

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES COMMITTEE

AGENDA



Monday 18 March 2019

at 4.00 pm

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

MEMBERS: NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES COMMITTEE

Councillors S Akers-Belcher, Belcher, Cassidy, James, Loynes, Marshall and T Richardson.

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

2. TO RECEIVE ANY DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST BY MEMBERS

3. MINUTES

- 3.1 To receive the Minutes and Decision Record of the meeting held on 18 February 2019 (previously circulated)
- 3.2 To receive the Minutes and Decision Record of the meeting of the Emergency Planning Joint Committee held on 5 December 2018.

4. KEY DECISIONS

- 4.1 Highway Code of Practice – *Assistant Director (Environment and Neighbourhood Services)*
- 4.2 5 Year Highway Maintenance Programme – *Assistant Director (Environment and Neighbourhood Services)*
- 4.3 Local Transport Plan 2018/19 Out-Turn and 2019/20 Programme – *Assistant Director (Environment and Neighbourhood Services)*



5. OTHER ITEMS REQUIRING DECISION

No items

6. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

No items.

7. ANY OTHER BUSINESS WHICH THE CHAIR CONSIDERS URGENT

FOR INFORMATION

Date of next meeting – to be confirmed.



EMERGENCY PLANNING JOINT COMMITTEE

MINUTES AND DECISION RECORD

5th December 2018

The meeting commenced at 10.00am at the Emergency Planning Annex,
Stockton Police Station, Bishop Street, Stockton-on-Tees, TS18 1SY

Present:

Councillor: Lewis Young (Middlesbrough Borough Council) (In the Chair)

Councillors: Marjorie James (Hartlepool Borough Council)

Officers: Denise Ogden, Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods
Stuart Marshall, Chief Emergency Planning Officer
Jon Hepworth, Group Accountant (Regeneration and
Neighbourhoods)
Jo Stubbs, Democratic Services Officer

8. Apologies for Absence

Apologies were submitted by Councillor Mike Smith (Stockton Borough Council)

9. Declarations of interest by Members

None

10. Meeting inquorate

As the meeting was inquorate it was agreed that it would be adjourned to a future date

Meeting adjourned at 10.15am.

The meeting recommenced on Tuesday 5th February 2019 at 10.00am at the
Emergency Planning Annex, Stockton Police Station, Bishop Street,
Stockton-on-Tees, TS18 1SY

Present:

Councillor: Lewis Young (Middlesbrough Borough Council) (In the Chair)

Councillors: Marjorie James (Hartlepool Borough Council)
Mike Smith (Stockton Borough Council)

Officers: Stuart Marshall, Chief Emergency Planning Officer
Jon Hepworth, Group Accountant (Regeneration and
Neighbourhoods)
Jo Stubbs, Democratic Services Officer

11. Apologies for Absence

None

12. Declarations of interest by Members

None

13. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 11th October 2018 were received.

14. Function and Operation of Cleveland Local Resilience Forum *(Cleveland Local Resilience Forum Chair)*

Purpose of Report

To provide background information on the structure and operation of Cleveland Local Resilience Forum.

Decision

That the report be deferred to the next meeting. The Chair requested that a report on current LRF activity be submitted by the LRF Chair.

15. Financial Management Report for period ending 31st October 2018 *(Chief Finance Officer and Chief Emergency Planning Officer)*

Purpose of Report

To provide details of the revenue outturn forecast as at 31st October 2018.

Issue(s) for consideration by the Committee

A summary of the outturn position was provided as set out in the report. A favourable variance of £5,000 on the main Emergency Planning (EPU) budget was forecast while the Local Resilience Forum budget was expected to be fully spent. Members were pleased to note the current budget stability.

Decision

That the latest forecast outturn be noted

16. Audit of Cleveland Emergency Planning Unit *(Chief Emergency Planning Unit)*

Purpose of report

To update members on the recent internal audit of Cleveland Emergency Planning Unit.

Issue(s) for consideration by the Committee

An independent internal audit had recently been carried out on the EPU in accordance with the CIPFA Code of Practice for Internal Audit in Local Government in the UK, as part a 3 yearly audit timetable. It showed “Satisfactory assurance”, the highest level of Audit return under the scheme and demonstrated that the risks were well controlled. Five areas for improvement were identified. Details of these and the action undertaken in response were appended to the report.

With respect to concerns around information sharing a member asked if it would be possible to hold a member briefing on this specific issue. The Chief Emergency Planning Officer advised that the plan was to produce a single updated Information Sharing Agreement document to apply across the North East responders upon receipt of new sector specific guidance

from Central Government. He would be happy to share this agreement document with members when it was completed but was unable to confirm when this would be. However the next tactical business group of the LRF would be looking at this issue in detail.

Decision

That the outcome of the internal audit and work undertaken by CEPU officers be noted.

17. Activity and Incident Report (1st September – 31st October 2018) (Chief Emergency Planning Officer)

Purpose of report

To inform members of the activities, incidents report and warning communications received and dealt with by the Cleveland Emergency Planning Unit between 1st September and 31st October 2018.

Issue(s) for consideration by the Committee

Between 1st September and 31st October –

- 5 warning communications had been received
- 2 incidents of note had taken place
- 4 training events had been held
- 5 training exercises had been held

Information was also given regarding community resilience activities and LRF activities.

A Member referred to potential power outages in the area covered by the Unit and queried the impact this could have on industrial premises. The Chief Emergency Planning Officer confirmed that all had the ability to shut down safely and would not be reliant on intervention. This was confirmed by another member with first-hand experience of such a shut down.

A member requested more information on the '3 meetings with the voluntary sector' referred to in the Action Plan. The Chief Emergency Planning Officer indicated that these were organisations covering all 4 local authorities and tended to be focussed on the emergency sector. He was keen to establish links with the wider voluntary sector.

A member asked whether the Unit had made preparations for new member inductions following the May 2019 local elections. The Chief Emergency Planning Officer confirmed that awareness training would be provided in

each borough with an additional LGA emergency awareness course for new councillors due to take place in Newcastle.

Decision

That the report be noted

The meeting concluded at 10.20am.

H MARTIN

CHIEF SOLICITOR

PUBLICATION DATE: 8th February 2019



Report of: Assistant Director (Environment & Neighbourhood Services)

Subject: HIGHWAYS CODE OF PRACTICE

1. TYPE OF DECISION/APPLICABLE CATEGORY

1.1 Key Decision test (ii) applies. Forward Plan Reference No. RN 02/19.

2. PURPOSE OF REPORT

2.1 To update the Council's highway policies and procedures to introduce elements from the document 'Well Managed Highway Infrastructure: A Code of Practice' published in October 2016, which was commissioned by the Department for Transport and produced by the UK Roads Liaison Group.

