

22 June 2015

Anthony Cartmell [<mailto:ajcartmell@fonant.com>]

Dear Mr Cartmell,

Worthing Sustainable Transport Scheme

Thank you for your further email of 19 June.

Our answers to your supplementary questions are given below. I cannot see any reasonable grounds for progressing your complaint to the next stage of our complaints procedure.

You have a concern that the Worthing Sustainable Scheme is not a transport scheme. However, when the Government signed the Growth Deal with all the LEP's, we were specifically encouraged to look for all solutions to promote economic growth and not to be restricted by Departmental responsibilities. Because of this, there is no requirement on any LEP to restrict the funding to a single Department's area, such as transport.

Even if there were, a scheme like the Worthing Sustainable Package would be consistent with other transport schemes, such as the Department for Transport's Local Sustainable Transport Fund and Sustrans' most recent Active Cities initiative.

Because of this, I cannot proceed any further with your complaint.

Answers to specific questions

A) Quote: "It means that the benefits have not been quantified. The scheme does have a benefit to cost ratio in the region of 4 to 1, which is comfortably in excess of our minimum requirement of 2 to 1. If the additional benefits had been quantified, the benefit to cost ratio would have been even higher."

Q1: Why were the transport benefits of this scheme, that purports to be a "Sustainable Transport" scheme, not quantified?

A1. In relatively small schemes we do not expect promoting authorities to quantify every benefit, particularly when the cost of evaluating those benefits is disproportionately high. This is standard practice. See also answer 4 below.

Q2: Can the LEP now quantify the transport benefits of this "sustainable transport" scheme, to show that the scheme "provides good value for money, as defined by the Department for Transport" as required by the LEP's own Assurance Framework [section 47, page 8]?

A2. No. The scheme has demonstrated that it offers good value for money against the benefits that can be quantified. Additional benefits would only increase an already positive benefit to cost ratio. It would not be a good use of public money to ask for further assessment.

B) Quote: "We are not, as you know, a transport organisation and so do not have to confine ourselves purely to transport schemes."

Q3: Why does the LEP's Strategic Economic Plan specifically detail the amounts of money allocated to "Sustainable Transport Packages" by the "Local Transport Body" if it is true that this money can be spent on non-transport schemes?

A3. This is not a non-transport scheme. It has both non-transport and transport elements, including improving facilities for pedestrians and reducing trip hazards. The Local Transport Body was considered to be the most suitable body to examine this scheme. We do not expect that a different conclusion would have been reached if the scheme had been considered by another committee or body of Coast to Capital.

Q4: Please could the LEP explain how the "Worthing Sustainable Transport Package" meets "the requirements for the DfT's Transport Business Case guidance" as required by the LEP's own Assurance Framework [section 54, p.9]?

A4. Section 54 of the Assurance Framework deals with large transport schemes costing more than £5 million. This section does not apply to the Worthing Sustainable Package as it has a gross cost of less than £5 million. Schemes of this scale are governed by section 57, page 10:

The LTB may agree a reduced level of assessment for small schemes (for example those costing less than £5 million including local contributions) and/or for schemes which are for a specified purpose, such as sustainability packages and resilience schemes. Such schemes could have reduced business cases and shorter consultation periods if the LTB is satisfied that the requirements applying to larger schemes would be disproportionate."

The Department for Transport considers pedestrian improvements to be core transport activities and had funded many schemes of this type, for example through its Local Sustainable Transport Fund. Our independent consultants Parsons Brinckerhoff have confirmed that this scheme is good value for money and should be funded.

Yours sincerely,



Ron Crank
Chief Executive