased in line with Lambeth's aspirations for regeneration with overall totals controlled to TfL growth indices (December 2001 guidance) applied to the 2003/4 bid
- ◆ all bus priority works are assumed to be funded via a package/partnership
- ◆ it is assumed that the bridge maintenance allocation will be zero
- ◆ the bid excludes all partnership/package participation
- ◆ road maintenance bids include an allowance for footway maintenance throughout
- ◆ an Augmented Bid includes the addition of funds for maintaining non-Principal Borough roads
- ◆ the Augmented Bid includes a £12m contribution to major interchange works to improve facilities at Brixton and Streatham.

Transport area	Gr. Scenario 2	Basic Bid: based on Growth Scenario 2 and TfL guidance Dec 2001					total bid
	2002/3	2003/4	2004/5	2005/6	2006/7	2007/8	5 year total
<b>Maintenance</b>							
Bridges	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Principal roads incl. Footways	606	1200	1200	1200	1200	1200	6000
<b>sub-total</b>	606	1200	1200	1200	1200	1200	6000
<b>Road safety</b>							
20 mph zones	100	250	250	250	250	250	1250
local safety schemes	300	440	440	440	440	440	2200
safer routes to schools	110	280	350	350	350	350	1680
<b>sub-total</b>	510	970	1040	1040	1040	1040	5130
<b>Reducing congestion</b>							
CPZs	0	150	250	250	250	250	1150
Borough signal works	23	0	0	0	0	0	0
Green travel, Car Free Day	60	200	200	200	200	200	1000
<b>sub-total</b>	83	350	450	450	450	450	2150
<b>Area-based: Streets for People</b>							
Home Zones	375	600	725	825	900	900	3950
traffic calming	0	300	300	350	300	300	1550
Environmental imp: gateways	0	400	500	500	500	500	2400
<b>Area-based: other schemes</b>							
Interchanges (non- major)	0	200	200	200	200	200	1000
bus route review	0	70	100	100	100	100	470
Walking	130	250	250	250	300	300	1350
cycling (non-LCN)	180	350	400	400	350	350	1850
town centres	0	500	750	1000	1000	1000	4250
regeneration schemes	110	280	280	540	310	310	1720
freight	80	80	80	80	80	80	400
air quality	0	200	200	200	200	200	1000
Accessibility to stations etc	0	200	200	200	200	200	1000

<b>Sub-total</b>	875	3430	3985	4645	4440	4440	20940
<b>Basic Bid Total</b>	2074	5950	6675	7335	7130	7130	34220
<b>Augmented Bid</b>							
Non-Principal road maintenance	0	3000	3000	3000	3000	3000	15000
interchanges (major)	0	50	2000	4000	4000	2000	12050
<b>Augmented Bid Total</b>	2074	9000	11675	14335	14130	12130	61270



2.7 Features of the above draft bid are set out below.

#### Maintenance: Principal roads

- 2.8 The structural road maintenance bid for Principal Borough roads is based on undertaking around 3km of work per year on the main non-TLRN network. This includes resurfacing and total reconstruction, as required, and a total annual cost of £1,200,000. The settlement for 2002/3 is £431,000 which allows for two schemes (A214 Streatham Common North and A2199 Croxted Road). It is intended to devote about 20% of any settlement to footway maintenance.
- 2.9 Separate priority lists based on condition and usage have been developed and, where possible, high priority carriageway and footway schemes will be combined in single contracts to minimise total costs. Bus routes have a considerable influence on prioritisation. The parameters assessed include the normal UKPMS parameters together with through routes, the presence of schools and bus routes.
- 2.10 The footway (pavement) maintenance programme is based on the Footway Condition Survey undertaken on 2001, which shows that about 30% of Lambeth's footways are classed as defective, one of the worst records in London.
- 2.11 As children, the elderly, the disabled and other pedestrians occupy two of the top three places in Lambeth's Road User Hierarchy (emergency vehicles claim the top place), it is appropriate that all means of improving pedestrian accessibility are vigorously pursued. Poor footway condition is a major obstacle for the most vulnerable pedestrians.
- 2.12 All Borough roads and footways have been subject to condition survey: a UKPMS report is due in March 2002 and will form the basis for all maintenance programmes.

#### Maintenance: non-Principal roads

- 2.13 TfL has not yet identified a funding source for non-Principal Borough roads but invites bids this year for the first time. The bid of £3m per year reflects the major backlog of such work accumulated over many years. Expenditure at this level over the five year BSP period will provide a stable condition base from which any additional expenditure will represent improving conditions overall (ie the average residual life of the non-Principal network will begin to increase). The condition survey (above) has been used to identify the 100 worst sites on the network and the programme is drawn from this.

