

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM AGENDA



Monday 29 September 2008

at 4.00pm

**in Committee Room B
Civic Centre, Hartlepool**

MEMBERS: NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM:

Councillors Akers-Belcher, Barker, R W Cook, Coward, Cranney, Fleming, McKenna, Worthy and Wright

Resident Representatives: John Cambridge, Mary Green and Brenda Loynes

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

2. TO RECEIVE ANY DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST BY MEMBERS

3. MINUTES

3.1 To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 18 August 2008.

4. RESPONSES FROM THE COUNCIL, THE EXECUTIVE OR COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL TO FINAL REPORTS OF THIS FORUM

No items.

5. CONSIDERATION OF REQUEST FOR SCRUTINY REVIEWS REFERRED VIA SCRUTINY CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE

No items.

6. CONSIDERATION OF PROGRESS REPORTS/BUDGET AND POLICY FRAMEWORK DOCUMENTS

No items.

7. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

7.1 The Condition of the Highw ays in Hartlepool - Feedback from North, Central and South Neighbourhood Consultative Forums held on 13, 14 and 15 August 2008 on the :

- (a) Covering Report – *Scrutiny Support Officer*; and
- (b) Verbal feedback from Neighbourhood Consultative Forums.

7.2 The Condition of the Highw ays in Hartlepool - Feedback from Site Visit to identified highw ays across Hartlepool held on 01 September 2008:

- (a) Covering Report – *Scrutiny Support Officer*; and
- (b) Verbal feedback from Site Visit.

7.3 The Condition of the Highw ays in Hartlepool - Feedback from Focus Group held on 15 September 2008:

- (a) Covering report – *Scrutiny Support Officer*; and
- (b) Verbal feedback from Focus Group.

7.4 The Condition of the Highw ays in Hartlepool - Evidence from the Neighbourhood Services Department on operational issues:

- (c) Covering Report – *Scrutiny Support Officer*; and
- (d) Verbal Evidence from the Neighbourhood Services Department.

8. ISSUES IDENTIFIED FROM FORWARD PLAN

9. ANY OTHER ITEMS WHICH THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS ARE URGENT

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

Date of next meeting Monday 27 October 2008 at 4.00 pm in the Council Chamber

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM

MINUTES

18 August 2008

The meeting commenced at 4.00 pm in the Civic Centre, Hartlepool

Present:

Councillor: Stephen Akers-Belcher (In the Chair)

Councillors: Caroline Barker, Christopher McKenna, Gladys Worthy and Edna Wright

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 4.2 (ii) Councillor Carl Richardson attended as substitute for Councillor Kevin Cranney.

Also in attendance:

Councillor Peter Jackson, Portfolio Holder for Neighbourhoods and Communities

Resident Representatives:

John Cambridge, Mary Green and Brenda Loynes.

Officers:

Dave Stubbs, Director of Neighbourhood Services
Mike Blair, Traffic and Transportation Manager
Paul Mitchinson, Highways Manager
Paul Hamilton, Insurance and Risk Management Manager
Charlotte Burnham, Scrutiny Manager
Laura Starrs, Scrutiny Support Officer
Angela Hunter, Principal Democratic Services Officer

17. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Kevin Cranney and Tim Fleming.

18. Declarations of interest by Members

None.

19. Minutes of the meeting held on 11 July 2008

Confirmed.

20. Responses from the Council, the Executive or Committees of the Council to Final Reports of this Forum

None.

21. Consideration of request for scrutiny reviews referred via Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee

None.

22. Consideration of progress reports/budget and policy framework documents

None.

23. The Condition of the Highways in Hartlepool – Setting the Scene (*Scrutiny Support Officer/Director of Neighbourhood Services*)

The Scrutiny Support Officer informed Members that the Director of Neighbourhood Services and other officers from Neighbourhood Services and the Finance Division were in attendance to provide a presentation as part of this Forum's investigation into the 'Condition of the Highways in Hartlepool'. The Portfolio Holder for Neighbourhoods and Communities was also in attendance and welcomed the Scrutiny Forum's investigation into the condition of the highways but asked Members to be mindful of the current budget process in which the Neighbourhood Services Department were being requested to identify £500k of efficiencies. However, the Director of Neighbourhood Services suggested that a capital investment of £5m across the next 4-5 years should see a vast improvement in the current highway situation in the town.

