

# Transport and Environment Committee

10.00am, Tuesday, 4 June 2013

## Road and Footway Additional Capital Investment Budget Allocation 2013/14

Item number	7.10
Report number	
Wards	All

### Links

Coalition pledges	<a href="#">P33</a> , <a href="#">P44</a> and <a href="#">P45</a>
Council outcomes	<a href="#">CO19</a> , <a href="#">CO23</a> and <a href="#">CO26</a>
Single Outcome Agreement	<a href="#">SO1</a> and <a href="#">SO4</a>

**Mark Turley**

Director of Services for Communities

Contact: Sean Gilchrist, Roads Renewal Manager

E-mail: [sean.gilchrist@edinburgh.gov.uk](mailto:sean.gilchrist@edinburgh.gov.uk) | Tel: 0131 529 3765

# Executive summary

## Road and Footway Additional Capital Investment Budget Allocation 2013/14

### Summary

---

At its Budget Meeting on 7 February 2013, the Council approved the allocation of an additional £12M for road and footway investment in 2013/14 – “2.21 investment of an additional £12 million in the city’s roads and pavements with a commitment to begin to remedy the particular issues in rural west Edinburgh”. This report proposes how this additional investment should be allocated across seven different work-streams, which are: Carriageways & Footways, City Centre Improvements, Neighbourhoods, Local Carriageway Surface Enhancement, Other Asset Management, Miscellaneous and Cycling Improvements.

This investment is in addition to the original £13.9M capital investment that was agreed by this Committee on 23 November 2012. Appendix A shows the budget allocation and the list of schemes that were approved.

### Recommendations

---

It is recommended that the Transport and Environment Committee:

- 1 approves the allocation of the additional capital budget for 2013/14 shown in Appendix B;
- 2 approves the list of carriageway and footway schemes shown in Appendix C
- 3 approves the allocation of the Local Shopping Area Pavements shown in Appendix D; and
- 4 notes that the total cost of the proposed scheme may exceed £12M. In this case any projects not completed in the current financial year will be rolled forward and funded through the 2014/15 capital allocation.

## Measures of success

---

The assessment of the condition of the city's roads is measured annually by the Scottish Road Condition Measurement Survey (SRMCS). Edinburgh's Road Condition Index (RCI) has improved from 42.3% in 2005/6 to 32.5% in 2011/12. Edinburgh's ranking among the 32 Scottish Local Authorities has increased from 23rd in 2005/6 to 13th in 2011/12. A continual gradual improvement in one or both of these indicators will be a measure of success.

The process for developing the annual programme and for assessing/prioritising proposed schemes has been overhauled in order to:

- provide more time for effective consultation at Neighbourhood level;
- improve the process for design and development of schemes; and
- ensure compliance with the requirements for registering works on the Scottish Road Works Register.

The new 'Capital Timeline' was introduced for the 2011/12 and was refined for the current year. It is working well and has enabled this report to be produced in good time to secure the approvals needed from Members.

Meeting the target for registration failures and continuance of the above process improvements will be a measure of success.

## Financial impact

---

The cost of improvement works will be funded from the approved additional capital allocation for roads and footway investment.

## Equalities impact

---

This report has been considered for an Equalities & Rights Impact assessment and as a result it has been decided that a full assessment is not required. A full impact assessment, which will be preceded by consultation, will be carried out on a scheme by scheme basis. The schemes recommended in this report for maintenance have been identified using the prioritisation method and will only require consultation with specific minority groups prior to the design being carried out.

The investment in the city's roads, footways, gullies and street lighting improves the accessibility and safety of the roads and footways network and therefore has a positive impact for all users, particularly older people and those with a disability. All footway reconstruction schemes incorporate dropped crossings at all junction points, if not already existing.

## **Sustainability impact**

---

The proposals in this report should have a positive impact on the environment by improving vehicle and bicycle ride quality through carriageway surfacing works and improved pedestrian passage on footway reconstruction schemes.

## **Consultation and engagement**

---

The revised methodology for prioritising roads and footways for capital investment, agreed by the Transport, Infrastructure and Environment Committee in November 2010, was the subject of extensive consultation with Neighbourhood Partnerships and interest groups.

The revised timeline, also introduced in 2010, for the development of the annual capital programme allows time for consultation with Neighbourhood Roads Teams and builds the ability for proposed schemes to be considered by Neighbourhood Partnerships.