#### Road safety

- 2.14 The overall road safety bid of £970,000 seeks double the current settlement of £448,000 for 2002/3. The current settlement includes £250,000 for the Holmewood Pilot Home Zone scheme. Home Zones represent far more than local safety schemes and are now allocated by TfL as area-based schemes. This appropriately reflects their wider range of benefits. The current bid allows for continuation of a substantial area-based local safety scheme programme, together with safer routes to schools and 20mph zone programmes.
- 2.15 Safer routes to schools programmes are based on clusters of schools and include soft and hard measures. Soft measures are usually implemented in the first part of each year to increase awareness and develop safety skills. These are linked to

more broadly-based School Travel Plans. Hard measures are then implemented to take advantage of this learning process.

- 2.16 This programme includes funding of £116,000 a year for 29 vacant school crossing patrols. Lambeth currently funds 31 sites but risk analysis highlights the additional need.

#### Reducing congestion

- 2.17 Reducing congestion is a rather curious TfL transport area as it contains no significant funding in the latest Lambeth settlement nor for London as a whole. However, it does allow additional support the Council's DTLR bursary-funded green travel co-ordinator. This will support a programme of targeted awareness campaigns and organisation of an annual Car Free Day.

- 2.18 CPZs have previously been regarded as self-financing as they should generate new income for the Council through fines and charges that exceed operating costs and should repay start-up and implementation costs over time. However, pump-priming revenue funds are useful to support scheme design work. The planned introduction of the Mayor's congestion charging scheme will generate a need for additional defensive measures, particularly on charging zone boundaries, with parking controls at their heart. TfL has identified an indicative budget of about £1.5m for complementary parking control schemes in Lambeth outside the BSP process. A BSP-based bid allows wider impacts (such as secondary displacement caused by the TfL-based schemes) to be monitored and addressed if necessary, particularly after charging commences.

#### Area-based schemes: general

- 2.19 The TLRN serves most important shopping and commercial centres and has its own funding programme outside the BSP process. However, this is a corridor-based approach whereas TfL and Lambeth both support area-based approaches to address problems and improve streetscape quality and amenity for whole communities. Lambeth's Key Issues Paper: Transport, The Way Ahead also recognises that Lambeth Council is not directly responsible for:

- ◆ major roads (TLRN)
- ◆ public transport
- ◆ major new sub-regional and regional public transport infrastructure.

- 2.20 However, area-based schemes merit additional funding and also provide most scope for integration:

- ◆ between programme elements within the BSP
- ◆ between BSP programmes and major schemes in the Mayor's Transport Strategy
- ◆ between BSP programmes and other funding streams
- ◆ between Borough-based programme and partnerships/packages.

- 2.21 A hierarchical approach helps make sense of this complex situation. In Lambeth, the road user hierarchy is confirmed in the recent Key Issues Paper on Transport. This is presented in Table 2.2.

**Table 2.2:  
Road user hierarchy**

<b>Priority</b>	<b>Road user group</b>
1	emergency vehicles
2	children, elderly people, people with sensory or mobility impairments
3	other pedestrians
4	cyclists
5	public transport
6	public services
7	local business collection and deliveries
8	residents' cars
9	non-local motor traffic

### Walking and cycling

- 2.22 These are separate networks based on (sometimes) inter-connected transport corridors. Lambeth's task is to ensure local communities are connected to these networks and to share the responsibility with higher authorities for improving inter-connections by providing new public transport interchanges and improving sub-standards existing ones. Walking and cycling are the most sustainable ways of gaining access to public transport networks when journeys cannot be comfortably completed using these modes. As accessibility by these modes is required to individual premises, accessibility must be area-wide and not corridor-based. Area schemes of various types provide improved accessibility for all if they are properly integrated. This addresses social inclusion aspirations and allows the mobility necessary for economic growth on a sustainable basis. Thus Lambeth's role in the hierarchy is largely to do with the accessibility needs of pedestrians and cyclists. Of these, one particularly important group is vulnerable pedestrians.
- 2.23 Within the overall walking programme, the Council wishes to continue with its programme of clutter removal (eg obsolete street furniture and lighting) to make better use of available pavement space and improve amenity and quality of provision.
- 2.24 The Council also supports the creation of a designated long distance footpath network. Funding for the North-South Key Route was included in the settlement for 2002/3 and Council would like to expand this programme element, orientating it around leisure destinations and attractive open spaces. The Council would involve "Walk First in Lambeth", Lambeth's pedestrian residents group, in the development of this programme. The programme amounts to £250,000 per year, rising to £300,000 in the third and fourth years.
- 2.25 Cycling is given a high priority in Lambeth. The Council has had a full-time cycling officer since 1999. Cycling is an important, feasible and healthy alternative to the extremes of the road user hierarchy: walking and motor vehicle use. Half the trips in London are under 2 miles in length, a distance that should be easily manageable by cycle by many people. In promoting cycling, the Council accepts that people are discouraged from doing so by safety concerns and traffic conditions. At present,