2.2 The document is a combined replacement for the three previous individual documents, namely 'Well Maintained Highways', 'Management of Highway Structures' and 'Well Lit Highways'. It is a risk based process and the majority of the recommendations within the document are already adhered to within existing policies.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 The code is designed to promote the adoption of an integrated asset management approach to highway infrastructure, based on the establishment of local levels of service through adopted risk based assessment.

3.2 It is important to note that the level of highway maintenance funding the Council receives from central government is determined by the authority being able to demonstrate it is following the recommended DfT asset management principles, including those set out in the Code of Practice.

3.3 Adopting the policies/documents detailed in this report should ensure that Hartlepool continues to receive 100% of the funding available.

- 3.4 The Code of Practice itself is not a statutory document and it is left to the discretion of individual highway authorities as to what, if anything, is implemented, however 36 recommendations are summarised at the beginning of the Code (**See Appendix 1**). Hartlepool Borough Council, along with the other Tees Valley authorities, already adheres to the majority of these recommendations, and this report seeks approval to update existing policies to reflect this. These recommendations cover a range of disciplines including safety inspections, inventory data, IT systems / Highways Management software, life cycle planning, etc, and this report is primarily concerned with inspections and defect response times.
- 3.5 The current inspection regime for footways is for detailed inspections to be carried out on a monthly basis for primary walking routes, 3 monthly for secondary walking routes and 6 monthly for link footways and local access footways. The regime of carriageway safety inspections on main and secondary distributor roads is monthly. All other carriageways are inspected every 6 months.
- 3.6 The Inspector will walk each street section twice, once in each direction, inspecting the footway on which he is walking and verge (if present), recording all actionable defects. Driven inspections are carried out on high speed roads, generally rural in nature, from a slow moving vehicle which travels the road once with the Inspector recording defects on the carriageway and footway in one pass.
- 3.7 When carrying out their inspections Highway Inspectors are trained to identify and consider defects which may be in need of repair. Any defects so identified will be placed into one of two categories:
- Category 1 defects are those which are considered to present a hazard to users of the highway. They are given a one hour or 24 hour time frame for repair. A one hour repair would be appropriate where there is an immediate risk of serious injury e.g. a large missing manhole cover. A 24 hour repair is allocated to all other dangers on the highway.
 - Category 2 defects are those which do not present a danger to users of the highway, but are likely to deteriorate and present a danger before the time of the next inspection. They are allocated a 28 day response time.

4. PROPOSALS

- 4.1 It is proposed that Hartlepool Borough Council follows the recommendations of the new Code and subsequently implements a risk based programme of inspections, reactive works and planned works. The Council's Highway Inspectors currently follow a regime whereby defects are placed into a 1 hour/24 hour or 28 day category for repair as detailed in paragraph 3.7, and the updated Code recommends that this is determined by a risk based analysis.

- 4.2 The Council's policy sets out Defect Investigatory Levels, i.e. a criteria that once met will require an Inspector to carry out a risk assessment and further investigation of a defect. Inspectors should consider repairing a defect either as a Category 1 or Category 2 defect. Highway Inspectors are trained to exercise their discretion in relation to any defect which they find by risk assessing each one as and when they find it. They do have a discretion to repair any defect on the highway that they consider to present a danger to the public, whether the defect meets the guidelines or not, depending on the context of the particular defect.
- 4.3 The Council's defect investigatory levels on footways are for a trip of more than 20mm, rocking flags greater than 20mm, and a rapid change of footway profile greater than 25mm and extending in plan dimension less than 600mm. For carriageways the guideline is a sharp edged depression (pothole) 40mm or greater in depth and extending in any one direction greater than 300mm.
- 4.4 The risk associated with all defects is required to be evaluated by assessing the likely impact should the risk occur, and the probability of it actually occurring. The four stages are:
1. Hazard / defect identified
 2. Assess risk impact – this can be determined by either a high (the defect is likely to cause damage / injury) or a low (the defect is unlikely to cause damage / injury) impact.
 3. Assess risk probability – the likelihood of highway users encountering the defect. This will probably increase as the usage / functionality of the road increases, therefore is directly linked to the Councils highway network hierarchy; and
 4. Determination of repair category.
- 4.5 The Council currently give consideration to both impact of the defect and the probability of the defect causing damage or injury, utilising the recommended risk based approach. The guidance contained within the Code is added to with officer's experience of insurance claims history, local knowledge and the nature of our highway network.

5. RISK IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 The policy will be updated to reflect a risk based approach. It is noted that this is based on the same defect investigatory levels so there is no increase in risk.

6. FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

- 6.1 Defect investigatory levels are to remain the same, so there will be no increase in the financial burden placed on the Council for highway maintenance works.

- 6.2 Adoption of the revised policies will ensure that the Council continues to receive the maximum available grant funding.

7. LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

- 7.1 Legal considerations have been considered as set out under paragraph 5.1 of this report.

8. CONSULTATION

- 8.1 No consultation has taken place, however discussions throughout the Tees Valley have been ongoing for a period of time, including relevant officers attending events relating to the new Code of Practice. All Tees Valley authorities share the view that changes to actual inspections are not required since ‘an appropriate risk impact’ is already taken into account, although individual Council policy documents are required to be brought in line with the new Code.

9. STAFF CONSIDERATIONS

- 9.1 Highway Inspectors need to be aware of the new Code, however defect repair response times are currently based upon risk to members of the public and location of the defect, and therefore little change to current working practices will be required. Reference to the new Code will be made during court appearances at which Council Officers will be defending claims made against the Highway Authority, and therefore all staff need to be aware of the changes.

10. OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

10.1	Child/Family Poverty Considerations	(See Appendix 2)
	Equality and Diversity Considerations	No relevant issues
	Section 17 of The Crime And Disorder Act 1998 Considerations	No relevant issues
	Asset Management Considerations	No relevant issues

11. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 11.1 That the Committee approves the adoption of the updated documents, relevant to the Council’s highway maintenance policies, which reflect changes brought about in the new Code of Practice. These documents comprise the Highway Maintenance Plan, the Highway Inspection Manual, the Highways Strategy Framework, Transport Asset Management Plan and the Highways Communication Strategy.

12. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 12.1 To ensure that Hartlepool Borough Council, along with the other Tees Valley authorities, has a policy which follows the 36 recommendations in the new 'Well Managed Highway Infrastructure: A Code of Practice'.
- 12.2 To ensure that the Council maximises the amount of highway maintenance funding it receives from central government, by clearly demonstrating it is following the nationally recommended asset management principles.

13. BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 13.1 The Council's Highway Maintenance Plan, Highway Inspection Manual, Highways Strategy Framework, Transport Asset Management Plan and the Highways Communication Strategy. A copy of the documents will be available at the Committee meeting, and in the Members' Room prior to this.

14. CONTACT OFFICER

- 14.1 Tony Hanson
Assistant Director (Environment and Neighbourhood Services)
Level 3
Civic Centre
Hartlepool
TS24 8AY

E-mail: tony.hanson@hartlepool.gov.uk

AUTHOR OF REPORT

Ralph Young
Highway Systems Technician
Civic Centre
Hartlepool Borough Council
TS24 8AY

Tel: (01429) 284141
E-mail: Ralph.young@hartlepool.gov.uk

Sign Off:-

Director of Policy and Finance ☒

Chief Solicitor ☒

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATION 1 – USE OF THE CODE

This Code, in conjunction with the UKRLG Highway Infrastructure Asset Management Guidance, should be used as the starting point against which to develop, review and formally approve highway infrastructure maintenance policy and to identify and formally approve the nature and extent of any variations.

RECOMMENDATION 2 – ASSET MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK

An Asset Management Framework should be developed and endorsed by senior decision makers. All activities outlined in the Framework should be documented.
(HIAMG Recommendation 1)

RECOMMENDATION 3 – ASSET MANAGEMENT POLICY AND STRATEGY

An asset management policy and a strategy should be developed and published. These should align with the corporate vision and demonstrate the contribution asset management makes towards achieving this vision. (HIAMG Recommendation 3)

RECOMMENDATION 4 – ENGAGING AND COMMUNICATING WITH STAKEHOLDERS

Relevant information should be actively communicated through engagement with relevant stakeholders in setting requirements, making decisions and reporting performance.
(Taken from HIAMG Recommendation 2)

RECOMMENDATION 5 – CONSISTENCY WITH OTHER AUTHORITIES

To ensure that users' reasonable expectations for consistency are taken into account, the approach of other local and strategic highway and transport authorities, especially those with integrated or adjoining networks, should be considered when developing highway infrastructure maintenance policies.

RECOMMENDATION 6 – AN INTEGRATED NETWORK

The highway network should be considered as an integrated set of assets when developing highway infrastructure maintenance policies

RECOMMENDATION 7 – RISK BASED APPROACH

A risk based approach should be adopted for all aspects of highway infrastructure maintenance, including setting levels of service, inspections, responses, resilience, priorities and programmes.

RECOMMENDATION 8 – INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

Information to support a risk based approach to highway maintenance should be collected, managed and made available in ways that are sustainable, secure, meet any statutory obligations, and, where appropriate, facilitate transparency for network users.

RECOMMENDATION 9 – NETWORK INVENTORY

A detailed inventory or register of highway assets, together with information on their scale, nature and use, should be maintained. The nature and extent of inventory collected should be fit for purpose and meet business needs. Where data or information held is considered sensitive, this should be managed in a security-minded way.

RECOMMENDATION 10 – ASSET DATA MANAGEMENT

The quality, currency, appropriateness and completeness of all data supporting asset management should be regularly reviewed. An asset register should be maintained that stores, manages and reports all relevant asset data.

(HIAMG Recommendation 5)

RECOMMENDATION 11 – ASSET MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS

Asset management systems should be sustainable and able to support the information required to enable asset management. Systems should be accessible to relevant staff and, where appropriate, support the provision of information for stakeholders.

(HIAMG Recommendation 12)

RECOMMENDATION 12 – NETWORK HIERARCHY

A network hierarchy, or a series of related hierarchies, should be defined which include all elements of the highway network, including carriageways, footways, cycle routes, structures, lighting and rights of way. The hierarchy should take into account current and expected use, resilience, and local economic and social factors such as industry, schools, hospitals and similar, as well as the desirability of continuity and of a consistent approach for walking and cycling.

RECOMMENDATION 13 – WHOLE LIFE / DESIGNING FOR MAINTENANCE

Authorities should take whole life costs into consideration when assessing options for maintenance, new and improved highway schemes. The future maintenance costs of such new infrastructure are therefore a prime consideration.

RECOMMENDATION 14 – RISK MANAGEMENT

The management of current and future risks associated with assets should be embedded within the approach to asset management. Strategic, tactical and operational risks should be included as should appropriate mitigation measures.

(HIAMG Recommendation 11)

Amended 15 March 2017:

RECOMMENDATION 15 – COMPETENCIES AND TRAINING

The appropriate competencies for all staff should be identified. Training should be provided where necessary for directly employed staff, and contractors should be required to provide evidence of the appropriate competencies of their staff.

RECOMMENDATION 16 – INSPECTIONS

A risk-based inspection regime, including regular safety inspections, should be developed and implemented for all highway assets.

RECOMMENDATION 17 – CONDITION SURVEYS

An asset condition survey regime, based on asset management needs and any statutory reporting requirements, should be developed and implemented.

RECOMMENDATION 18 – MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS AND CLAIMS

Records should be kept of all activities, particularly safety and other inspections, including the time and nature of any response, and procedures established to ensure efficient management of claims whilst protecting the authority from unjustified or fraudulent claims.

RECOMMENDATION 19 – DEFECT REPAIR

A risk-based defect repair regime should be developed and implemented for all highway assets.

RECOMMENDATION 20 – RESILIENT NETWORK

Within the highway network hierarchy a 'Resilient Network' should be identified to which priority is given through maintenance and other measures to maintain economic activity and access to key services during extreme weather.

RECOMMENDATION 21 – CLIMATE CHANGE ADAPTATION

The effects of extreme weather events on highway infrastructure assets should be risk assessed and ways to mitigate the impacts of the highest risks identified.

RECOMMENDATION 22 – DRAINAGE MAINTENANCE

Drainage assets should be maintained in good working order to reduce the threat and scale of flooding. Particular attention should be paid to locations known to be prone to problems, so that drainage systems operate close to their designed efficiency.

RECOMMENDATION 23 – CIVIL EMERGENCIES AND SEVERE WEATHER EMERGENCIES PLANS

The role and responsibilities of the Highway Authority in responding to civil emergencies should be defined in the authority's Civil Emergency Plan. A Severe Weather Emergencies Plan should also be established in consultation with others, including emergency services, relevant authorities and agencies. It should include operational, resource and contingency plans and procedures to enable timely and effective action by the Highway Authority to mitigate the effects of severe weather on the network and provide the best practicable service in the circumstances.

RECOMMENDATION 24 – COMMUNICATIONS

Severe Weather and Civil Emergencies Plans should incorporate a communications plan to ensure that information including weather and flood forecasts are received through agreed channels and that information is disseminated to highway users through a range of media.

