

# Public Document Pack

## Executive Member Decisions

Friday, 3rd May, 2019

Time Not Specified

---

### AGENDA

1. **Highway Maintenance Prioritisation Model**  
**Highway Maintenance Prioritisation Model EMD** 2 - 8  
**Highway Maintenance Prioritisation Model EIA Checklist**  
**Prioritisation Model**

Date Published: Date Not Specified  
Denise Park, Chief Executive

## EXECUTIVE MEMBER DECISION



**REPORT OF:** Executive Member for Regeneration

**LEAD OFFICERS:** Director of Environment and Operations

**DATE:** 01/04/2019

**PORTFOLIO/S AFFECTED:** Regeneration

**WARD/S AFFECTED:** All

**SUBJECT:** Highway Maintenance Prioritisation Model

### 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This briefing paper describes the composition, structure and utilisation of a prioritisation model for highway capital maintenance schemes.

### 2. RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Executive Member:

1. Approves the highways prioritisation model.
2. Authorises its publication on the Council's website.
3. Authorises an annual review and development of the prioritisation model to ensure that it continues to reflect the needs of the network.

### 3. BACKGROUND

The authority's highway network demands significant and continuing maintenance to ensure that it remains fit for purpose. Determining which particular roads receive maintenance at any given time ensures that the budget is used in the most efficient manner. Techniques such as lifecycle planning are well established in the authority and have improved the quality of maintenance of the fabric of the highway. Until now proposed carriageway resurfacing schemes have been approved by the Executive Member based on unpublished models and analytical methods. These techniques have provided a forward works programme of up to two years and have been extended to include footways and cycle paths, street lighting and traffic signals. The assessment of highway structures has been developed separately and continues to provide a comprehensive works programme funded through the Local Transport Plan.

### 4. KEY ISSUES & RISKS

The model is described in detail in Appendix 1. It will act as a guide to engineers considering recommending resurfacing schemes to the Executive Member for inclusion in capital maintenance works programmes. Engineering staff will continue to consider all mitigating circumstances, enabling them to draft a proposed works programme that considers all parameters relevant to the maintenance of the highway network. A number of relevant criteria are assigned weighted attributes, the sum of the scores of these criteria is ranked and the highest scoring schemes are recommended for maintenance works. The criteria are described below, clearly the choice of criteria, attribute and the

assigned score are crucial to the efficient functioning of the model itself and the programme of schemes it produces. The costs of routine reactive maintenance are assessed separately to this direct model and may influence the final works programme if these costs appear to be disproportionately high. The model does not take into account the geographical position of the road within the Borough. The future plans of utility companies are taken into account when the initial list is produced. Given the range of scores available it is probable that a number of sites will have the same score; if there are insufficient funds to complete all these schemes engineering judgement will be used to determine which to recommend for maintenance.

**Criteria, attributes and associated scores.**

Item	Criteria	Attribute	Score
1.	Condition. Video survey.	Grade 5, Black	40
		Grade 4, Red	30
		Grade 3, Amber	20
		Grade 2, Yellow	10
		Grade 1, Green	0
2.	Road class.	A	40
		B	30
		C	20
		U	10
3.	Resilient Road.	Yes	30
		No	0
4.	Bus Route.	Yes	30
		No	0
5.	Amenity.eg. School, hospital, fire, ambulance, police station, sports ground, places of worship, bus & rail stations.	Yes	30
		No	0
6.	Skid Resistance, measured skid resistance less than required value by.....	0.6	30
		0.4	20
		0.2	10
		0	0
7.	Index of Multiple Deprivation  Ranges between 19 in Whalley Banks and 31,142 in Edgworth, approx. 80 different values.	1 to 10,000	30
		10,001 to 20,000	20
		20,001+	10
8.	Usage	Residential	30
		Shopping	20
		Industrial	10

## 5. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

The prioritisation model compliments the existing asset management policy and strategy as well as the current lifecycle plans.

## 6. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

This model will assist in the continuing improvement of the expenditure of the highways capital maintenance budget. It will allow the authority to improve the quality of maintenance at no additional cost.

## 7. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

The Council has a duty under section 41 of the Highways Act 1980 to maintain the public highway network in a condition that is safe for users. This includes all roads, footways, footpaths and verges for which the highway authority has responsibility. The Act does not define what comprises maintenance nor does it set specific or minimum standards.

## 8. RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

No additional internal resources are required to achieve the aims of this model.

## 9. EQUALITY AND HEALTH IMPLICATIONS

**Please select one of the options below. Where appropriate please include the hyperlink to the EIA.**

Option 1  Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) not required – the EIA checklist has been completed.

Option 2  In determining this matter the Executive Member needs to consider the EIA associated with this item in advance of making the decision. *(insert EIA link here)*

Option 3  In determining this matter the Executive Board Members need to consider the EIA associated with this item in advance of making the decision. *(insert EIA attachment)*

## 10. CONSULTATIONS

The Council has and continues to work closely with adjacent local highway authorities, namely Lancashire County Council and Blackpool Borough Council, sharing knowledge and improving techniques via the Local Council Roads Investment Group (LCRIG). The Council also works with innovative private sector companies to develop and implement maintenance solutions.

