

Mr Kieran Preston
Director General
West Yorkshire Passenger Transport
Executive
Wellington House, Wellington Street
Leeds, LS1 2DE

Our Ref: M4700/54/3/03
Your Ref:
Date: 14 December 2005

Margaret Jackson
Director, Economic Affairs Group

Government Office for Yorkshire & The
Humber
25 Queen Street
Leeds
LS1 2TW

Enquiries: 0113 280 0600

Direct Line: 0113 233 8200

Fax: 0113 233 8306

Email:

Margaret.jackson@goyh.gsi.gov.uk

2006/07 LOCAL TRANSPORT CAPITAL EXPENDITURE SETTLEMENT

This letter contains the results of the 2006/07 local transport capital settlement both for the whole of England (outside London) and for the West Yorkshire sub-region in particular. The details cover the West Yorkshire's authorities 2006/07 allocations for fully approved major schemes, maintenance and the integrated transport (small scale) schemes block. Also outlined are planning guidelines for the integrated transport block for the remaining years of the second local transport plan (LTP) period (2007/08 to 2010/11). Further decisions about major schemes, including programme entry decisions, will be announced next Spring.

The second five year LTP period starts next Spring, with final LTPs for 2006/2011 needing to be completed by the end of March. Good local transport planning (as evidenced by some of the provisional plans) with strong cross-service working, stakeholder involvement, supported by a strong evidence base and analysis, and with effective arrangements for implementation and monitoring will contribute to achieving local priorities (specifically related to transport and beyond), including the priorities shared between central and local government.

Annual Progress Report (APR)

West Yorkshire's most recent APR demonstrates that in 2004/05 good progress had been made towards implementing the first LTP. Scheme delivery was good, although some major schemes are still progressing slower than forecast. Even more encouraging is the progress made on spend. The West Yorkshire authorities' spent more than their funding allocation for 2004/05 on transport, which enabled some under spends from previous years to be recovered. Performance on achieving local and core targets is also encouraging although the bus patronage target is not on track to be met.

More details about the progress assessments, including some discussion of future arrangements for progress reporting, are set out in Annex 1.

Second Local Transport Plan Overview

82 provisional second LTPs have been produced for England outside London. All plans have been assessed in terms of six criteria, with each criterion being marked as 'very promising', 'promising but needs more work' or 'needs substantial improvement'. These six criteria assessments are built into an overall marking as described below.

The assessment criteria (and sub-criteria) are set out in annex C of the 'Full Guidance on Local Transport Plans' (December 2004). More information about the benchmarks used in the assessment is being published on the DfT website.

Nationally, 16 plans that have at least three criteria marked as 'very promising' (and the remainder as 'promising but needs more work') are being classified as 'very promising' plans. Of the other provisional plans, 59 of them have been classified as 'promising'. The 'promising' category for provisional plans encompasses a wide band of achievement. The remaining 7 provisional plans have been classified as 'needing substantial improvement'.

The Department will build on these assessments when it examines the final plans due in March 2006. At that stage, it expects to assess plans into four bands, "excellent", "good", "fair" and "weak".

We hope that most 'very promising' provisional plans will translate into 'excellent' final plans as long as the promoting authorities maintain their high standards of plan development. Some of the stronger 'promising' provisional plans may be improved upon and also develop into 'excellent' final plans. Most 'promising' provisional plans should translate into at least 'fair' or 'good' final plans, but there is no guarantee that a 'promising' provisional plan might not end up as a 'weak' final plan. The provisional plans which have been classified as 'needing substantial improvement' will need to be better if they are not to be classified as 'weak'.

Provisional Plan Assessment for West Yorkshire

The provisional second LTP for West Yorkshire has been assessed as 'promising'.

The Provisional Plan has clearly set transport in a wider context and incorporates evidence and analysis of the key influences affecting transport. The Plan gives a clear picture of the transport challenges facing West Yorkshire. However the Plan does not succeed in linking this to the planned programme and targets. The Plan provides generally convincing strategies on accessibility and road safety but less so on congestion and air quality. Further detail is required on the demand management measures and the impact these will have on congestion.

Further feedback on your provisional LTP is attached at Annex 2 and feedback on the provisional plans as a whole is attached as Annex 3. In addition, we will be meeting with you to expand on the comments in your LTP/APR assessments.

Performance Funding

The LTP Guidance indicated that up to 25% of an authority's 2006/07 integrated transport block allocation might be varied for performance on delivery and for the quality of provisional plans.

The assessment of provisional LTPs has affected the 2006/07 allocation as follows:

"Very Promising"	+12.5%
"Promising"	no change
"Needing Substantial Improvement"	no change

In addition, the assessment of APRs has affected the 2006/07 allocation as follows:

"Excellent"	+12.5%
"Good"	+5%
"Fair"	-5%
"Weak"	-12.5%

Next year's assessment of final second LTPs and the delivery reports for first LTPs will impact on the planning guidelines allocated for 2007/08 to 2010/11.

