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REPORT OF

THE STRATEGIC DIRECTOR FOR SUSTAINABLE REGENERATION

TO THE LEAD MEMBER FOR PLANNING

ON 15th NOVEMBER 2011

TITLE: THE HIGHWAY NETWORK RECOVERY PROGRAMME – 2011/12 REVIEW

RECOMMENDATIONS: That the Lead Member for Planning:

1. Approves the principle of the Network Recovery Programme, utilising identified highway investment funding for the works as outlined in the report and;
2. Approves the approach set out in this report for consideration within the Capital Gateway process.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

This report seeks funding approval for the programme of works associated with the Highway Network Recovery Programme. The intention of the Network Recovery Programme is to recover the carriageway and footway network to a sustainable steady state at a minimum cost.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS:

(Available for public inspection) Highway Maintenance and Network Recovery Report – Approved by Lead Member on the 21st December 2010.

KEY DECISION: YES

1. **Background**
2. A report submitted outlining the proposals for a Highway Network Recovery Programme was approved by Lead Member for Planning on the 21st December 2010. This report outlined the challenges faced by the Authority as a result of the poor condition of the highway infrastructure due to underfunding over the past 20 years, the ‘claims culture’ which has resulted in the diversion of highway maintenance funding into claims settlement and the accelerated deterioration of the network due to the poor standard of utility company reinstatements.
3. Following approval of the proposals outlined in the report, and the commitment of capital funding to this initiative, programmes of planned maintenance were initiated and implemented. Maintenance techniques such as carriageway inlays, micro-asphalt surface treatments and carriageway surface dressing have been carried out to good effect which will assist in minimising future maintenance liabilities and will eventually reduce the amount of funding required for reactive maintenance such as the filling of potholes.
4. A programme of regular highway inspection has been maintained and this, together with the commitment of adequate levels of revenue funding, has ensured that the identified minor repairs can be carried out within timescales prescribed by the national code of practice for highway maintenance. This has ensured the City has a robust Section 58 defence which enables an improved defence against third party tripping claims.
5. A programme of core sampling of utility company reinstatements has been established which has highlighted the poor standard of compliance with nationally agreed reinstatement specifications. This has raised the profile of this issue at a national level and as a result of the City’s successful performance in this area there are proposals to operate this established programme of core sampling throughout the other Greater Manchester authorities.
6. However, the defined network Recovery programme is still in its early stages and to build on the successes achieved in a relatively short period of time a longer term commitment is sought so that the process can continue. In view of the current financial challenges faced it is even more important that effective methods of highway infrastructure maintenance are utilised to minimise longer term liabilities and reduce whole life costs.
7. The detailed proposals outlined in the Lead Member report approved on 21st December 2010 resulted in the following proposed spend profile.

Year One (2011/12) - £4,965,483

Year Two (2012/13) - £3,059,273

Year Three (2013/14) - £3,627,325

Despite the highway maintenance works carried out to date it should be noted that the funding identified for year 1 has been subject to several pressures. A street lighting infrastructure replacement programme has been initiated which has been funded from the existing approved capital funding to a value of £1.966m. Additionally during this financial year it has been necessary to capitalise several revenue functions which has resulted in a further commitment of £2m the identified capital budget. This has meant that the rate of implementation of the highway network programme has had to be reviewed and the spend profile adjusted.

1. **Details**
2. The aim of the Network Recovery Programme is to recover the carriageway network to reach a sustainable steady state at a minimum cost. The general aim is to move from a reactive maintenance regime to a more planned programme.
3. Roads that are nearing critical levels of deterioration should be treated with a preventative measure such as micro-asphalt surfacing or conventional carriageway surface dressing. These chosen preventative-maintenance techniques are intended to extend the short term life and delay further depreciation.
4. The programme of preventative treatments needs to be supplemented with establishment of a carriageway ‘blacktop’ programme. Conventional planing and surfacing techniques such as planing and resurfacing will be utilised to restore rapidly deteriorating carriageway surfaces.
5. Additionally a programme of footway reconstruction needs to be introduced from 2012/13 to ensure that the adopted footways are maintained to a standard which minimises the amount of reactive maintenance currently being carried out. This in turn will assist in minimising the number of third party tripping claims against the Authority.