cycling accounts for about 2% of trips. The Council plans to meet the Mayor's target of 10% by 2012.

2.26 The Council seeks to achieve this target by:

- ◆ complementing the London Cycle Network by expanding the Lambeth Cycle Network (LaCN)
- ◆ the installation of secure and attractive cycle parking facilities at appropriate locations such as stations, interchanges, shopping centres, public places, leisure facilities, places of assembly and employment centres
- ◆ securing the provision of changing and shower facilities directly and through planning agreements at key destinations including schools and employment centres
- ◆ establishing way-marked routes to schools as part of the safer routes to schools programme
- ◆ providing cycle training and initiating awareness campaigns
- ◆ integrating cycle-friendly measures in traffic management and highways works by providing advanced stop lines at signalised junctions, for example, and in the planning process for Red Routes, bus priority, regeneration and other area-based schemes.

2.27 The provision of well designed, high quality cycle-friendly measures in this wide range of circumstances implies a substantial programme. Funding in the range £350,000 to £400,000 per year is sought.

Public transport interchanges

2.28 Although Lambeth has no direct control over public transport services, it can influence their provision by working in partnership with the operators and within teams developing new schemes. The Council does this enthusiastically and has recently confirmed its support for the Mayor's Cross River Transit/London Tram project.

2.29 The Council seeks a new interchange in Brixton to provide new or improve connections between:

- ◆ new platforms on the South London (heavy rail) Line that passes over Brixton Road adjacent to Brixton Underground Station and is part of the Mayor's Orbirail network designated for improvement
- ◆ a proposed southern terminus for Cross River Transit/London Tram which could connect north Lambeth (and north Southwark) with job and leisure opportunities north of the River and provide relief for Underground congestion
- ◆ Brixton Underground Station also located on Brixton Road.

The potential completion date of the Cross River Transit/London Tram is 2007 if this is the first intermediate mode scheme chosen.

- 2.30 Another opportunity for a vastly improved interchange is in the centre of Streatham. The redevelopment of Streatham Station is long overdue. A new bus/rail interchange and additional mixed use development would greatly enhance the travel experience of public transport users and help lever in private finance. Streatham is on the route of the proposed extension of the East London (heavy rail) Line, which could connect Wimbledon with the Thames Gateway and beyond via Streatham and Tulse Hill. This too is part of the Mayor's Orbirail initiative. The Mayor seeks implementation of the East London Line Extensions as an early priority with possible completion in 2006. There may be scope in the longer term to connect with Croydon Tramlink.
- 2.31 Major scheme funds are sought to part fund these two important projects to a total value of £12.05m over five years. It is assumed that this would be funded from outside the Group 1 and 2 "pot" in the TfL Business Plan (see para 1.31). These can be regarded as regeneration projects in that both serve socially disadvantaged parts of inner London. They are compatible with the aspirations of the SELTRANS partnership.
- 2.32 Other public transport interchanges merit improvement. The Council seeks a smaller pot of funds (£200,000 per year) for small scale improvements that would add value to larger schemes funded by operators and developers by ensuring appropriate accessibility measures were in place eg signage, drop kerbs etc. Priority would be given to interchanges on the East London Line (southern) Extension (eg Tulse Hill) to maximise the benefits of that scheme and (later) to connections between the Cross River Transit/London Tram scheme and existing heavy rail, Underground and bus routes.

#### Bus route review

- 2.33 One aspect of public transport development that has been ignored to date is a review of bus routes in and around Lambeth. The perceived poor distribution of existing routes figured prominently in the public consultation exercise in late 2001. The Council seeks modest revenue funds (£70,000) to set up, manage and promote a review in partnership with London Buses in 2003/4. Better community access and integration with proposed new and improved rail services would be an important element.