Integrated Transport Block

£547m has been allocated towards the integrated transport block nationally. This is an increase of £26m on the previously published planning guidelines. £14m of that extra funding is to support the continuation of funding previously supported through supplementary bids and £12m has been added to fund high quality provisional plans. However the general principle for the second plan period is that planning guidelines cover all the available funding nationally and extra funding for some authorities will be found from reducing the guidelines elsewhere. Thus a corollary of increasing the funding for 2006/07 for the 33 plan areas recording excellent or good progress in 2004/05 is that the authorities recording fair progress (which means generally satisfactory delivery) on their first plans in 2004/05 have had their guidelines for 2006/07 reduced by 5%.

The Department consulted on the introduction of a formula to distribute much of the integrated transport block funding between councils earlier this year. The consultation included proposed financial planning guidelines for local transport plan areas. The Department has considered the comments made during the consultation and made some amendments to the funding formula. These will be published shortly on its website. These result in a planning guideline for your plan area in 2006/07 of £27.134m.

This has been adjusted to produce an integrated transport allocation for 2006/07. The adjustment takes account of the assessed quality of your provisional Plan and the assessed progress made in delivering your first plan in 2004/05:

	2006/07 Guideline £m (i)	Plan Adjustment (ii)	APR Adjustment (iii)	2006/07 Allocation £m (i) x[1 + (ii) + (iii)]
West Yorkshire	27.134	0	+5.0%	28.491

The planning guidelines for the plan area for future years are:

£ms	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11
West Yorkshire	27.146	29.261	31.519	33.931

In accordance with your wishes the Integrated Transport Block has been split between the six authorities as follows:

	<u>£m</u>
Bradford	4.438
Calderdale	2.396
Kirklees	3.837
Leeds	5.871
Wakefield	3.279
WYPTE	8.670
Total	28.491

Maintenance

£672m is being provided across the country for highways capital maintenance in 2006/07. £621m of this is being distributed formulaically and indicative allocations for authorities were announced last year. The remaining £51m is being allocated in response to bids including for strengthening on the Primary Route Network and for smaller authorities exceptional maintenance schemes (some of the larger schemes costing less than £5m).

West Yorkshire's share is confirmed as £33.310m. This is made up of £17.008m for highway maintenance, £9.964m for bridge maintenance and £6.338m for structures on the Primary Route Network.

The funding has been allocated to the five local authorities in accordance with the Department's formula, with the structures on the Primary Route Network added on separately. The final allocations are shown below:

	<u>Highway Maintenance</u>	<u>Bridge Maintenance</u>	<u>Primary Route Structures</u>	<u>Total</u>
Bradford:	2.849	2.338	0.520	5.707
Calderdale:	2.533	1.349	1.633	5.515
Kirklees:	3.290	2.578	2.475	8.343
Leeds:	5.657	2.979	1.710	10.346
Wakefield:	2.679	0.720	0	3.399
Total:	17.008	9.964	6.338	33.310

The Primary Route Structures that are being funded are as follows:

Bradford

- i) A6036 Odsal Phase 3 - £0.520m

Calderdale

- i) A58 Burdock Way Parapets and King Cross Viaduct - £1.633m

Kirklees

- i) A629 Retaining Walls - £0.150
- ii) A62 Queensgate Underpass, Huddersfield Ring Road - £0.250m
- iii) A62 Unna Way – Huddersfield Ring Road - £0.375m
- iv) A62/A629 Huddersfield Ring Road Parapet Strengthening - £0.750m
- v) A638 Ashworth Road Bridge - £0.500m
- vi) A642 Mining Museum Underpass - £0.450m

Leeds

- i) A58(M) Inner Ring Road Parapets Phase 6 - £0.900m
- ii) A64(M) Inner Ring Road Retaining Walls Phase 3 - £0.600m

- iii) A653 Crown Point Bridge Parapet Upgrading - £0.210m

The West Yorkshire APR also contained funding bids for some other structures on the Primary Route Network. These bids have not been funded because the structures are not on the recognised Primary Route Network. These are as follows:

Bradford

- i) A6177 Bolton Road
- ii) A6177 Station Road

Kirklees

- i) A62 Leeds Road Railway Bridge
- ii) A62 Cooper River Bridge

De-trunked Roads

The Department has also accepted bids totalling £38m for support for capital maintenance work on recently de-trunked roads in 2006/07.

Early next year, the Department will also be making formulaic grant allocations for routine maintenance on de-trunked roads for 2006/07, as in previous years. The Government aims to incorporate funding for de-trunked roads into the formula in due course, but is committed to allocating special grant until such time as this can be achieved.

For your authority, the Department has accepted the following bids for funding support:

Bradford

- i) Surface Dressing of Addingham Bypass north of the A6034 roundabout - £0.025m
- ii) Resurfacing of the A65 Church Street/Leeds Road at Ilkley - £0.080m

Calderdale

- i) Reconstruction and Resurfacing of the A646 at Hebden Bridge - £0.290m

Leeds

- i) Re-kerbing and resurfacing of the A650 Drighlington Bypass - £0.210m
- ii) Resurfacing of the A6120 Ring road at Moortown - £0.314m

iii) Resurfacing of the A660 at Adel - £0.154m

Support for Capital Funding Allocations

Financial support for the integrated transport block, highways maintenance and de-trunked roads allocations is being provided in the form of SCE(R) and is part of the single pot. In 2007/08 the equivalent support for exceptional maintenance schemes, bridge strengthening on the Primary Route Network, the integrated transport block in excess of 75% of the guidelines, and the highways capital maintenance block in excess of 75% of the 2006/07 allocations will be made by direct grant. All funding support for major schemes will also be channelled via direct grant.