## 11. STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE

The recommendations are made further to advice from the Monitoring Officer and the Section 151 Officer has confirmed that they do not incur unlawful expenditure. They are also compliant with equality legislation and an equality analysis and impact assessment has been considered. The recommendations reflect the core principles of good governance set out in the Council's Code of Corporate Governance.

**12. DECLARATION OF INTEREST**

All Declarations of Interest of any Executive Member consulted and note of any dispensation granted by the Chief Executive will be recorded and published if applicable.

<b>VERSION:</b>	<b>1</b>
-----------------	----------

<b>CONTACT OFFICER:</b>	<b>Matthew Joyce</b>
-------------------------	----------------------

<b>DATE:</b>	1 <sup>st</sup> April 2019.
--------------	-----------------------------

<b>BACKGROUND PAPER:</b>	Appendix 1 Highways Prioritisation Model.
--------------------------	---

## EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST

***This checklist is to be used when you are uncertain if your activity requires an EIA or not.***

An Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) is a tool for identifying the potential impact of the organisation's policies, services and functions on its residents and staff. EIAs should be actively looking for negative or adverse impacts of policies, services and functions on any of the nine protected characteristics.

The checklist below contains a number of questions/prompts to assist officers and service managers to assess whether or not the activity proposed requires an EIA. Supporting literature and useful questions are supplied within the [EIA Guidance](#) to assist managers and team leaders to complete all EIAs.

<b>Service area &amp; dept.</b>	Environment and Operations Highways and Engineering	<b>Date the activity will be implemented</b>	01/03/2019
---------------------------------	--	--	------------

<b>Brief description of activity</b>	Prioritisation Model for Capital Maintenance Schemes
--------------------------------------	--

Answers favouring doing an EIA	Checklist question	Answers favouring not doing an EIA
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Does this activity involve any of the following: - Commissioning / decommissioning a service - Change to existing Council policy/strategy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Does the activity impact negatively on any of the protected characteristics as stated within the Equality Act (2010)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not sure	Is there a sufficient information / intelligence with regards to service uptake and customer profiles to understand the activity's implications?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Not sure	<b>Does this activity:</b> Contribute towards unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act <i>(i.e. the activity creates or increases disadvantages suffered by people due to their protected characteristic)</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Not sure	Reduce equality of opportunity between those who share a protected characteristic and those who do not <i>(i.e. the activity fail to meet the needs of people from protected groups where these are different from the needs of other people)</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Not sure	Foster poor relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not <i>(i.e. the function prevents people from protected groups to participate in public life or in other activities where their participation is disproportionately low)</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>FOR = 0</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>AGAINST =6</b>

**Will you now be completing an EIA?**

Yes

No

The EIA toolkit can be found [here](#)

<b>Assessment Lead Signature</b>	<i>M. Joyce</i>
<b>Checked by departmental E&amp;D Lead</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Date</b>	23/04/2019

## **Prioritisation Model – Carriageway.**

### **Purpose**

This prioritisation model assesses a number of criteria to determine which sections of the Borough's highway network are repaired. The model embraces both structural repair of failed highways and preventative maintenance using techniques such as surface dressing and micro-asphalt.

### **Method**

A set of criteria are established to assess each section of the adopted carriageway, individual criteria are assigned attributes to reflect the current condition of that criteria, these attributes are, themselves, assigned scores. Individual scores are totalled to enable comparison of individual road sections.

### **Review**

This model will be revised annually to ensure that the criteria considered and their implementation remain current, relevant and ensure public satisfaction (as determined via the NHT survey).

### **Criteria**

The criteria considered and their associated attributes and scores are tabulated below.

Item	Criteria	Attribute	Score
1.	Condition. Video survey.	Grade 5, Black	40
		Grade 4, Red	30
		Grade 3, Amber	20
		Grade 2, Yellow	10
		Grade 1, Green	0
2.	Road class.	A	40
		B	30
		C	20
		U	10
3.	Resilient Road.	Yes	30
		No	0
4.	Bus Route.	Yes	30
		No	0
5.	Amenity. eg. School, hospital, fire, ambulance, police station, sports ground, places of worship, bus & rail stations.	Yes	30
		No	0

6.	Skid Resistance, measured skid resistance less than required value by.....	0.6	30
		0.4	20
		0.2	10
		0	0
7.	Index of Multiple Deprivation		
	Ranges between 19 in Whalley Banks and 31142 in Edgworth, approx. 80 different values.	1 to 10,000	30
		10,001 to 20,000	20
		20,001+	10
8.	Usage	Residential	30
		Shopping	20
		Industrial	10

### **Structural and preventative maintenance**

The video survey covers the whole of the adopted road network and comprises approximately 58,000 separate sections.

The video survey assesses the condition of the highway network and assigns each element a grade between 1 (good condition) and 5 (poor condition).

Some roads are unsuitable for surface treatments as they are either

- a. Too steep or,
- b. Too tight a radius or,
- c. Have too many junctions or,
- d. Have heavy tree cover.

The model identifies these roads and excludes them from consideration for surface treatments. The model also excludes roads with condition attributes of grade 3 or higher from consideration for surface treatments.

### **Scheme composition**

Defective areas will be amalgamated to produce economically viable schemes. Adjoining areas of highway in reasonable condition will be incorporated into a scheme to maintain viability. The notional efficiency of a potential scheme will be determined by summing the product of the area and score of each element and dividing by the sum of the areas.