The Director of Neighbourhood Services and the other officers in attendance gave a detailed and comprehensive presentation which identified the duty the local authority had to maintain the highways and how this was undertaken including the inspection regime covering reactive and programmed maintenance. It was highlighted that Hartlepool was currently in the top quartile in the country in relation to key Government performance measures relating to highway repairs. Members were asked to note that as part of the regulation and enforcement duties, the co-ordination of utilities access to the highways for road and street works was undertaken.

The insurance trends for 1998-2008 were included in the presentation and identified that Hartlepool had the largest proportion of cases that become litigated within the Tees Valley with repudiation being around or in excess of 80%. Details of current and outstanding highway insurance claims were

provided in the presentation.

A lengthy discussion ensued which included the following issues:

- (i) A number of statements were made by Members on specific areas of the town with particular highway problems and the Director of Neighbourhood Services suggested that any problems be reported to the contact centre in the first instance to enable an investigation to be undertaken.
- (ii) A Member questioned why when a team goes on sites to repair defects in the highway and other defects were identified in the process, they were not repaired at the same time. The Director of Neighbourhood Services indicated where any defects were defined under the current Government guidance for statutory repair, they were undertaken immediately. However, current budget restrictions did not allow for all non-statutory repairs to be undertaken.
- (iii) Clarification was sought on how the public were notified of any disruption due to highways repairs. The Director of Neighbourhood Services responded that all highway repairs were published in advance in the Hartlepool Mail and on the Council's website. A Member suggested that ward councillors should be notified of any disruption within their ward due to highway repairs. The Director of Neighbourhood Services indicated that ward councillors could be included on the circulation list.
- (iv) A Member asked if there was a programme of maintenance for back streets. The Director of Neighbourhood Services indicated that although there was currently no budget allocated for the maintenance of back streets. However, if a back street was identified as being in a dangerous state of repair, action would be taken.
- (v) A number of concerns were raised about the state of the pavements in York Road and the number of insurance claims resulting from this area. The Director of Neighbourhood Services responded that this had been identified and funding was being sought to rectify this issue and Members were asked to note that Phase 2 of York Road which was currently underway was being carried out to a different specification.
- (vi) Clarification was sought on the budget for insurance and whether any interest accrued was returned to the highways budget. The Insurance and Risk Manager responded that the insurance fund covered all service areas and any interest accrued was transferred to the General Fund. The Portfolio Holder confirmed that interest accrued from all funds was included within the overall budget to offset council tax etc. It was highlighted to Members that this formed part of the annual budget consultation process undertaken through scrutiny.
- (vii) Reference was made to the Government's key performance measures which only covered 19% of the roads in the town and what level of performance was required for the remaining 81%? The Director of Neighbourhood Services indicated that the figures

provided in the presentation were compiled from anecdotal evidence and that no detailed analysis had been undertaken of the remaining 81% at this point in time.

- (viii) A Member sought clarification on the shift from revenue funding to capital investment. The Highways Manager indicated that this was incorporated into the Local Transport Plan as defined by Central Government to focus on highway safety. Members were asked to note that the Local Transport Plan included several strategies with targets to reach in order to ensure the maximum funding was received from Central Government.
- (ix) The presentation made reference to vandal damage, what did this include? The Director of Neighbourhood Services indicated that this was analysed by the contact centre system and included instances of fences being pulled down or young people displacing paving slabs.
- (x) A Member was concerned that there were such a lot of issues to be considered as part of this investigation. The Chair indicated that if any Members had specific issues they wished to be considered as part of this investigation to inform the Scrutiny Support Officer.

The Director of Neighbourhood Services and the Neighbourhood Services and Finance Officers were thanked for their attendance and presentation.

Decision

The presentation was noted and would be used to inform Members during their investigation.