Major Schemes and Exceptional Schemes

This announcement confirms £209m of funding support for 2006/07 to continue work on 44 existing major schemes.

For the West Yorkshire authorities the following allocation has been made.

£m Scheme	2006/07		
	Total	Grant	SCE(R)
Leeds Inner Ring Road Stage 7	26.483	11.267	15.216

As set out in last year's decision letter, funding for each stage of WYPTE's Bus/Education Transport Scheme is dependent upon the successful implementation of earlier phases. We are considering the information provided and hope to be in a position to make a decision on the release of phase three funding shortly. Subject to this decision the allocations will be £7.000m for 2006/07 and £0.504m for 2007/08 and we have included provision for this in the settlement.

Decisions on other schemes, including WYPTE's bids for Wakefield Westgate Station and the A65 Kirkstall Road Quality Bus Corridor and Kirklees' Structures bid will be taken after regional advice has been obtained early next year.

We are considering Leeds' bid for a cost increase on the East Leeds Link scheme. We will inform you of these decision in due course.

Conclusion

The preparation of provisional LTPs has meant that 2005 has once again been a challenging year. I would like to record our appreciation of your efforts and commitment on both the LTP and APR process. I know Phil Jones and his team appreciate the co-operation you have given them throughout the year and we will continue to work with you as you finalise your second LTP.

Please contact Phil Jones if you have any questions of detail on this letter. I know Phil and his team have met with you already to provide feedback on your provisional LTP and we hope to be able to meet with your authority early in the New Year to provide more detailed feedback on both the APR and LTP.

Margaret Jackson
Director Economic Affairs

ANNEX 1 – ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORT SCORING AND ASSESSMENT

Use of scores

The assessment of APRs produces a transport score for each LTP area. All authorities have been given a performance classification according to their score - "excellent", "good", "fair" or "weak". The scores also provide a useful indication for the DfT of local authorities' progress towards delivering their LTPs.

Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPA)

Local authorities' APR performance classifications form one component of the transport element of the CPA "Environment" block. The results of this year's CPA refresh are due to be announced by the Audit Commission shortly. Further details of the methodology can be found on the Audit Commission's website.

How your score was determined

This year the scores were derived from our assessment of local authorities' performance in 2004/05 alone. Our assessment criteria closely reflected the three criteria set out in Annex 1 of the 2005 Guidance on producing APRs.

In respect of the delivery of their first local transport plans during 2004/05, authorities in most plan areas (46) were assessed as "fair", with 22 as "good" and 11 as "excellent". 6 authorities were assessed as "weak" - two fewer than last year.

The levels of performance required to reach the "fair", "good" and "excellent" classifications are broadly equivalent to those required to reach "average", "above average" and "well above average", respectively, last year. The marking system has been altered and the scores it produces, particularly for weaker and middling performance, are higher than those produced by last year's marking system - so the scores required to reach the "fair" and "good" categories this year are higher than those required last year to reach the "average" and "above average" categories.

Your score

Your score, determined as described above, is **83%**. It means that the delivery of your first local transport plan in 2004/05 has been classed as **good**.

WEST YORKSHIRE	
Core Targets Score = 25.2	
On Track	Total KSIs Child KSIs Rural Accessibility
Not on Track	Bus Patronage Cycling
No Clear Evidence	-
Comments	West Yorkshire are 'on track' to meet 3 out of their 5 core targets. Good progress has been made towards achieving the safety targets. The Bus Passenger Satisfaction indicator has been discounted as it is not included as a core indicator for 2005 APR.
Local Targets Score = 29.5	
On Track	11 out of 14 targets
Not on Track	3 out of 14 targets
No Clear Evidence	-
Comments	West Yorkshire are on track to meet 79% of their local targets. The Traffic Growth in Leeds target has been judged as 'not on track' because the figures for traffic in Leeds are not in line with the target trajectory.
Delivery Score = 28.17	
Scheme Delivery	Delivered 14/17 scheme types
Spend	West Yorkshire spent 118% of their 2004/05 local transport allocation
Majors	Significant delays have occurred on Leeds - East Leeds Link and Wakefield - Glasshoughton Coalfields link.
Comments	West Yorkshire are performing well on delivery of local schemes and are spending more than their local transport allocation.
Total	83 % (Good)

APR Scoring Summary

APRs were scored out of 100 marks as follows:

Progress towards targets and objectives (70 marks)

- core indicators maximum 35 marks
- local indicators maximum 35 marks

Effective delivery of schemes and spending programme (30 marks)

- delivery of small scheme types maximum 10 marks
- effective spending programme maximum 10 marks
- progress on major schemes maximum 10 marks

Progress towards targets and objectives

Marks were allocated based on our assessment of progress towards targets as follows:

"On track"	5 marks
"Not on track"	1 mark if 2004/05 figure has improved compared to baseline
	1 mark if 2004/05 figure has improved compared to the previous measurement
	1 mark if APR includes a clear and credible explanation about how the authority will meet the target in future years

Final marks for both core and local targets were calculated using the formula (which scales then to reflect plans containing different number of targets):

$(\text{Total marks} \div \text{Number of Assessed Indicators}) \times 7$

Some targets were discounted from calculations. For example if:

- they were judged as "no clear evidence" (this includes those targets where no data was collected this year, unless the authority had indicated in previous reporting that it would not be collected e.g. biennial survey);
- local indicators were essentially the same as a core indicator;
- an output target that was met in previous years and had not been stretched for this APR.