RECOMMENDATION 25 – LEARNING FROM EVENTS

Severe Weather and Civil Emergencies Plans should be regularly rehearsed and refined as necessary. The effectiveness of the Plans should be reviewed after actual events and the learning used to develop them as necessary.

RECOMMENDATION 26 – PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK

A performance management framework should be developed that is clear and accessible to stakeholders as appropriate and supports the asset management strategy. (HIAMG Recommendation 4)

RECOMMENDATION 27 – PERFORMANCE MONITORING

The performance of the Asset Management Framework should be monitored and reported. It should be reviewed regularly by senior decision makers and when appropriate, improvement actions should be taken. (HIAMG Recommendation 13)

RECOMMENDATION 28 – FINANCIAL PLANS

Financial plans should be prepared for all highway maintenance activities covering short, medium and long term time horizons.

RECOMMENDATION 29 – LIFECYCLE PLANS

Lifecycle planning principles should be used to review the level of funding, support investment decisions and substantiate the need for appropriate and sustainable long term investment. (HIAMG Recommendation 6)

RECOMMENDATION 30 – CROSS ASSET PRIORITIES

In developing priorities and programmes, consideration should be given to prioritising across asset groups as well as within them.

RECOMMENDATION 31 – WORKS PROGRAMMING

A prioritised forward works programme for a rolling period of three to five years should be developed and updated regularly. (HIAMG Recommendation 7)

RECOMMENDATION 32 – CARBON

The impact of highway infrastructure maintenance activities in terms of whole life carbon costs should be taken into account when determining appropriate interventions, materials and treatments.

RECOMMENDATION 33 – CONSISTENCY WITH CHARACTER

Determination of materials, products and treatments for the highway network should take into account the character of the area as well as factoring in whole life costing and sustainability. The materials, products and treatments used for highway maintenance should meet requirements for effectiveness and durability.

RECOMMENDATION 34 – HERITAGE ASSETS

Authorities should identify a schedule of listed structures, ancient monuments and other relevant assets and work with relevant organisations to ensure that maintenance reflects planning requirements.

RECOMMENDATION 35 – ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT, NATURE CONSERVATION AND BIODIVERSITY

Materials, products and treatments for highway infrastructure maintenance should be appraised for environmental impact and for wider issues of sustainability. Highway verges, trees and landscaped areas should be managed with regard to their nature conservation value and biodiversity principles as well as whole-life costing, highway safety and serviceability.

RECOMMENDATION 36 – MINIMISING CLUTTER

Opportunities to simplify signs and other street furniture and to remove redundant items should be taken into account when planning highway infrastructure maintenance activities.

APPENDIX 2

POVERTY IMPACT ASSESSMENT FORM

1. Is this decision a Budget & Policy Framework or Key Decision? YES				
If YES please answer question 2 below				
2. Will there be an impact of the decision requested in respect of Child and Family Poverty? NO				
If YES please complete the matrix below				
GROUP	POSITIVE IMPACT	NEGATIVE IMPACT	NO IMPACT	REASON & EVIDENCE
Young working people aged 18 - 21				
Those who are disabled or suffer from illness / mental illness				
Those with low educational attainment				
Those who are unemployed				
Those who are underemployed				
Children born into families in poverty				
Those who find difficulty in managing their finances				
Lone parents				
Those from minority ethnic backgrounds				
Poverty is measured in different ways. Will the policy / decision have an impact on child and family poverty and in what way?				
Poverty Measure (examples of poverty measures appended overleaf)	POSITIVE IMPACT	NEGATIVE IMPACT	NO IMPACT	REASON & EVIDENCE

Overall impact of Policy / Decision				
NO IMPACT / NO CHANGE	✓	ADJUST / CHANGE POLICY / SERVICE		
ADVERSE IMPACT BUT CONTINUE		STOP / REMOVE POLICY / SERVICE		
Examples of Indicators that impact of Child and Family Poverty.				
Economic				
Children in Low Income Families (%)				
Children in Working Households (%)				
Overall employment rate (%)				
Proportion of young people who are NEET				
Adults with Learning difficulties in employment				
Education				
Free School meals attainment gap (key stage 2 and key stage 4)				
Gap in progression to higher education FSM / Non FSM				
Achievement gap between disadvantaged pupils and all pupils (key stage 2 and key stage 4)				
Housing				
Average time taken to process Housing Benefit / Council tax benefit claims				
Number of affordable homes built				
Health				
Prevalence of underweight children in reception year				
Prevalence of obese children in reception year				
Prevalence of underweight children in year 6				
Prevalence of obese children in reception year 6				
Life expectancy				



Report of: Assistant Director (Environment & Neighbourhood Services)

Subject: 5 YEAR HIGHWAY MAINTENANCE PROGRAMME

1. TYPE OF DECISION/APPLICABLE CATEGORY

1.1 Key Decision test (i) and (ii) applies. Forward Plan Reference No. RN 03/19.

2. PURPOSE OF REPORT

2.1 To seek approval for a 5 year Highway Maintenance Programme, determined by carriageway condition surveys and following Department for Transport recommended asset management processes.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 The condition of the highway network is established primarily from information obtained from SCANNER vehicles and Course Visual Inspections (CVIs). These inspections are carried out annually, by specialist contractors, in partnership with the other North of England Authorities. The information is then analysed, through the United Kingdom Pavement Management System (UKPMS), which allocates ratings to each section of highway ranging from 0 (good condition) to 100 (nil residual life).

3.2 For the financial year 2019/2020 the capital grant allocation for highway maintenance is expected to be £1,188,000, and the 5 year programme has been prepared assuming a similar level is allocated each year.

3.3 Due to the large number of roads having the same condition rating, results are also supplemented by rating assessments, carried out in house on the basis of Highway Inspector's reports to determine the schemes that should be given priority within the 5 year programme. Consideration is also given to requests received from members of the public and Elected Members, through the Community Forums or directly to Officers.

3.4 The roads and footways included in the maintenance programme are those that are in the most need of repair, as identified by the methods detailed above. The priorities, however, may change over the coming years, as one

highway can deteriorate more quickly than another. The highway network is constantly under threat from damage caused by increases in the volume of traffic, greater vehicle weights, the weather and the disturbance of the structure of the road through the digging of utility trenches. The key to maintaining the highway network successfully is to monitor the condition and at the best time, apply the most cost effective treatment to maximise the life of the road. The Council achieves this through both planned and reactive maintenance based on an assessment of need, and making use of the latest available processes and techniques.

- 3.5 In light of the committees decision to invest in the 'Highway Improvement' scheme, the 19/20 programme has been developed accordingly. The additional £2.5m investment into the borough's highways through the aforementioned scheme has allowed this updated programme to focus on some of the major routes throughout the Borough. **Appendix 1** outlines those schemes already commissioned through the improvement project and provide an update to Committee on progress.