24. Condition of the Highways in Hartlepool – Evidence from the Authority's Portfolio Holder for Neighbourhoods and Communities *(Scrutiny Support Officer/Portfolio Holder for Neighbourhoods and Communities)*

The Chair informed Members that the Portfolio Holder for Neighbourhoods and Communities had been invited to attend the meeting to provide evidence in relation to the ongoing investigation in to the Condition of Highways in Hartlepool.

The Portfolio Holder began by thanking the Highways Team for their hard work and commitment in delivering a quality service within such a tight budget and remit in line with Government guidelines. The report sought responses to the following key questions:

- (a) What are your roles and responsibilities in relation to highways maintenance and inspection within the town? The Portfolio Holder indicated that his role was to oversee officers responsibilities in relation to the statutory duties for highway safety and to ensure that they comply with standards set within Government guidelines.

- (b) What are your views on the current highway maintenance and inspection service provision within Hartlepool? The Portfolio Holder emphasised that the Highways Team do an excellent job within the confines of a tight budget. The Highways Manager commented that an increase in the programmed maintenance budget would improve the current state of the highways and would result in less reliance on reactive maintenance.
- (c) What are your views on the standards of highways in Hartlepool in comparison to national and regional standards? The Portfolio Holder commented on the fact that there were outstanding insurance claims of £308k for highways and £440k for pavements which was indicative of the current standards of highways within the town.
- (d) What areas of improvement if any, would you suggest to ensure the town's roads are maintained to an acceptable standard? Whilst acknowledging the current budget situation and the efficiencies required, the Portfolio Holder reiterated earlier comments that an injection of £5m over the next 5 years for the rolling programme of maintenance would result in a vast improvement in the condition of the highways across the town. It was highlighted to Members that if there was no increase in the highways budget, it would result in more of a shift to reactive maintenance as opposed to programmed maintenance, which was in effect a 'fire-fighting' scenario.

The Portfolio Holder for Neighbourhoods and Communities was thanked for his attendance and for answering Members' questions.

Decision

The comments of the Portfolio Holder for Neighbourhoods and Communities were noted and would be used to inform Members during their investigation.

25. Fire Alarm – Evacuation of Building

The fire alarm sounded and the building was evacuated.

The meeting concluded at 6.20 pm

CHAIRMAN

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM

29 September 2008



Report of: Scrutiny Support Officer

Subject: CONDITION OF THE HIGHWAYS IN HARTLEPOOL:
FEEDBACK FROM THE NEIGHBOURHOOD
CONSULTATIVE FORUMS – COVERING REPORT

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To facilitate a discussion amongst Members of this Forum in relation to the feedback from the Neighbourhood Consultative Forums.

2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 2.1 As part of the evidence gathering process for the undertaking of the investigation into the Condition of the Highways in Hartlepool, the Chair of the Forum along with the Scrutiny Support Officer recently attended the North, Central and South Neighbourhood Consultative Forums, and the following issues were raised:-

- (a) Drop Kerbs / tactile pavements;
- (b) Accessibility for people with disabilities / mobility problems; and
- (c) response times.

- 2.2 In line with good practice, the Chair and the Scrutiny Support Officer who were in attendance are requested to share / discuss their findings at today's meeting.

3. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 That Members of the Forum note the feedback from the Neighbourhood Consultative Forums as outlined in paragraph 2.1 of this report.

Contact:- Laura Starrs – Scrutiny Support Officer
Chief Executive's Department - Corporate Strategy
Hartlepool Borough Council
Tel: 01429 523 647
Email: laura.starrs@hartlepool.gov.uk

BACKGROUND PAPERS

There were no background papers referred to in the preparation of this report.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM

29 September 2008



Report of: Scrutiny Support Officer

Subject: CONDITION OF THE HIGHWAYS IN HARTLEPOOL:
FEEDBACK FROM SITE VISIT – COVERING
REPORT

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To facilitate a discussion amongst Members of this Forum in relation to the site visit to identified carriageways / footpaths across Hartlepool held on 01 September 2008.

2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 2.1 As part of the evidence gathering process for the undertaking of the investigation into the Condition of the Highways in Hartlepool a site visit was recently attended by Members of the Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum to identified carriageways / footpaths across Hartlepool.
- 2.2 In line with good practice, Members of this Forum who were in attendance are requested to share / discuss their findings at today's meeting.

3. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 That Members of the Forum discuss their findings from the site visit as outlined in paragraph 2.1 of this report.

Contact:- Laura Starrs – Scrutiny Support Officer
Chief Executive's Department - Corporate Strategy
Hartlepool Borough Council
Tel: 01429 523 647
Email: laura.starrs@hartlepool.gov.uk

BACKGROUND PAPERS

There were no background papers referred to in the preparation of this report.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM

29 September 2008



Report of: Scrutiny Support Officer

Subject: CONDITION OF THE HIGHWAYS IN HARTLEPOOL
– FEEDBACK FROM FOCUS GROUP – COVERING
REPORT

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To facilitate a discussion amongst Members of this Forum in relation to feedback received as a result of the Focus Group held on 15 September 2008.

2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 2.1 Members will recall that at the meeting of this Forum on 11 July 2008, the Terms of Reference and Potential Areas of Inquiry / Sources of Evidence for this Scrutiny investigation were approved by the Forum.
- 2.2 Consequently, in order to seek the views of residents on the Condition of the Highways in Hartlepool a focus group session was held on the 15 September 2008 in the Council Chamber.
- 2.3 The issues raised / views expressed at the Focus Group are attached as **Appendix A** to this report.

3. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 That Members consider the issues raised at the Focus Group on the 15 September 2008 as detailed in Appendix A.

Contact Officer:- Laura Starrs – Scrutiny Support Officer
Chief Executive's Department - Corporate Strategy
Hartlepool Borough Council
Tel: 01429 523647
Email: laura.starrs@hartlepool.gov.uk

BACKGROUND PAPERS

No background papers were used in the preparation of this report.

7.3 (a) APPENDIX A

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM FOCUS GROUP – CONDITION OF THE HIGHWAYS IN HARTLEPOOL

15 September 2008

Notes

Present:

Councillors: Stephen Ackers - Belcher (Chair),

Members of the Public

Officers: Dave Stubbs, Director of Neighbourhood Services
Denise Ogden, Head of Neighbourhood Management
Paul Mitchinson, Highway Services Manager
Charlotte Burnham, Scrutiny Manager
Laura Starrs, Scrutiny Support Officer

Investigation into the Condition of the Highways in Hartlepool

The Chair of the Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum delivered a presentation which included the following:-

- (i) Aim of the investigation;
- (ii) Progression of the investigation so far; and
- (iii) What was hoped to achieve during the course of the Focus Group.

It was reported that this was an opportunity for everyone present to express their views and provide input into the scrutiny investigation. The Group's views were sought on the following questions:-

- (i) **What in your opinion are the main problems with the highways in Hartlepool?**
 - (a) Highways were not seen as a priority, an example provided was that the budget did not reflect the growth of the town;
 - (b) Roads were not built to carry the current volume of traffic;
 - (c) The speed of traffic effected the condition of the roads; and
 - (d) Paved footpaths were seen as a danger.
- (ii) **In your opinion are the highways in better / worse condition compared to other local areas?**
 - (a) General opinion was that the roads were in worse condition than neighbouring authorities; and

7.3 (a) APPENDIX A

- (b) Concerns were raised over traffic calming schemes.
- (iii) **Have you ever suffered any personal injury or damage to vehicles due to the condition of the highways in Hartlepool? If so, was the problem on the highway rectified?**
 - (a) Psychological problems resulting from noise / vibrations;
 - (b) Depression;
 - (c) Emotional demands / tensions; and
 - (d) Concerns over obstructions in particular for the elderly.
- (iv) **Have you ever reported a road / pavement defect? If so, was the problem resolved and approximately how long did it take? And who did you report it to?**
 - (a) Reported on several occasions but problem never resolved;
 - (b) By Letter;
 - (c) Civic Centre Complaints Department;
 - (d) Consultative Forums; and
 - (e) Confusion over how to report defects.
- (v) **What areas of improvement if any, would you suggest to ensure the town's roads / pavements are maintained to an acceptable standard?**
 - (a) Redirect traffic calming money to fund other major maintenance issues;
 - (b) Tarmac was the preferred option for pavements; and
 - (c) More money from Central Government / lobby Parliament.