Effective Delivery of Scheme and Spending Programme

Individual Small Scheme Types

Scheme types that were judged to have 25% negative divergences in cost or number of schemes delivered were counted as not delivered as planned (as explained in the APR guidance). Final marks were awarded on a sliding scale based on the percentage of scheme types delivered as planned (taking into account if any divergence was clearly explained).

Effective Spending Programme

Effective spend was marked according to a sliding scale based on the percentage of total transport block allocation spent in 2004/05. 100%+ spend = 10 marks.

Major Schemes

Each fully or provisionally approved major scheme (not those submitted for regional prioritisation) was assessed against a scale related to the length of any reported delays or the size of any new cost increases. Each major scheme was assessed separately and the final score averaged. Where an authority has no major scheme, the total score for the small schemes and spending programme was multiplied by 1.5.

Delivery Nationally

Our assessments of progress in delivering first local transport plans in 2004/05 cover three areas - how far authorities are towards achieving the targets they set locally on core indicators (local public transport patronage, road casualty reduction, cycling and rural accessibility), how far they are towards achieving locally set targets for local indicators and whether they are delivering their planned programmes. As indicated previously, maintenance indicators were not assessed this year.

Many authorities remain on track to deliver local casualty reduction targets consistent with the national targets, or more stretching than them. There is a great deal of variation in the progress recorded, with some local authority areas well behind their targets. Progress on delivering bus patronage and cycling targets is more patchy.

Overall a substantial majority of the local targets set for local indicators are on track to being achieved.

In 2004/05 virtually all authorities spent in excess, up to or virtually up to the levels of their transport block capital allocations. There continues to be evidence of some difficulties delivering some of important elements of some block programmes - for example bus priority measures.

Overall progress in 2004/05 was similar to that achieved in 2003/04.

Future Progress Assessments

Next year progress will be assessed across the whole of the first LTP period (2001 to 2006) on the basis of delivery reports. The Department consulted on draft guidance to local authorities last summer as part of the consultation about 'Financial Planning Guidelines for Local Transport Plans'. A summary of the issues raised in the consultation and the Department's response to them will be published on the DfT website shortly, along with finalised guidance to local authorities.

Local transport plans have now been in place for five years and the vast majority of local authorities are delivering schemes with the increased investment that has accompanied the

plans. This investment is now delivering outcomes so the Department will be introducing a more focused progress reporting regime for the second plan period, in line with the general Government move to reduce the reporting burden on local government.

With this in mind, the Department will not assess how closely actual and programmed scheme delivery are matched, in order to give councils more latitude to respond to local circumstances and concerns. Authorities should now have their own processes in place to monitor the delivery of their transport programmes, targets and objectives. It is important that these processes are maintained and improved where necessary. Effective forward planning and programming remain important if outcomes are to be delivered effectively.

In general, the first round of progress reports about second local transport plans will not be needed until 2008 and it is likely that progress will be assessed every two years rather than every year as has been the case in the first plan period. Exceptionally, more frequent reports may be required from those authorities whose plans are classified as weak, at least until progress has been demonstrated.

These changes enable the Department to reduce the financial and output reporting required from authorities.

Advice about future progress reports will be published nearer the time, but it is likely that there will be a strong focus on the delivery of outcome related targets. Where possible this will take into account how far those targets were considered particularly stretching in the light of earlier performance. Reports will also be expected to show absolute levels of progress including progress as measured by the indicators which are mandatory for all authorities during the second plan period. These indicators focus on accessibility, the environment, congestion, buses, road safety, and highways maintenance. There is likely to be a key interest in how authorities are aligning their broad plans to tackle congestion with their approach under the network management duty.