4. PROPOSALS

- 4.1 The 5-year programme attached at **Appendix 1** is based on the assumption that future year allocations will be of similar levels to this year.
- 4.2 Reconstruction works have been identified where other processes are not appropriate, and will be carried out in the interests of highway safety. Generally, however, other treatments such as re-surfacing and surface dressing, which are cheaper but have a shorter term impact than full reconstruction, will be utilised. Main roads which carry higher volumes of traffic are resurfaced using Masterflex, which is a stone mastic asphalt material, whereas quieter, more lightly trafficked roads are done using, dense bitumen macadam (DBM).
- 4.3 All principal and classified roads are inspected using survey vehicles equipped with lasers, video image collection and inertial measurement apparatus to enable surveys of the road surface condition to be carried out whilst traveling at high speeds. These surveys are carried out using state of the art equipment.

5. RISK IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 There may be a need to re-prioritise individual projects as a result of other areas of the network deteriorating quickly and requiring emergency works, which could require the programme to be adjusted.
- 5.2 It should be noted that the Council has finite resources available to support one-off Capital investment and these proposals will fully commit the available resources.

6. FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

- 6.1 The Medium Term Financial Strategy approved by Finance and Policy Committee on 28th January 2019 and Council on 21st February 2019, approved the capital budgets detailed in paragraph 3.2.
- 6.2 The report enables this committee to approve the detailed schemes. These schemes will be funded primarily from the Structural Maintenance element of the Council's Local Transport Plan, as part of the capital grant allocation for highway maintenance (as at paragraph 3.2 of this report), giving an estimated total budget for 2019/2020 of approximately £1,188,000.

7. LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

- 7.1 Temporary Prohibition of Driving Orders will be advertised, where necessary, to support the road closures required for the works.

8. CONSULTATION

- 8.1 The roads to be resurfaced are identified from detailed survey data, highway inspections and engineer's site visits. Any complaints raised throughout the year are also assessed to determine whether they should be considered for inclusion in the programme.

9. ASSET MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS

- 9.1 The Asset Register will be updated to reflect the roads which are resurfaced.

10. OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Child/Family Poverty Considerations	See Appendix 2
Equality and Diversity Considerations	No relevant issues
Section 17 of The Crime And Disorder Act 1998 Considerations	No relevant issues
Staff Considerations	No relevant issues

11. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 11.1 In accordance with the authority delegated by Council within the approved MTFS for 2019/2020 it is recommended that Members approve the proposed programme as shown in **Appendix 1**, and note that this will fully commit the £1.188m available in 2019/2020.

12. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 12.1 To ensure that structural highway maintenance funding is prioritised to achieve maximum benefit from the available budget.

13. BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 13.1 MTFs report of the Finance and Policy Committee on the 28th January, 2019 and Council on 21st February, 2019.
Neighbourhood Services Committee 12th September 2018 – Highway Improvement Programme

14. CONTACT OFFICER

- 14.1 Tony Hanson
Assistant Director (Environment and Neighbourhood Services)
Level 3
Civic Centre
Hartlepool
TS24 8AY

E-mail: tony.hanson@hartlepool.gov.uk

AUTHOR OF REPORT

Peter Frost
Highways, Traffic and Transport Team Leader
Level 4
Civic Centre
Hartlepool
TS24 8AY

Tel: (01429) 523200

E-mail: peter.frost@hartlepool.gov.uk

Sign Off:-

Director of Policy and Finance ☒

Chief Solicitor ☒

APPENDIX 1**Year 1 2019/20*****Year 1 2019/20**

Street	Location	Type	Cost Est.
A689	Wynyard	Masterflex	185,000
A689	Belle Vue Way	Masterflex	73,000
A689	(Travis Perkins)	Masterflex	76,000
A689	Stockton Street	Masterflex	117,000
A689	Burn Rd to Huckelhoven Way	Masterflex	115,000
A179	Powlett Rd Roundabout	Masterflex	50,000
A179	Hart Bypass (Up to High Barns)	Masterflex	144,000
Brenda Road	Tofts Road to Power Station	Masterflex	120,000
Marina Way	Full	Masterflex	116,000
Coronation Drive	Sections	Masterflex	80,000
CETL Access Rd	Full	DBM	18,000
Lister Street	York Rd to Wansbeck Gdns	DBM	25,000
Dalton Piercy Rd	Various Sections	DBM	15,000
Cleveland Road	Section before new roundabout	Masterflex	18,000
A689/ Sapper's Corner (Central reservation area)		Masterflex	20,000
Hibernian Grove	Full	DBM	£8000
Heriot Grove	Full	DBM	£8000

£1,188,000

APPENDIX 1**Year 2 2020/21**

Street	Location	Type	Cost Est.
A689	Sections (Incl. Sapper's Corner)	Masterflex	£90,000
Mainsforth Terrace	South of Burn Road	Masterflex	£96000
Elwick Road	Section at end of Park Avenue	Masterflex	£24000
Thomlinson Road	Full	DBM	£16000
Front Street, Hart	Full	DBM	£80000
Dalton Piercy Main Road	Full	DBM	£100000
Greenland Road	Full	DBM	£48000
Cornwall Street	Full	DBM	£69000
Glentower Grove	Full	DBM	£26000
Bertha Street	Full	DBM	£11000
Mowbray Road	Sections	Full	£100000
Coronation Drive	Sections	Masterflex	£100000
Park Avenue	Full	DBM	£28000
Whitby St South	Full	DBM	£22000
Cleveland Road	Section before Steetley R'dabout	Masterflex	£22000
Lancaster Rd Slip Rd	Full	DBM	£15000
Tees Road	Power Station to boundary (Sections)	Masterflex	£60000
Ocean Road	Hartville Rd to Ravensworth	DBM	£42000
Blakelock Rd	Bede Grove to Shakespeare Ave	DBM	£36000
Marina Way	Middleton Rd R'dabout	Masterflex	£90000
King Oswy Drive	School section	Masterflex	£30000
Hart Road	Easington Rd to Bamburgh Rd	Masterflex	£82000
			<u>£1,187,000</u>