In conclusion, the Chair thanked all attendees for their input and ideas to the investigation and encouraged their attendance at the next meeting scheduled for 29 September 2008 at 4.00 pm.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM

29 September 2008



Report of: Scrutiny Support Officer

Subject: CONDITION OF THE HIGHWAYS IN HARTLEPOOL
– EVIDENCE FROM THE NEIGHBOURHOOD
SERVICES DEPARTMENT – COVERING REPORT

1. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

- 1.1 To inform Members of the Forum that officers from the Neighbourhood Services Department have been invited to attend this meeting to provide evidence in relation to the ongoing investigation into the 'Condition of the Highways in Hartlepool'.

2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 2.1 Officers from the Neighbourhood Services Department will be in attendance at today's meeting to give evidence as part of this Forum's investigation into the 'Condition of the Highways in Hartlepool' in relation to the following operational issues:-
- (a) where highways maintenance sits within the department's structure;
 - (b) the maintenance backlog: what, where, cost and area specific;
 - (c) what is re-active and planned maintenance;
 - (d) overview of the Planned Maintenance Programme (copies distributed);
 - (e) the Council's policy on tarmac -v- paving specifically in conservation areas;
 - (f) breakdown of manpower / equipment;
 - (g) overview of the Local Transport Plan (LTP);
 - (h) current response times to rectify defects;

- (i) traffic calming measures in relation to the Highways Budget; and
- (j) the different materials used for road maintenance including the use of modern materials and associated costs.

3. RECOMMENDATION

- 3.1 That Members of the Forum consider the views of the officers from the Neighbourhood Services Department in attendance at this meeting and seek clarification on any relevant issues, where felt appropriate.

Contact Officer:- Laura Starrs – Scrutiny Support Officer
Chief Executive's Department - Corporate Strategy
Hartlepool Borough Council
Tel: 01429 523 647
Email: laura.starrs@hartlepool.gov.uk

BACKGROUND PAPERS

There were no background papers referred to in the preparation of this report.

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM REPORT

29 September 2008



Report of: Director of Neighbourhood Services

Subject: CONDITION OF THE HIGHWAYS IN HARTLEPOOL

(a) *Where highways maintenance sits within the department's structure*

- a) The current management arrangement for highway maintenance is that reactive maintenance the highway inspections and the day to day flagging repairs and filling of potholes, is the responsibility of the Neighbourhood Management Division and is delivered by internal resources. Planned maintenance major reconstructions that are carried out on a one off basis due to major failures and the carriageway resurfacing programme that is carried out once per annum, is the responsibility of Technical Services Division and is delivered by external contractors. Overall management responsibility is with Technical Services.

The structure has developed through time from the Client / Contractor split – introduced to satisfy the requirements of Compulsory Competitive Tendering, to the current arrangements – introduced to enable Technical Services to be a super-client for all developments on the highway network following the introduction of Local Transport Plan's, and to enable Neighbourhood Management to deliver highway, horticultural and street cleansing services on an area basis.

The structure is currently under further revision as a consequence of the Traffic Management Act, which has contributed to the need to establish an Integrated Transport Unit to focus on Traffic and Transportation issues. In a similar manner, it has been determined that the highways section needs to have the same focus and be in charge of its own destiny, so the highway functions are also in the process of being integrated into a single service unit. Once implemented, Neighbourhood Management will be responsible for all aspects of highway maintenance and this will further enhance the area basis of the service delivery.

(b) *The maintenance backlog: what, where, cost and area specific;*

- b) As reported by the Head of Technical Services to the Neighbourhoods and Communities Portfolio holder on 25th March 2008, the current estimated cost of rectifying the highways already identified as defective is approximately

£20M. The maintenance backlog comprises carriageway defects, footway defects, gully and drainage defects, bridge defects and also includes items such as barriers, bollards, traffic signs, street name plates and white and yellow lines. The most significant issue in terms of public liability is the condition of flagged footways, but the most significant issue in terms of customer satisfaction and members of the public complaints is the condition of carriageways. The locations of each type of remedial work are spread across all areas and are identified in terms of need, not location. Consequently it would require more detailed analysis to break down the information by forum area. However, analysis of the financial year 2004/5 reactive maintenance spend indicates that 39% of the budget was spent in the north area, 40% in the central area and 21% in the south area.