Local Transport Plan Assessment – Annex 2

Name of Local Authority: West Yorkshire

Date of Document: July 2005

Criteria One: Context

Table 1a Context	Comments
<p>The consistency of a plan's objectives, targets and programmes with the wider policy and planning context.</p> <p>Grade</p> <p>Promising but needs more work</p>	<p>The Plan makes the connection between LTP objectives and the longer term community vision for West Yorkshire. The focus in the LTP strategy on supporting economic regeneration and improving accessibility reflects closely the long term vision but it is unclear whether the scheme programme is similarly geared to supporting that vision.</p> <p>The Plan describes how the LTP sits alongside other local strategies and plans covering for example urban and rural renaissance and community cohesion. However it does not explain how far aims, objectives, policies and priorities are closely aligned across the various strategies and plans.</p> <p>The strategy is broadly consistent with the plans for housing growth and economic regeneration but there is no evidence that the LTP is influencing other local authority programmes, for example the plans for the location of new development.</p> <p>The Plan sets out how the LTP and Regional Transport Strategy objectives link together and how LTP actions are contributing to RTS priorities. However the Plan does not make clear how it relates to the Regional Economic Strategy.</p> <p>The Plan is broadly consistent with national transport policies, though its solutions to current and emerging problems on both the strategic and local network focuses on increasing capacity rather than managing demand.</p> <p>Areas for development include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • evidence that the balance of the programme reflects and supports the strategy and long term vision • more evidence of alignment of LTP aims and objectives with those for other local strategies • an indication of how the LTP is shaping authorities' other programmes

Context Sub- Criteria Assessment

Table 1b Sub Criteria	Needs Substantial Improvement	Promising but needs more work	Very Promising
1a The Plan reflects the long term vision of local authorities serving the plan area and a long term local transport strategy consistent with that vision.		x	
1b The delivery programme, and LTP objectives and targets, are consistent with the full range of local policy aims and objectives and the outputs of the wider local corporate planning framework (e.g. corporate plans, community strategies and Best Value performance plans).	x		
1c The Plan will influence, and will therefore be broadly consistent with, other decisions of local authorities in the area covered by the LTP e.g. in housing, planning economic development, education and social services.		x	
1d The Plan is broadly consistent with, and will influence the development of, spatial planning and economic development strategies produced at the regional level.		X	
1e The Plan is consistent with relevant national-level policies - in particular as they relate to strategic transport networks and their users, the environment, sustainable communities, and economic development.		X	

2. Criteria Two: Analysis

Table 2a Analysis	Comments
<p>The Plan is built on a sound analysis of local transport problems and opportunities.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Grade</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Very Promising</p>	<p>The Plan contains substantial and highly relevant analysis of existing and emerging transport issues, and of the key influences affecting future demand. It explains the transport issues that this gives rise to- in terms of congestion, accessibility and social inclusion – in different parts of West Yorkshire.</p> <p>The Plan explains that the strategy has been developed in the light of past experience but there is little evidence of this other than in respect of the road safety strategy, which has been clearly informed by a safety study in disadvantaged areas.</p> <p>The impact of major schemes, in terms of their potential contribution towards priorities and targets has been analysed. The Plan has also analysed the potential outcomes from different strategic approaches. But it is less clear how far it has examined a range of possible solutions and evaluated the impact of key elements of the strategy, including demand management options and interventions that make the best use of existing capacity.</p> <p>The Plan identifies public transport improvements as holding the key to tackling congestion and accessibility issues but fully considers the contribution of all other modes, identifying issues and planned solutions within the strategy for addressing them.</p> <p>The Plan has made good use of modelling and mapping data to inform the choice of the strategic options and consideration of accessibility issues.</p> <p>The environmental impact of different strategic options has been fully considered and draws on the results from a scoping report.</p> <p>Areas for development include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the Plan has been developed with the benefit from LTP1 experience and best practice elsewhere • More evidence of the consideration and potential impact of demand management options and interventions that make better use of existing capacity. • Evidence that the analysis of the transport issues has been carried forward and informed the planned programme and proposed targets.

Analysis Sub- Criteria Assessment

Table 2b Sub Criteria	Needs Substantial Improvement	Promising but needs more work	Very Promising
2a The Plan contains appropriate analysis relating not only to existing local transport problems, but also to possible emerging problems, and to opportunities to deliver a better quality of life to local communities.			x
2b The Plan's analysis of problems and opportunities is fully informed by the existing evidence base, including the past experience of the Plan authorities and others.		x	
2c The Plan's analysis avoids making assumptions that are not necessarily supported by evidence.		x	
2d The Plan addresses problems and opportunities across the full range of transport modes used in the area - including car travel, walking, cycling, public transport, taxis and private hire travel, distribution of freight, the use of public service vehicles, coach travel, motorcycling, wheelchair use and horse riding.			x
2e The Plan makes appropriate use of analytical techniques (e.g. modelling and accessibility planning), and air quality assessment. ¹		x	
2f. The Plan demonstrates that the environmental impact of Plan schemes and policies has been fully considered and that the LTP will take opportunities to improve the environment (e.g. through the inclusion of selected analysis produced in support of a Strategic Environmental Assessment.)			x

¹ There is no expectation that full accessibility analysis using Accession or similar software will have been carried out in time to inform the July 2005 submission