#### Road vehicles

- 2.34 It is recognised that all modern economies rely heavily on road vehicles. In order to ensure that people's right to own a car and service their businesses is not threatened, roadspace must also be managed according to a hierarchy. To this end, Lambeth's road user hierarchy places cyclists and public transport (buses and trams) above the needs of other vehicle users. This involves developing local cycle networks that complement and provide access for local communities to the LCN. It may also involve bus priority measures off the Red Route system.
- 2.35 Among vehicle users, priority is given to local users, especially local businesses and residents. Non-local car users will be discouraged from using Lambeth's road system for non-essential car journeys by a combination of the Mayor's congestion charging scheme and Lambeth's parking controls.

## Freight

- 2.36 In this context, revenue funds (£80,000) are sought to set up and maintain a Quality Freight Partnership.

## Streets for People

- 2.37 Streets for People is assumed to include Home Zones, traffic calming and related environmental improvements in residential areas. Such schemes change the relationship between vehicle users and pedestrian and cyclists in favour of non-vehicular modes. At their best (in Home Zone form), non-vehicle users are clearly in charge of their own streets and the streets themselves have greatly improved quality and amenity. The TfL guidance stresses quality of design and provision this year for the first time. The Council enthusiastically supports this position and sees Home Zones and related traffic calming schemes as major opportunities to deliver quality. A programme totalling about £7.9m over five years is envisaged.
- 2.38 Quality in design and materials does not come cheaply and a substantial programme is envisaged to ensure quality is delivered. This includes an extended Gateways programme of environmental enhancements. Lambeth has helped deliver two successful Gateway schemes to date with TfL: Waterloo and Lambeth Bridge. The bid allows for additional schemes identified in a feasibility study: Herne Hill, Norwood, Brixton Underground approaches and Clapham. The Gateway programme envisages a programme costing in the range of £400,000 to £500,000 a year.

## Town centres

- 2.39 Public consultation highlighted the need for Borough-wide attention to town centre improvements. A substantial programme is needed to address safety, accessibility and amenity problems primarily affecting pedestrians. These problems extend well beyond the coverage of interchange and other major programmes based on the Mayor's proposals. The bid is for a programme costing £500,000 in 2003/4 peaking at £1,000,000 in 2005-08.
- 2.40 These programmes will be linked to the Council's Community Strategy to assist the economic, social and environmental well-being of community areas.

## Regeneration

- 2.41 Having dealt with schemes that address residential areas and town centres, a regeneration-based programme linked to the Neighbourhood Renewal programme is needed to help promote more jobs, better education, improved health, reduced crime and better housing. Area management schemes that focus on commercial and employment areas are needed. They will include particular mixes of solutions selected from and integrated with other programmes. Improved street lighting and CCTV may be important elements. The funding programme matches that for town centres.
- 2.42 The area schemes for town centres and regeneration will be partly differentiated by ensuring they complement different funding sources.

## Air quality

- 2.43 The Council's Key Issues Paper identifies air quality as an important local issue in Lambeth. Improving air quality is also a core task set by the Mayor and involves developing additional measures to achieve air quality objectives for nitrogen dioxide and fine particles. The latter are thought to be particularly harmful to health. The Council has designated Air Quality Management Areas where national air quality

will not be met by 2005 unless additional action is taken. These include the northern part of the Borough defined by Waterloo, Vauxhall and Kennington, Brixton centre and three main road corridors, two of which are on the TLRN. These designations are the result of the latest predictions based on a number of parameters. The estimation process is quite sensitive and reacts significantly to modified assumptions. One of the most important is the impact of the Mayor's proposed congestion charging scheme in Lambeth.

2.44 There are two solutions to transport-derived air quality problems: reduce the number of motorised vehicles on the network or reduce the emissions of those vehicles still in use. The authorities are looking, with the GLA at the feasibility of creating "low emission zones", from which the most polluting vehicles would be excluded.

2.45 The bid includes £200,000 per year for:

- ◆ setting up roadside vehicle emissions testing equipment (based on the Westminster pilot scheme)
- ◆ install an air quality monitoring station in Brixton and continue development of the four existing sites.

These installations will provide the additional data needed to refine the prediction process and help design remedial measures.

#### Accessibility

2.46 Appropriate accessibility measures should be built in to all relevant schemes but it would be useful to have a separate pot of money for specific measures identified in consultation and not covered elsewhere. A programme of £200,000 is envisaged. This will be focused particularly on the approaches to rail stations other than those dealt with in other parts of the Plan and enable Borough-wide coverage.

dah/lambeth LIP/draft BSP Jan 2002/30.01.02