1. Up to date highway survey data has been recently reassessed and the proposed rolling programme of works is outlined in the tables below.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Year 0 (2011/2012)** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Carriageways** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Treatment Type | **Principal** | | **Classified Non Principal** | | **Unclassified** | | | |  |  |  |  |
| **Red** | | **Red** | | **Red** | | **Amber** | |  |  |  |  |
| Area m2 | Cost | Area m2 | Cost | Area m2 | Cost | Area m2 | Cost |  |  |  |  |
| 100mm Inlay | 11287 | £282,175.00 | 4237 | £105,925.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 40mm Inlay | 10000 | £150,000.00 | 8000 | £120,000.00 | 9460 | £141,900.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Micro Asphalt with membrane 5% pre patching | 20080 | £200,800.00 | 10168 | £101,680.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Micro Asphalt with 5% pre patching | 28219 | £141,095.00 | 23726 | £118,630.00 | 54000 | £270,000.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Renew Binder with later Surface Dressing |  |  |  |  | 0 | £0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Surface Dressing with 10% pre patching |  |  | 33895 | £67,790.00 | 100000 | £200,000.00 | 0 | £0.00 |  |  |  |  |
| Restorative Clause 90 Bitumen Preservative |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **69586** | **£774,070.00** | **80026** | **£514,025.00** | **163460** | **£611,900.00** | **0** | **£0.00** |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Year 0 Cost =** | | **£1,899,995.00** | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Footways** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Category 1a, 1 and 2 "bad" footways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Treatment Type | **Flagged** | | **Bituminous** | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 75% of total | | 25% of total | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area m2 | Cost | Area m2 | Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Replace existing flags with new, isolated kebd/edging  renewal | 0 | £0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Relay flags with isolated kerb/edging replacement | 0 | £0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Slurry seal including masking ironwork, 5% pre patching,  isloated kerb/edging renewal |  |  | 9679 | 48395 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **0** | **£0.00** | **9679** | **£48,395.00** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Year 0 Cost =** | | **£48,395.00** | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Year 1 (2012/2013)** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Carriageways** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Treatment Type | **Principal** | | | | **Classified Non Principal** | | | | **Unclassified** | | | |
| **Red** | | **Amber** | | **Red** | | **Amber** | | **Red** | | **Amber** | |
| Area m2 | Cost | Area m2 | Cost | Area m2 | Cost | Area m2 | Cost | Area m2 | Cost | Area m2 | Cost |
| 100mm Inlay |  |  |  |  |  | £0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 40mm Inlay | 13524 | £202,860.00 |  |  | 2493 | £37,395.00 |  |  | 16317 | £244,755.00 |  |  |
| Micro Asphalt with membrane 5% pre patching | 27047 | £270,470.00 | 31690 | £135,240.00 | 1496 | £14,960.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Micro Asphalt with 5% pre patching | 13524 | £67,620.00 | 95071 | £67,620.00 | 3490 | £17,450 | 66176 | £330,880 | 65262 | £326,310.00 |  |  |
| Renew Binder with later Surface Dressing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8158 | £81,580.00 |  |  |
| Surface Dressing with 10% pre patching |  |  |  |  | 4986 | £9,972.00 |  |  | 73420 | £146,840.00 | 500758 | £1,001,516.00 |
| Restorative Clause 90 Bitumen Preservative |  |  |  |  |  |  | 22059 | £22,059.75 |  |  |  |  |
|  | **54095** | **£540,950.00** | **126761** | **£202,860.00** | **12465** | **£79,777.00** | **88235** | **£352,939.75** | **163157** | **£799,485.00** | **500758** | **£1,001,516.00** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Year 1 Cost =** | | £2,977,527.75 | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | **Add 3% inflation on year 0 rates =** | | | **£3,066,853.58** | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Footways** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Category 1a,1 and 2 "bad" footways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Category 3 and 4 "very bad" footways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Treatment Type | **Flagged** | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 100% of total | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area m2 | Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Replace existing flags with new, isolated kebd/edging  renewal | 33903 | £745,866.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Relay flags with isolated kerb/edging replacement | 20979 | £209,790.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **54882** | **£955,656.00** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Year 1 Cost =** | | £955,656.00 | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Add 3% inflation on year 0 rates =** | | **£984,325.68** | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Year 2 (2013/2014)** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Carriageways** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Principal** | | | | **Classified Non Principal** | | | | **Unclassified** | | | |
|  | **Amber** | | **Yellow** | | **Amber** | | **Yellow** | | **Amber** | | **Yellow** | |
| Treatment Type | Area m2 | Cost | Area m2 | Cost | Area m2 | Cost | Area m2 | Cost | Area m2 | Cost | Area m2 | Cost |
| Micro Asphalt with membrane 5% pre patching |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Micro Asphalt with 5% pre patching | 9073 | £45,365.00 |  |  | 15676 | £78,380.00 | 113414 | £567,070.00 |  |  | 367155 | £1,835,775.00 |
| Surface Dressing with 10% pre patching | 27219 | £54,438.00 | 207165 | £414,330.00 |  |  |  |  | 150613 | £301,226.00 | 367154 | £734,308.00 |
| Restorative Clause 90 Bitumen Preservative |  |  |  |  | 5226 | £3,919.50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **36292** | **£99,803.00** | **207165** | **£414,330.00** | **20902** | **£82,299.50** | **113414** | **£567,070.00** | **150613** | **£301,226.00** | **734309** | **£2,570,083.00** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Year 2 Cost =** | | £4,034,811.50 | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | **Add 3% inflation on year 0 rates =** | | | **£4,280,531.52** | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Footways** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Category 3 and 4 "bad" footways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Treatment Type | **Condition "Bad"** | | | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Flagged** | | **Bituminous** | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 75% of total | | 25% of total | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area m2 | Cost | Area m2 | Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Replace existing flags with new, isolated kebd/edging  renewal | 27239 | £599,258.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Relay flags with isolated kerb/edging replacement | 27239 | £272,390.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Slurry seal including masking ironwork, 5% pre patching,  isloated kerb/edging renewal |  |  | 36318 | 181590 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **54478** | **£871,648.00** | **36318** | **£181,590.00** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Year 2 Cost =** | | £1,053,238.00 | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | **Add 3% inflation on year 0 rates =** | | | **£1,117,380.19** | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Year 3 (2014/2015)** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Carriageways** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Principal** | | **Classified Non Principal** | | **Unclassified** | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Yellow** | | **Yellow** | | **Yellow** | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Treatment Type | Area m2 | Cost | Area m2 | Cost | Area m2 | Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Micro Asphalt with 5% pre patching |  |  |  |  | 418050 | £2,090,250.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Surface Dressing with 10% pre patching | 286098 | £572,196.00 | 148260 | £296,520.00 | 418050 | £836,100.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **286098** | **£572,196.00** | **148260** | **£296,520.00** | **836100** | **£2,926,350.00** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Year 4 Cost =** | | £3,795,066.00 | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | **Add 3% inflation on year 0 rates =** | | | **£4,146,971.08** | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Footways** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Category 3 and 4 "bad" footways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Treatment Type | **Condition "Bad"** | | | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Flagged** | | **Bituminous** | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 75% of total | | 25% of total | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area m2 | Cost | Area m2 | Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Replace existing flags with new, isolated kebd/edging  renewal | 27238 | £599,236.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Relay flags with isolated kerb/edging replacement | 27238 | £272,380.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Slurry seal including masking ironwork, 5% pre patching,  isloated kerb/edging renewal |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **54476** | **£871,616.00** | **0** | **£0.00** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Year 4 Cost =** | | £871,616.00 | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | **Add 3% inflation on year 0 rates =** | | | **£952,438.34** | |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Depreciation Model** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Service Life** | | **Proportion of network** | | **Average Service Life** | | **% of Network to treat each year** | | |  |  |  |
| Principal | 10 | | 25% | | 8.5 | | 11.76 | | |  |  |  |
| 8 | | 75% | |  |  |  |
| Classified Non Principal | 12 | | 25% | | 10.5 | | 9.52 | | |  |  |  |
| 10 | | 75% | |  |  |  |
| Unclassified | 10 | | 100% | | 10 | | 10 | | |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