3. Criteria Three: Maximising Value from Resources

Table 3a Maximising value from Resources	Comments
<p>The Plan will deliver the best possible results, given the likely availability of public funds and the current state of infrastructure and transport services.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Grade</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Promising but needs more work</p>	<p>There is evidence of consideration being given to alternative strategic scenarios with a view to achieving the best outcome from available resources and to a range of measures for making more effective use of the network and manage demand. However it is unclear how far value for money considerations underlie the preferred strategic options and planned programme, and the extent to which demand management measures, including smarter choice options, have been examined as alternatives to public transport or infrastructure investment</p> <p>The Plan sets out a general approach to maintenance of existing assets but does not explain how priorities are determined in relation to objectives and targets. Each authority and the PTE are developing and implementing asset management plans but it is unclear how they are being brought together in relation to TAMP.</p> <p>The Plan gives particular weight to the potential for improved bus services as a mechanism for managing overall demand but needs to give greater consideration to smarter choice options.</p> <p>The Plan sets out clearly the plans of each authority in West Yorkshire for taking on the network management duty.</p> <p>The Plan identifies areas where revenue funding supports LTP funding initiatives, in particular bus facilities and services, and maintenance. However it does not explore the possible use of revenue funds alongside the capital programme to deliver better outcomes.</p> <p>The Plan does not address how it would manage budgets where scheme costs are not in line with the profile.</p> <p>Areas for development include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More evidence that the value for money of the programme, and components within it, has been assessed • More evidence of the consideration of different packages or approaches to demand management and assessment of their potential impact, including contribution towards achievement of bus strategy objectives • Evidence of consideration of the scope for co-ordination of capital and revenue funded interventions • Evidence of systems in place for managing budgets and re-appraising schemes in the light of cost increases or delays

Maximising Value from Resources Sub- Criteria Assessment

Table 3b Sub Criteria	Needs Substantial Improvement	Promising but needs more work	Very Promising
3a. The Plan analysis has sought to identify and prioritise the local transport policies and schemes that would deliver the best possible value for money.		x	
3b. Every opportunity will be taken to make the best use of existing assets, both to avoid the need for new or upgraded infrastructure and to maximise the benefits of new or upgraded infrastructure.	x		
3c. The Plan would maintain assets in a cost-effective way, and that asset maintenance will be informed by LTP objectives and targets.		x	
3d. The Plan adequately considers (in the context of local circumstances) a range of potential options for delivering congestion, pollution and road safety benefits through managing demand for travel by road and influencing travel behaviour.		x	
3e. The Plan demonstrates how the Network Management duty will be implemented in a way that will maximise the value of existing traffic networks.		x	
3f. The Plan is not just a capital investment plan, but demonstrates how opportunities will be taken to improve transport outcomes through the effective use of revenue budgets.		x	
3g. The Plan is framed in a way that is consistent with a realistic view of funding from all sources - including the 'planning guidelines' provided by the Department - and does not contain unfunded aspirations.	Pass		
3h. The Plan will implement a robust and effective approach to budgeting, the control of costs, and the securing of partnership funding from non-LTP sources.	x		

4. Criteria Four: Involvement

Table 4a Involvement	Comments
<p>The effectiveness of consultation and involvement of stakeholders in local transport.</p> <p>Grade</p> <p>Promising but needs more work</p>	<p>There is evidence of internal consultation with different services within the authority and of cross-Departmental working on accessibility initiatives and the development of accessibility planning. But there is no evidence offered to indicate whether this internal joint working has helped shape the Plan or that the LTP has influenced other local plans.</p> <p>The Plan identifies issues – bus fares, ticketing, supported rail services and freight initiatives – where joint working takes place or is planned. This is in addition to partnership working on national policies and Yorkshire-wide major schemes. However there is no evidence of consultation and a co-ordinated approach to strategy development with neighbouring authorities.</p> <p>There is evidence of consultation with Local Strategic Partnerships and key stakeholder groups – through largely consultation events and workshops - in developing the Plan, particularly on accessibility and road safety issues. It is unclear how far this consultation has shaped or had a marked impact on the Plan.</p> <p>The Plan includes a clear commitment to work with the Highways Agency (and Network Rail and DfT Rail) to ensure LTP plans complement improvements to the strategic network. There is clear evidence of close working with HA on major schemes and key working groups.</p> <p>The Plan includes a commitment to on-going consultation on the final LTP and key elements within it.</p> <p>Areas for development include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of cross-Departmental working shaping development of the final Plan and of the LTP influencing other local plans • Evidence of a co-ordinated approach to strategy development and implementation on cross-boundary issues • Evidence of continuing stakeholder involvement and consultation and an indication of where this has influenced the final Plan

Involvement Sub- Criteria Assessment

Table 4b Sub Criteria	Needs Substantial Improvement	Promising but needs more work	Very Promising
4a. The Plan has been developed with the full and active participation of all relevant tiers of local government and all relevant departments or divisions within local authorities.	x		
4b. The Plan has been developed in a way that fully addresses local transport needs and opportunities across administrative boundaries.	x		
4c. The Plan has been developed with the active involvement of a wide range of interested local stakeholders – including companies delivering transport services, other local businesses, local public services, local communities and special interest groups – and where possible makes use of existing consultative and planning bodies (e.g. Local Strategic Partnerships, Rural Transport Partnerships).		x	
4d. The Plan's policies and schemes with impacts on strategic transport networks have been developed with the other responsible agencies (e.g. the Highways Agency, other DfT delivery agencies, rail industry bodies, freight operators, operators of coach services).		x	
4e. The Plan analysis is informed by consideration of the full range of people, communities, public services and businesses affected by the Plan. ²		X	