(c) *What is re-active and planned maintenance*

- c) Reactive maintenance is defined as the removal of hazardous defects to ensure the safety of road and footway users. It is carried out in response to routine inspections (monthly for high amenity features, 3 monthly for medium amenity features and 6 monthly for low amenity features) or customer reports. If, on a routine inspection or in response to a customer complaint, a defect at or above the intervention standard is identified, the inspector will place a works order for the defect to be rectified. If the defect is not at or above the intervention standard, it is not identified for repair.

By its nature, the reactive service carries out only very small jobs that satisfy pre-determined criteria. It is important to minimise the volume of reactive work because the unit cost of work of this nature is much greater than that of planned maintenance. It is also vital to ensure that defects that do not satisfy the intervention standard are not carried out because the reactive budget is limited and it is vital that all actionable defects are repaired for the full 52 weeks per annum. Failure to ensure this may lead to an increase in successful claims against the council.

Planned maintenance involves the replacement of surfaces that have come to the end of their life cycle. The expression “20 year maintenance backlog” is a reference to planned maintenance, not to reactive maintenance. Planned maintenance is carried out to maintain the serviceability of the highway asset e.g. good ride quality on carriageways.

Sustainability is an important aspect of planned maintenance – and not just in the sense of recycling materials and minimising the use of “new” natural resources. The treatment selected is a significant element of sustainability. Excessive reactive maintenance cannot be regarded as a sustainable exercise, as unit costs for reactive maintenance average 10 times that of planned maintenance. Cheap resurfacing cannot be regarded as sustainable unless the new cheap technology produces the same or similar life span. Highway schemes should target 20 – 25 years as a minimum life span. Inappropriate treatment that results in short term success only is not a sustainable approach. Planned maintenance needs to use quality products

and quality workmanship to produce sustainable schemes that last the test of time.

(d) Overview of the Planned Maintenance Programme

- d) The planned maintenance programme for 2008/09 contains 2 carriageway reconstructions, 33 planning and resurfacing schemes and 15 footway reconstruction schemes.

Carriageway reconstructions are the most expensive type of maintenance due to the work content. Reconstructions are necessary when the carriageway sub-base has failed. In this circumstance, resurfacing is inadequate as the failure is due to ground movement in the sub-base layer. Any new surface would inevitably fail due to further ground movement if the sub-base is not reconstructed.

The planning and resurfacing schemes are the type of maintenance that most road users prefer. This type of maintenance can only be carried out if the sub-base layers are in good condition. Failure can occur in these layers if the surface course is not adequately maintained, so timely intervention is important. One of the common failure mechanisms is oxidation of the binder in the tarmac. Oxidation results in the road surface disintegrating – which means that patching is virtually impossible to carry out to the appropriate standard. Consequently the programme targets oxidised roads as much as possible to reduce the need for patching in this type of road. Failure due to deformation can be patched, and consequently this type of failure is not targeted as a first priority.

The annual programme usually includes a batch of surface dressing schemes. Although there is no programme of surface dressing works for 08/09, it is a very cost effective method of extending the life of carriageways. It is important to understand that surface dressing cannot be applied to roads in poor condition. Even the surface layer needs to be in reasonable condition for this process to be suitable. Nevertheless, when funds allow, surface dressing is an excellent process to extend the life of middle aged roads.

Footway reconstructions are an important aspect of the highway risk management strategy, although funding in recent years has resulted in less money being allocated to this type of work. Insurance trend analysis indicates that the majority of public liability claims arise from trips on flagged footways. 39% of all highway claims arise from incidents on the footway. Nevertheless, the pressure to improve carriageway condition has involved a shift from circa 66/33 to circa 75/25 in favour of carriageways for the past two years.

e) The Council's policy on tarmac – v – paving specifically in conservation areas

- e) The "Footway Construction Policy" was introduced by the Planning Committee on the recommendation of the Director of Environment and Development at their 12th December 1996 meeting. The advice given was "...that 40% of all

insurance claims occurred in respect of the flagged footways, whereas only 2% occurred on flexible (bitmac) footways.”