## **Background reading/external references**

---

Road and Footway Investment – Capital Programme for 2013/14

## Road and Footway Additional Capital Investment Budget Allocation 2013/14

### 1. Background

---

- 1.1 This report seeks approval for the proposed budget allocation for the additional £12M capital road and footway improvements 2013/14.
- 1.2 At its Budget Meeting on 7 February 2013, Council approved the allocation of an additional £12M for road and footway investment in 2013/14 – “2.21 investment of an additional £12 million in the city’s roads and pavements with a commitment to begin to remedy the particular issues in rural west Edinburgh”. This report proposes how this additional investment should be allocated across seven different work-streams, which are: Carriageways & Footways, City Centre Improvements, Neighbourhoods, Local Carriageway Surface Enhancement, Other Asset Management, Miscellaneous and Cycling Improvements.
- 1.3 This investment is in addition to the original £13.9M capital investment in roads, footways and street lighting that was agreed by this Committee on 23 November 2012. Appendix A shows the budget allocation and the list of schemes that were approved.

### 2. Main report

---

#### Budget Allocation

- 2.1 The proposed budget allocation across the seven different work-streams is shown in Appendix B.

#### Carriageways & Footways

- 2.2 It is proposed to allocate £8.48M to carriageway and footway works. This includes £5.83 for the main Carriageways and Footways allocation, £1M for City Centre Improvements, £0.80M for Local Shopping Area Pavements and £0.85M for Ward Allocation.
- 2.3 The largest allocation of funding will be used for road and pavement resurfacing and it is proposed to allocate £5.83M to this work-stream. It is intended that the

existing system of prioritisation be used to determine the programme of works. The additional investment should help to improve the Road Condition Index, RCI, score for Edinburgh. The proposed list of carriageway and footway schemes is shown in Appendix C.

- 2.4 The schemes shown in Appendix C have an associated budget estimate. This estimate can vary depending on the design solution required. If the schemes come in above estimate then it may not be possible to delivery everything in 2013/14. Any scheme that is not delivered in 2013/14 will be rolled forward and funded through the 2014/15 programme of works.
- 2.5 The procedures used for identifying capital schemes and the prioritisation used to determine the schemes for investment are detailed in Appendix D.
- 2.6 The prioritisation procedures currently in place were introduced in 2010. These procedures were approved by the Transport, Infrastructure and Environment Committee in November 2010.
- 2.7 At the Committee meeting in November 2012, it was suggested that a Sub-Committee be set up, chaired by Councillor Henderson, to review all aspects of the prioritisation procedures. The members of this Sub-Committee are Councillor Robert Aldridge, Councillor Nigel Bagshaw, Councillor Karen Doran, and Councillor Allan Jackson.

### **Roads in Rural West**

- 2.8 The budget motion approved by Council on 7 February 2013 included - "2.21, investment of an additional £12 million in the city's roads and pavements with a commitment to begin to remedy the particular issues in rural west Edinburgh". Four Carriageway schemes in the west of Edinburgh are therefore proposed that will benefit from capital Investment in 2013/14. These are Freelands Road, Builyeon Road, Old Liston Road and Long Dalmahoy Road.

### **City Centre Improvements**

- 2.9 Upgrading the Public Realm sections along the route of the on-street Tramline with adjacent complimentary pavement reconstruction will enhance the experience of Tram users. Pedestrians accessing or alighting from the Tram will benefit greatly from this investment. Works will be informed by a recent Gehl study. The areas that have been identified to benefit from this investment are: York Place, Frederick Street, Hanover Street and Shandwick Place.

### **Neighbourhoods**

- 2.10 It is proposed to invest a further £0.35M to ensure that the programme to replace non-functioning and collapsed gullies continues in 2013/14.

- 2.11 The investment in Local Shopping Area Pavements will allow the Council to make improvements to benefit several areas in Edinburgh, allowing members of the public to see a tangible difference in their local area. The areas for improvement were identified through consultation with individual Neighbourhood Teams which have a more detailed knowledge of the desires and requirements of the residents and businesses in their local areas. The raw condition assessment was then used to prioritise the schemes identified for investment. It is proposed to invest £0.8M in local shopping areas. The list of schemes identified for this investment is shown in Appendix E.
- 2.12 It is proposed to invest an additional £50k per ward to be used for each neighbourhood. There will be a total investment of £0.85M across all 17 wards and will allow the neighbourhoods to invest in roads, footways in their area, in line with locally agreed priorities.