² 4e originally appeared under the analysis criteria in Annex C of the LTP guidance

5. Criteria Five: Performance Management

Table 5a Performance Management	Comments
<p>The robustness and quality of the process for setting and monitoring local targets and trajectories.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Grade</p> <p>Needs Substantial Improvement</p>	<p>The proposed targets reflect the Plan's objectives and priorities with local targets covering planned specific outcomes. The Plan does not though explain how the strategy, delivery plan and targets relate to each other and will address the challenges identified by the analysis. there is no evidence of systems in place for managing risks and reviewing targets.</p> <p>The Plan does not explain what systems and processes are to be put in place for monitoring and reviewing targets</p> <p>It is unclear how the targets will be achieved through the planned programme and how risks to delivery of the programme and targets would be managed.</p> <p>Areas for development include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrating that the strategy, delivery plan and targets will address the challenges identified by the analysis • Evidence of how the planned programme supports achievement of the targets • Details of the system for monitoring and reviewing targets that shows what would be done to ensure targets remain challenging but realistic • A detailed risk assessment that sets out a range of realistic mitigation measures for keeping the programme and targets on track

Performance Management Sub Criteria Assessment

Table 5b Sub Criteria	Needs Substantial Improvement	Promising but needs more work	Very Promising
5a. The Plan targets have been set in a way that reflects the transport aims and objectives of the local authority or authorities involved, and the wider policy and planning context, instead of (for example) a predetermined transport investment programme.		x	
5b. Development of the Plan has brought about a robust system for reviewing LTP targets to ensure they are, and will remain, realistic and challenging.	x		
5c. The Plan targets will measure outcomes directly, or measure outputs demonstrably related to outcome		x	
5d. The Plan will include all relevant mandatory targets and indicators.	Pass		
5e. The plan targets will be accompanied where possible by year by year trajectories, and a robust process will be in place for setting these trajectories and monitoring performance against those trajectories.	Not assessed for provisional LTP2		
5f. The plan identifies how the targets will be achieved, the key risks to the achievement of the targets, and how those risks will be managed	x		

6. Criteria Six: Priorities

Table 6a Priorities	Comments
<p>The extent to which the identified shared priorities, and the identified quality of life issues, have driven the development of the LTP delivery programme, objectives and targets.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Grade</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Promising but needs more work</p>	<p>The Plan indicates that good progress has been made on accessibility planning. It explains how mapping packages have been used to identify levels of public transport accessibility and areas where access is a particular problem. There is also evidence of partnership working and the embedding of accessibility planning across services and in development of the strategy.</p> <p>The strategy for tackling congestion is less convincing. It focuses on bus service improvements achieving modal shift and is forecasting an increase in patronage of 5% over the LTP period. The Plan identifies modest demand management measures but does not make clear how far these will help contain or reduce congestion and over what timescale.</p> <p>The Plan identifies Air Quality Management Areas and Areas of Concern and puts forward a strategy for reducing emissions that relies heavily on modal shift and capacity improvements to tackle congestion issues.</p> <p>The road safety strategy identifies groups and areas at risk through analysis of road casualty statistics, recognises the importance of education, training and enforcement and makes the connection to wider policies around health and community safety.</p> <p>Areas for improvement include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developing the analytical base for the accessibility strategy and evidence that accessibility assessments have informed the Plan's policies and priorities • More evidence that the contribution of demand management measures in addressing congestion has been considered • Evidence of a more balanced and comprehensive strategy for addressing current and emerging air quality problems • More evidence that quality of life issues have been taken into account in development of the strategy and programme

Priorities Sub Criteria Assessment

Table 6b Sub Criteria	Needs Substantial Improvement	Promising but needs more work	Very Promising
6a. The Plan contains evidence that the developing accessibility strategy will deliver accessibility objectives, and will ensure those strategies and objectives are addressed by the wider local policy and planning agenda.		x	
6b. The Plan convincingly addresses current and emerging congestion problems using a range of policy tools (or provides convincing evidence that there are no such problems), and ensures that the need to address congestion levels is addressed by the wider local policy and planning agenda.	x		
6c. The Plan convincingly addresses current and emerging air quality problems – especially those in Air Quality Management Areas – that are related to local transport (or provides evidence that there are no such problems), and ensures that local transport related air quality problems are addressed by the wider local policy and planning agenda.	x		
6d. The Plan will convincingly deliver better road safety outcomes, especially for vulnerable road users, through a range of policy tools, and ensures that the road safety objectives are addressed by the wider local policy and planning agenda		x	
6e. The Plan policies and schemes will demonstrably take all reasonable opportunities to deliver: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - sustainable and prosperous communities - enhanced, 'people-friendly' public spaces - protection and enhancement of landscapes and biodiversity - enhanced personal security - healthier communities - fewer transport-related noise problems - progress towards climate change objectives 		x	

ANNEX 3: KEY GENERAL ISSUES ASSOCIATED WITH PROVISIONAL SECOND LOCAL TRANSPORT PLANS

In general, the provisional second local transport plans provide evidence of good standards of local transport planning.

However a number of the provisional plans lacked satisfactory analysis and there are many plans that would benefit from stronger analysis.