APPENDIX 1**Year 3 2021/22**

Street	Location	Type	Cost Est.
Sections of KRN subject to inspections (A689, A179, etc)		Masterflex	£300000
Truro Drive	Full in sections	Masterflex	£100000
Middleton Rd	Raby Rd to Lancaster Rd	Masterflex	£54000
Jutland Road	Full	DBM	£26000
Bilsdale Road	Full	DBM	£24000
Warkworth Drive	Full	DBM	£20000
Johnson Street	Full	DBM	£16000
Winthorpe Grove	Full	DBM	£15000
Cowper Grove	Full	DBM	£10000
Mowbray Road	Sections	Masterflex	£60000
Coronation Drive	Sections	Masterflex	£40000
Easington Rd	Holdforth Rd to Raby Rd	Masterflex	£40000
Dalton Piercy Road	A19 to Village	Masterflex	£98000
Chester Road	Jesmond Rd to Thornhill Gdns	DBM	£32000
Malcolm Rd	Full	DBM	£15000
Chaucer Ave	Full	DBM	£38000
Marina Way	Lanyard R'dabout	Masterflex	£90000
Lansdowne Rd	Lister St to Park Rd	DBM	£34000
Studland Drive	Full	DBM	£30000
Tunstall Avenue	Full	DBM	£35000
Parton Street	Full	DBM	£25000
Monkton Rd	Full	DBM	£20000
Bolton Grove	Full	DBM	£26000
Hart Lane	Golf Course to Quarry	Masterflex	£55000
			<u>£1,203,000</u>

APPENDIX 1**Year 4 2022/23**

Street	Location	Type	Cost Est.
Sections of KRN subject to inspections (A689, A179, etc)		Masterflex	£200000
Old Cemetery Road	Full	DBM	£73000
Fens Crescent	Full	DBM	£38000
Manor Close	Full	DBM	£41000
Acclom Street	Full	DBM	£9000
Lancaster Road	Full	DBM	£125000
Earlsferry Road	Full	DBM	£28000
Eaglesfield Road	Full	DBM	£45000
Queensland Road	Full	DBM	£35000
Lightfoot Crescent	Full	DBM	£28000
Radnor Grove	Full	DBM	£24000
Manor Road	Full	DBM	£18000
Kesteven Road	Full	DBM	£44000
Ridlington Way	Full	DBM	£24000
Edgar Street	Full	DBM	£12000
Lizard Grove	Full	DBM	£15000
Troutpool Close	Full	DBM	£14000
Carroll Walk	Full	DBM	£33000
Ivy Grove	Full	DBM	£24000
Lime Crescent	Full	DBM	£52000
Oxford Road	Stockton Rd to Leamington Parade	Masterflex	£38000
Chichester Close	Cul-de-sacs	DBM	£23000
Easington Rd	Boundary to King Oswy Drive	Masterflex	£130000
Greatham Back Rd	Middle section	DBM	£30000
Hart Village	A179 to western village entrance	DBM	£95000
Minch Road	Full	DBM	£24000
Newhaven Court	Full	DBM	£24000
			<u>£1,246,000</u>

APPENDIX 1**Year 5 2023/24**

Street	Location	Type	Cost Est.
Sections of KRN subject to inspections (A689, A179, etc)		Masterflex	£245000
York Road	Raby Rd to Victoria Rd	Masterflex	£85000
Throston Grange Lane	(Eastern section)	Masterflex	£60000
Seaton Lane	Brenda Rd to A689	Masterflex	£120000
Worset Lane	Full	DBM	£80000
Casebourne Road	Full	DBM	£60000
Friar Terrace	Full	DBM	£15000
Moor Parade	Full	DBM	£66000
Albion Terrace	Full	DBM	£60000
Dalkeith Road	Full	DBM	£54000
York Place	Full	DBM	£60000
Grosvenor Street	Grange Rd to School	DBM	£34000
Leamington Drive	Full	DBM	£12000
Ellison Street	Full	DBM	£14000
Roxby Close	Full	DBM	£16000
Baltic Street	Full	Masterflex	£54000
Whitfield Drive	Full	DBM	£18000
Grainger Street	Full	DBM	£18000
Peebles Ave	Full	DBM	£24000
Retford Grove	Full	DBM	£25000
Southgate	Full	DBM	£38000
Thornhill Gdns	Full	DBM	£26000
Kilmarnock Rd	Owton Manor Lane to Jedburgh Rd	Masterflex	£76000
			<u>£1,260,000</u>

Notes:

- 1 Some schemes may need to be prioritised/ substituted due to other roads deteriorating more quickly.**
- 2 The estimates above are based on current prices on Annual Tender so costs likely to change when current contract renewed 2023/24 or if increase in material costs etc.**
- 3 Estimates are based on HBC receiving a similar budget allowance year on year.**

APPENDIX 2

POVERTY IMPACT ASSESSMENT FORM

1. Is this decision a Budget & Policy Framework or Key Decision? YES				
If YES please answer question 2 below				
2. Will there be an impact of the decision requested in respect of Child and Family Poverty? NO				
If YES please complete the matrix below				
GROUP	POSITIVE IMPACT	NEGATIVE IMPACT	NO IMPACT	REASON & EVIDENCE
Young working people aged 18 - 21		x		
Those who are disabled or suffer from illness / mental illness				
Those with low educational attainment				
Those who are unemployed				
Those who are underemployed				
Children born into families in poverty				
Those who find difficulty in managing their finances				
Lone parents				
Those from minority ethnic backgrounds				
Poverty is measured in different ways. Will the policy / decision have an impact on child and family poverty and in what way?				
Poverty Measure (examples of poverty measures appended overleaf)	POSITIVE IMPACT	NEGATIVE IMPACT	NO IMPACT	REASON & EVIDENCE

APPENDIX 2

Overall impact of Policy / Decision				
NO IMPACT / NO CHANGE		ADJUST / CHANGE POLICY / SERVICE		
ADVERSE IMPACT BUT CONTINUE		STOP / REMOVE POLICY / SERVICE		
Examples of Indicators that impact of Child and Family Poverty.				
Economic				
Children in Low Income Families (%)				
Children in Working Households (%)				
Overall employment rate (%)				
Proportion of young people who are NEET				
Adults with Learning difficulties in employment				
Education				
Free School meals attainment gap (key stage 2 and key stage 4)				
Gap in progression to higher education FSM / Non FSM				
Achievement gap between disadvantaged pupils and all pupils (key stage 2 and key stage 4)				
Housing				
Average time taken to process Housing Benefit / Council tax benefit claims				
Number of affordable homes built				
Health				
Prevalence of underweight children in reception year				
Prevalence of obese children in reception year				
Prevalence of underweight children in year 6				
Prevalence of obese children in reception year 6				
Life expectancy				

<p style="text-align: center;">NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES COMMITTEE</p> <p style="text-align: center;">18 March 2019</p>
--



Report of: Assistant Director (Environment & Neighbourhood Services)

Subject: LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN 2018/19 OUTTURN AND 2019/20 PROGRAMME

1. TYPE OF DECISION/APPLICABLE CATEGORY

1.1 Key Decision test (ii) applies. Forward Plan Reference No. RN 05/19.

2. PURPOSE OF REPORT

2.1 To inform the Neighbourhood Services Committee of the progress made under the Local Transport Plan delivery programme during 2018/2019, and to identify potential schemes for 2019/2020.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 The third Local Transport Plan (LTP) 2011-2026, sets out how a safe and sustainable transport system can be delivered within Hartlepool. It was recognised that funding, particularly in the short to medium term, was significantly reduced from the second LTP period and, while this represented a significant barrier to delivering the Council's aspirations for improving the transport network in Hartlepool, it provided opportunities to work more closely with our partner organisations for the overall benefit of the Borough.