1. The revised spend profile for the Network Recovery Programme is summarised below.

Year Zero (2011/12) - £1,948,390

Year One (2012/13) - £4,051,178

Year Two (2013/14) - £5,397,911

Year Three (2014/15) - £5,099,409

3.0 **Conclusions**

3.1 The Network Recovery Programme has been successful in its implementation to date and there has been a noticeable reduction in the number of third party complaints being received.

3.2 It is important that for the continued success of this initiative the programme of identified works is endorsed and further funding is committed.

3.3 As the works programme is delivered, further benefits in terms of reduced reactive maintenance funding via the revenue account and a reduction in third party tripping claims will become apparent.

4.0 **Recommendations: That Lead Member:**

4.1 Approves the principle of the Network Recovery Programme, utilising identified highway investment funding for the works outlined in the report.

4.2 Approves the approach set out in this report for consideration within Capital Gateway process.

KEY COUNCIL POLICIES:

* Connecting people to opportunities – Council’s Community Strategy and;
* Local Transport Plan.

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT AND IMPLICATIONS:

The resulting improvement in road conditions will improve accessibility for all residents and commuters in a rational and fair way.

ASSESSMENT OF RISK:

Medium - The consequences of not carrying out the works identified within the Network Recovery Programme report will result in further deterioration of the highway infrastructure which will ultimately cost even more to manage and maintain. There is also the risk that liability claims will increase.

SOURCE OF FUNDING:

Highway Investment Programme funding via approved Prudential Code borrowing will be required so that the programme of repairs identified in the report can be delivered in a timely manner.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS - Supplied by Melinda Edwards Ext 3112

**The Highways Act 1980 (‘the Act’) places upon highway authorities the duty to ‘maintain’ those highways that are maintainable at the public expense. ‘Maintenance’ includes repair for the purposes of the Act.  The said highways should be in a fit state to accommodate the ordinary traffic which passes or may be expected to pass along them.**

**Section 58 (1) of the Act provides the highway authority with a defence in an action against it for non-repair of the highway if it can prove that it has taken such care as in all the circumstances is reasonably required to secure that the part of the highway to which the action relates was not dangerous to traffic.**

**The proposals contained within the report will assist the Council in complying with its statutory duties and the Council should also be better placed to either repudiate more third party highway claims entirely or reduce the level of damages payable should settlement be deemed appropriate.**

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS - Supplied by Alison Swinnerton Ext 2585

The funding of the Network Recovery Programme for 2012/13 is dependent on a successful Capital Gateway Bid. All bids have been submitted and the outcome will be known in February 2012. The Network Recovery Programme will have to be shaped to fit the amount of capital funds made available.

OTHER DIRECTORATES CONSULTED: Not applicable

CONTACT OFFICER: Stuart Whittle TEL. NO: Ext 4038

WARD(S) TO WHICH REPORT RELATE(S): All