The Department issued a three side note in September, 'Preparation of Final Local Transport Plans: Next Steps', and local authorities should refer to this alongside the guidance on local transport plans that the Department issued in December 2004. Key issues, which the Department did not assess fully in the provisional plans, but which will be examined in more depth in final plans include:

- performance management - including the treatment of risks, the systems set up to monitor targets and if necessary take corrective action, the analysis and evidence underlying the targets set;
- the integration of air quality within the plan where there are local transport related air quality management areas or air quality is a key local objective;
- accessibility strategies - including an improved evidence base and analysis, cross-sectoral working, action planning and indicator and target setting;
- how authorities are aligning their broad plans to tackle congestion with their approach under the network management duty.

Although work is still in progress to meet the new requirement for producing accessibility plans, some good examples have been developed. These included Merseyside, Greater Nottingham and Oxfordshire.

Air Quality/Climate Change

Pages 48-51 of the LTP guidance and paragraph 11 of the September note covered what authorities should include in their LTPs on air quality issues. But some provisional plans were less than convincing in their treatment of air quality issues. In particular, the way they considered congestion and the environmental impacts of road traffic, how public transport could contribute to an improvement in air quality, and the consideration of the impact assessment of air quality measures were lacking. The final local transport plans should adopt a strategic approach to the air quality shared priority by demonstrating effective links between air quality and other key shared priority areas.

Additional assistance for authorities in developing the air quality aspects of final local transport plans is available on Defra's action planning website (operated by Casella Stanger) http://www.casellastanger.com/actionplan_helpdesk/.

Page 56 of the LTP guidance covered how LTPs should demonstrate their contribution to the achievement of the UK's CO₂ targets. This was not dealt with well in many plans.

Congestion/Network Management

Pages 35-39 of the LTP guidance indicated that strong analysis and evidence was needed to underpin strategies for managing the network to tackle congestion, particularly where they involve major investment. In many cases this was not done. It is important that LTPs consider the contributions to reducing congestion of different modes of transport (including public transport, walking or cycling), parking provision and pricing and priorities between road users for scarce road space. In respect of buses, where Local Authorities have separately identified concessionary passengers (with expected uplift levels) from other patronage growth levels, it would be helpful if they set this out.

Pages 37-38 of the LTP guidance covered the requirements of the network management duty. However, there were examples of LTPs that gave cause for concern where authorities were failing to make any mention of network management plans or templates that were known to be well advanced. Paragraph 3.15 of the LTP guidance lists some of the important issues to consider and we expect to see quantifiable or otherwise appropriate evidence to support them. LTPs are one of the sources of evidence the Department will use in determining how a local traffic authority is performing its network management duties and hence, whether statutory intervention may be required to enforce these. More details may be obtained from DfT and GO engagement teams.

Major Schemes

Pages 62-67 of the LTP guidance covered major schemes. However, despite the warnings of funding pressures on majors in the guidance, a number of plans contained unrealistic numbers of proposals for major schemes. The case for major new infrastructure needs to be considered in detail before any schemes are put forward for delivery during or shortly after the second plan period - this should include the thorough consideration of alternatives (including a realistic 'Do Minimum' case) and supporting demand management measures.

Stakeholder Involvement

Both the first and second (paragraph 5.16) editions of the LTP guidance have emphasised the importance of effective consultation. The level and way stakeholders and the public have been involved in transport strategy development, as evidenced by the plans, have varied. The Department encourages all local authorities to continue with active stakeholder involvement over the next five years.

Public Rights of Way Improvement Plans

Pages 83 and 84 of the LTP Guidance covered this subject. In finalising plans authorities should update the progress reports on the development of their Rights of Way Improvement Plan included in the provisional plans as requested in the guidance. As work on rights of way planning has advanced in many areas, there should be more evidence in final plans that the contribution of the rights of way network has been considered in addressing problems and opportunities across the full range of transport modes used in the area, including walking, cycling, horse riding and wheelchair use.

Schools White Paper

Authorities will also need to be aware of the transport implications of the Schools White Paper - *Higher Standards, Better Schools For All* - published on 25 October. The White Paper proposes an over-arching duty on local authorities to assess the travel and transport needs of all pupils, and to promote safe and sustainable methods of travel to school. It will extend rights to home to school transport for pupils from low income families (free transport to any of the 3 nearest suitable secondary schools between 2 and 6 miles away, and free transport to the nearest school more than 2 miles away for primary aged children); and allow for the setting up of Pathfinder authorities to implement innovative solutions to home to school transport.

Finance Forms

Funding support for the integrated transport and highways maintenance blocks is provided on the basis that authorities intend to invest in these areas to the levels supported. The Department will circulate finance forms F11 and F12 for return with final plans in March and any local authorities planning to use less funding than the planning guidelines should indicate this on the forms. A short proforma to enable targets and trajectories to be recorded in a consistent way in final plans is also being circulated.

Funding Support for Exceptional Maintenance, PRN Bridge Strengthening Schemes and Detrunked Roads for 2007/08

Requests for funding support for these schemes can be made alongside the full LTP2s or separately by 31st July 2006.