3.2 The strategy is not limited to the five year timescale of previous LTP's but is designed to look towards 2026 and evolve over this period. This extended timescale ensures that the LTP is aligned with regional strategies and local development frameworks. The strategy continues to be kept under review within this time period, to ensure that it remains current, responding to any changes in circumstances and taking into account any revisions in guidance and best practice.

- 3.3 In March 2015, the final year of the LTP Delivery Plan (2011-2015) was completed. A subsequent LTP Strategic Delivery Plan (2015-2021), had already been approved at the Neighbourhood Services Committee meeting on 16th March 2015, covering the 6 year period, (indicative allocations only, for the final 3 year periods) which can be found in **Appendix 1**.
- 3.4 Year 4 (2018/2019) of the Strategic Delivery Plan (2015-2021), will be completed in March 2019, and Year 4 (2019/20) will commence in April 2019.

4. PROPOSALS

- 4.1 The Local Transport Plan funding has enabled the Council to undertake a significant number of projects to help maintain and improve both our strategic and local road network.
- 4.2 **Appendix 2** details all of the works delivered during 2018/2019, while it also includes proposed schemes for 2019/2020 (subject to further committee reports where necessary).

5. FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

- 5.1 All works/schemes will be funded via the LTP allocation from Central Government as detailed in the Local Transport Delivery Plan (2015-2021), which was approved by the Neighbourhood Services Committee on 16th March 2015.
- 5.2 The Integrated Transport Block allocation is expected to remain at £719,000.

6. RISK IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 There is a possibility that a small number of the schemes listed in the 2018/2019 column in **Appendix 2** may slip into 2019/20 for a number of reasons.

7. OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Legal Considerations	No relevant issues
Child/Family Poverty Considerations	(See Appendix 3)
Equality and Diversity Considerations	No relevant issues
Section 17 of The Crime And Disorder Act 1998 Considerations	No relevant issues
Staff Considerations	No relevant issues
Asset Management Considerations	No relevant issues

8. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 8.1 That the Neighbourhood Services Committee notes the works / schemes delivered during 2018/2019, and approves the proposed schemes for 2019/2020.

9. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 9.1 To facilitate the continuation of the Local Transport Plan delivery programme.

10. BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 10.1 LTP Strategic Delivery Plan – Neighbourhood Services Committee – 16th March, 2015.

11. CONTACT OFFICER

- 11.1 Tony Hanson
Assistant Director (Environment and Neighbourhood Services)
Level 3
Civic Centre
Hartlepool
TS24 8AY

E-mail: tony.hanson@hartlepool.gov.uk

AUTHOR OF REPORT

Peter Frost
Highways, Traffic and Transport Team Leader
Level 4
Civic Centre
Hartlepool
TS24 8AY

Tel: (01429) 523200

E-mail: peter.frost@hartlepool.gov.uk

Sign Off:-

Director of Policy and Finance ☒

Chief Solicitor ☒

APPENDIX 1

Allocation of Integrated Transport Block Capital Funding (2015/16 to 2020/21)

Theme	Scheme Type	2015-16 £000's	2016-17 £000's	2017-18 £000's	2018-19 £000's	2019-20 £000's	2020-21 £000's
Bus Infrastructure (BI)	Bus Stop Improvements	25	25	25	25	25	25
Cycling Schemes (CY)	Cycle tracks/lanes	100	100	100	100	100	90
	New cycle parking facilities	5	5	5	5	5	5
Sustainable Travel (ST)	Sustainable Travel Improvements	25	25	25	25	15	25
Local Safety Schemes (LS)	Safer routes to school	75	75	75	65	65	75
	Local Safety Schemes	75	75	75	75	75	75
	Signage Improvements	14	14	14	14	14	14
Road Crossings (RC)	Dropped Kerbs	35	35	35	25	25	25
Traffic Management and Traffic Calming (TM)	Traffic Signal Improvements	50	50	50	50	50	50
	School Safety Schemes	30	30	30	30	30	30
	Highway Improvement Schemes	85	85	85	95	95	95
Local Road Schemes (RD)	Verge Hardening Programme	50	50	50	50	50	50
	Access to Employment	50	50	50	50	30	50
Hartlepool Vision (HV)	Masterplan Improvements	50	50	50	50	50	50
Miscellaneous (OS)	Car park improvements	50	50	50	20	50	50
	LTP Development						10
	Street Lighting improvements				40	40	
Total		719	719	719	719	719	719

APPENDIX 2

Scheme Type	2018-2019	2019-2020
Bus Infrastructure (£25,000)	<p>Repairs to HBC owned bus shelters :</p> <p>Maintenance of HBC owned bus shelters / poles, as required.</p> <p>Low floor infrastructure bus stop upgrades, as required</p> <p>6 No. additional bus stops & low floor infrastructure along the northern section of Merlin Way</p> <p>Stockton Road (Foggy Furze) – Installation of bus shelter at existing stop near to Greenside pub.</p> <p>Miscellaneous :</p> <p>Canopy / shelter cleansing Carriageway lining works – various locations Purchase of new bus timetable casings. New / replacement timetable installation works at various locations. Installation of missing, corroded and damaged bus stop poles, in preparation for Tees Valley upgrade of all bus stop flags Printing of new / updated bus timetables</p>	<p>Greatham High Street – Low floor infrastructure at existing bus stop, and provision of additional stop with low floor (Subject to ongoing consultation with Parish Council).</p> <p>New bus shelter at existing stop in Merlin Way (Subject to public consultation).</p> <p>Repairs to HBC owned bus shelters :</p> <p>Maintenance of HBC owned bus shelters / poles, as required.</p> <p>Low floor infrastructure bus stop upgrades, as required</p> <p>Miscellaneous :</p> <p>Canopy / shelter cleansing Carriageway lining works – various locations Purchase of new bus timetable casings. New / replacement timetable installation works at various locations. Installation of missing, corroded and damaged bus stop poles, in preparation for Tees Valley upgrade of all bus stop flags Printing of new / updated bus timetables (various).</p>