The Committee resolved “That a policy of replacing flagged construction with flexible macadam construction (particularly considering coloured macadam surfacing for certain areas) be adopted for footway renewal schemes in all areas except where the footway is within a main shopping area, conservation areas or other high amenity areas which the council may designate.”

f) Breakdown of manpower / equipment

- f) The Highway Works element of the Highway Services section has the following staff members:-

Highway Works Manager

Highways Supervisor

Highway Technician

7 No. Paviments

12 No. Driver/Labourers (interchangeable roles, but at any one time, 7 will act as labourers for Paviments, 3 will act as the patching team and 2 will be on general works/drainage works)

4 No. Gully Cleansing Operatives

2 No. Modern Apprentice Paviments

The vehicles used are:-

5 No. 17 tonne demountable body wagons

5 No. 7½ tonne fixed body wagons

1 No. 3½ tonne pickup (Rapid Response)

2 No. Gully Machines

1 No. JCB

1 No. Tracta Loading Shovel

g) Overview of the Local Transport Plan (LTP)

- g) In simple terms, the Local Transport Plan (LTP) sets out how the Council intends to develop a high quality, integrated and safe transport system that supports Hartlepool's continued growth and regeneration. It seeks to facilitate the delivery of a wide range of local transport schemes and policy measures to address the identified problems and is used to acquire the capital budgets that will fund the schemes over the five year plan period.

The total 5 year budget is **£11.35M**. Of that **£4.75M** is for structural highway maintenance and is delegated to Highway Services to supplement the revenue budget. Of the remaining LTP funding **£5.526M** is for highway development schemes. This is made up of :-

Bus priority schemes - **£552k**, e.g. York Road Phase 2, scheduled for delivery in 2008

Bus Infrastructure Schemes - **£340k**, e.g. contributions to York Road Phase 2 and Low Floor Bus Stop Programme

Cycling Schemes - **£780k**

Walking Schemes - **£87k**

Local Safety Schemes - **£1205k**, e.g. Hart Lane, Cleveland Road, Newburn Bridge, Street Lighting Schemes

Road Crossings – **170k**, e.g. dropped crossings with contributions from the Forums)

Traffic Calming Schemes - **£803k**, e.g. M block, Chatham Road, Bamburgh/Clavering, Woodstock Way, King Oswy Drive,

Local Road Schemes - **£932k**, e.g

Other Schemes - **£657k**

The remaining **£1074k** is made up of:-

Cleveland Camera Partnership - **£874k**

Travel Plans - **£150k**

Public Transport Interchange - **£50k**

Full details of the types of scheme under each budget header can be seen on pages 190 – 195 of the full LTP document.

h) Current response times to rectify defects

h) There are currently three categories of response:-

Emergency Works – 1 hour. This category is for extremely dangerous situations only. When a repair is possible, it is carried out immediately, but this category is usually restricted to making safe by the erection of barriers.

Urgent Works – 24 hours. This category is for defects that are actionable and pose a medium risk hazard. Consequently it is more usual to require a 24 hour response on a high amenity footway than a low amenity footway.

Routine Reactive Works – 28 days. This is for all other “actionable” defects.

i) Traffic calming measures in relation to the Highways Budget; and

i) Traffic calming is funded directly from the LTP and is not funded from maintenance budgets. See (g) above – Traffic Calming Schemes - £803k.

j) The different materials used for road maintenance including the use of modern materials and associated costs.

- j) Whilst there is a considerable range of surfacing materials available, the most common treatments for carriageways are:-

Surface Dressing
Bitumen Macadam (usually 10mm in carriageways)
Hot Rolled Asphalt
Stone Mastic Asphalt

The most common treatments for footways are:-

Slurry Seal
Bitumen Macadam (usually 6mm in footways)
Flagstones
Block Paving.

The cost per square metre varies with quantity due to the economies of scale in large schemes, and prices of all bituminous products have risen dramatically in recent months. The planning and resurfacing contract is currently out to tender and is due at Contract Scrutiny on 6th October. Accurate prices can be reported on award of the contract.