Scheme Type	2018-2019	2019-2020
Cycle tracks / lanes (£100,000)	<p>Brenda Rd (A689 to steel works) – Cycleway improvement scheme.</p> <p>Bishop Cuthbert Access Improvements Easington Rd bus stop to Hartfields footpath link.</p> <p>National Cycle Network 14 – (Cowpen Bewley) – Cycleway resurfacing, contribution to LGF scheme.</p>	<p>A689 – Brenda Rd link (Public footpath to north of steel works site) – Cycleway provision, contribution to LGF scheme.</p> <p>Bishop Cuthbert Access Improvements (Around perimeter of estate) - Cycleway improvements, contribution to LGF scheme.</p> <p>Brenda Road – Burn Road (Alongside A689) – Cycleway improvements, contribution to LGF scheme.</p> <p>The Way of St. Hild – Coastal route improvements.</p>
<p>New cycle parking facilities (£5,000)</p> <hr/> <p>Signage Improvements (£14,000)</p>	<p>Mill House Leisure Centre – Cycle lockers</p> <p>Civic Amenity Site, Burn Road – Cycle lockers</p> <p>Marina – Cycle parking</p> <p>Vehicle activated signs – Marina Way, Westbrooke Ave, West View Rd, King Oswy Drive, Hart Village.</p> <p>Industrial Estate direction signage</p>	<p>Fens Shops - Cycle parking.</p> <p>Tofts Farm – Cycle parking.</p> <p>Brougham School – Cycle parking.</p> <hr/> <p>Fens School - Electronic 20mph signage (School times).</p> <p>Throston Grange Lane – Electronic 20mph signage (School times).</p> <p>Other signage to be identified.</p>

Scheme Type	2018-2019	2019-2020
Sustainable Travel Improvements (£25,000)	General footpath/ crossing improvements.	Contribution to St. Theresa's School safety scheme.
Safer Routes To School (£75,000)	Collingwood Road traffic calming scheme. Easington Road – Hartfields footpath link. Owton Manor Lane pinch points scheme.	St. Aidan's School puffin crossing. Springwell School safety improvements.
Local Safety Schemes (£75,000)	Kipling Road traffic calming scheme. Brenda Road crossing. Windermere Rd/ Kendal Rd traffic calming scheme. Implementation of various lining works. Traffic regulation orders (various).	Contribution to A179/Hart village signalisation, ahead of three developer contributions. Southbrooke Avenue traffic calming scheme (subject to further report to Committee).
Road Crossings (dropped kerb schemes) (£25,000)	Seaton Carew – Various locations. The Parade. A689/ Dawlish Drive.	Schemes to be identified / confirmed.

Scheme Type	2018-2019	2019-2020
School Safety Schemes (£30,000)	Greatham Primary School traffic calming scheme.	West Park Primary School safety scheme.
Verge Hardening programme / car parking bays (£50,000)	Moffat Rd, Highland Rd, Oxford St, Thackeray Rd, Wisbech Close, Sandbanks Drive.	Schemes to be identified / confirmed.
Traffic Signal Improvements (£50,000)	Oxford Road/ Shrewsbury St puffin crossing.	Upgrade to A689/Sapper's Corner signals.
Car Park Improvements (£20,000)	Multi-storey car park waterproofing and decking improvements.	Contribution to Seaton Coach Park redevelopment. Contribution to Archer Street car park works.
Highway Improvement Schemes (£95,000)	Hart Lane/Wiltshire Way traffic signals upgrade. Elwick Road cats eyes and road marking refresh (other locations as required). Small scale neighbourhood schemes (bollards, guard rails, signage, footpaths, etc).	Next phase of cats eyes upgrade – various locations. Investigation of traffic signals for Park Road/ Osborne Rd junction. Small scale neighbourhood schemes (bollards, guard rails, signage, footpaths, etc).

Scheme Type	2018-2019	2019-2020
Access To Employment (£50,000)	The Bis footpath renewal works.	Contribution to ISQ works as required.
Master Plan Improvements (£50,000)	Contribution to ISQ works – Church Square.	Contribution to ISQ works – Stockton Street.
Street Lighting (£40,000)	Improvements to small number of ‘dark areas’ following LED project, including Spalding Road, Masefield Road and Throston Grange. Rear of Clavering Road – footpath lighting. Town Moor – continuation of existing lighting.	Hart village improvement works. Catcote Rd pedestrian island improvements.
Bridges (£140,00 carried forward from previous years)	Greatham Creek Bridge Re-surfacing of existing bridge deck including all traffic management. Note – This bridge is jointly owned by Hartlepool Borough Council and Stockton Borough Council. Gabion design work by Maccaferri and the associated ground investigation work needed (carried out by ARC Environmental).	The next phase of Greatham Creek bridge repairs is the Gabion abutment repairs

POVERTY IMPACT ASSESSMENT FORM

1. Is this decision a Budget & Policy Framework or Key Decision? YES				
If YES please answer question 2 below				
2. Will there be an impact of the decision requested in respect of Child and Family Poverty? NO				
If YES please complete the matrix below				
GROUP	POSITIVE IMPACT	NEGATIVE IMPACT	NO IMPACT	REASON & EVIDENCE
Young working people aged 18 - 21		x		
Those who are disabled or suffer from illness / mental illness				
Those with low educational attainment				
Those who are unemployed				
Those who are underemployed				
Children born into families in poverty				
Those who find difficulty in managing their finances				
Lone parents				
Those from minority ethnic backgrounds				
Poverty is measured in different ways. Will the policy / decision have an impact on child and family poverty and in what way?				
Poverty Measure (examples of poverty measures appended overleaf)	POSITIVE IMPACT	NEGATIVE IMPACT	NO IMPACT	REASON & EVIDENCE

Overall impact of Policy / Decision				
NO IMPACT / NO CHANGE		ADJUST / CHANGE POLICY / SERVICE		
ADVERSE IMPACT BUT CONTINUE		STOP / REMOVE POLICY / SERVICE		
Examples of Indicators that impact of Child and Family Poverty.				
Economic				
Children in Low Income Families (%)				
Children in Working Households (%)				
Overall employment rate (%)				
Proportion of young people who are NEET				
Adults with Learning difficulties in employment				
Education				
Free School meals attainment gap (key stage 2 and key stage 4)				
Gap in progression to higher education FSM / Non FSM				
Achievement gap between disadvantaged pupils and all pupils (key stage 2 and key stage 4)				
Housing				
Average time taken to process Housing Benefit / Council tax benefit claims				
Number of affordable homes built				
Health				
Prevalence of underweight children in reception year				
Prevalence of obese children in reception year				
Prevalence of underweight children in year 6				
Prevalence of obese children in reception year 6				
Life expectancy				