### **Local Carriageway Surface Enhancement**

- 2.13 Building on the success of the Right First Time, RFT, initiative for road repairs it is proposed to introduce a RFT capital programme with a budget allocation of £1.8M. This would allow roads that have never received any surface enhancements to be holistically surfaced through this RFT process. It would, therefore, negate the need for them to be considered for capital investment and significantly increase the life of the asset. Roads surfaced through this process will need only very minimal, if any, revenue repairs over a period of many years. The Finance service has confirmed that the type of work proposed can be treated as capital expenditure.

If agreed, this will give all six Neighbourhood Road Teams the ability to fund at least one surface enhancement squad for a whole year. Revenue RFT repairs will continue to be funded through Neighbourhood revenue budgets.

### **Other Asset Management**

- 2.14 It is proposed to invest £0.25M in other asset renewals. This programme of asset replacement or renewals is carried out in conjunction with footway schemes that are included in the carriageway and footway programme and involves the replacement of street furniture and street lighting. In the case of street lighting where the lighting columns on a footway improvement scheme are more than 25 years old (ie they are near to exceeding their design life) then it is more efficient to replace the lighting columns at the same time as the footway works.

### **Miscellaneous**

- 2.15 Inspection, design and supervision is a critical element of work that is required when delivering the capital carriageway and footway schemes. It is proposed to allocate £0.40M for this work. The inspection, design and supervision budget

will be closely monitored and if the costs are lower than expected then the funding will be re-allocated and used to bring forward additional carriageway and footway schemes.

### **Cycling Improvements**

- 2.16 Council has a commitment to allocate a percentage of the Transport revenue and capital budgets to improve cycling facilities throughout Edinburgh. 5% was allocated in 2012/13 and this will increase to 6% in 2013/14.
- 2.17 The 6% budget commitment will enable the Council to deliver new cycling infrastructure to support increases in cycling. This will help the Council to achieve the targets set out in the Active Travel Action Plan and will include the creation of links between existing off-road routes and upgrading the facilities that are available on-road. Appendix F shows how this 6% budget will be allocated. These schemes have been selected in after consultation with cycling forums.

## **3. Recommendations**

---

- 3.1 It is recommended that the Transport and Environment Committee approves:
- 3.1.1 the allocation of the capital budget for 2013/14 shown in Appendix B;
  - 3.1.2 the list of carriageway and footway schemes shown in Appendix C
  - 3.1.3 the allocation of the Local Shopping Area Pavements shown in Appendix E; and
  - 3.1.4 notes that the total cost of the proposed scheme may exceed £12M. In this case any projects not completed in the current financial year will be rolled forward and funded through the 2014/15 capital allocation.

### **Mark Turley**

Director of Services for Communities



<b>Coalition pledges</b>	<b>P33</b> – Strengthen Neighbourhood Partnerships and further involve people in decisions on how Council resources are used <b>P44</b> – Prioritise keeping our streets clean and attractive <b>P45</b> – Spend 5% of the transport budget on provision for cyclists
<b>Council outcomes</b>	<b>CO19</b> – Attractive Places and Well Maintained – Edinburgh remains an attractive city through the development of high quality buildings and places and the delivery of high standards and maintenance of infrastructure and public realm <b>CO23</b> – Well engaged and well informed – Communities and individuals are empowered and supported to improve local outcomes and foster a sense of community <b>CO26</b> – The Council engages with stakeholders and works in partnership to improve services and deliver on agreed objectives
<b>Single Outcome Agreement</b>	<b>SO1</b> – Edinburgh’s economy delivers increased investment, jobs and opportunities for all <b>SO4</b> – Edinburgh’s communities are safer and have improved physical and social fabric
<b>Appendices</b>	<b>Appendix A</b> –Capital Budget Allocation <b>Appendix B</b> – Additional Capital Road and Footway Budget Allocation 2013/14 <b>Appendix C</b> – Road Services Proposed Schemes 2013/14 <b>Appendix D</b> – Prioritisation of Maintenance Schemes <b>Appendix E</b> – Road Services Proposed Footway Schemes – Local Shopping Areas <b>Appendix F</b> – Cycling Allocation

Capital Budget Allocation

## Current and Predicted Capital Allocation

	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16
£M	16	13.9	15.069	15.069

## Proposed Budget Allocation for 2013/14

Roads, Footways and Street Lighting Budget	<u>£m</u>	13.90	
<u>Carriageways &amp; Footways</u>	<u>£m</u>		
Budget for carriageway works		4.07	
Budget for Local Roads Thin Overlay		1.00	
Budget for footway works		2.55	
Budget for Local Footways		0.35	
TOTAL			-7.97
<u>Street Lighting</u>	<u>£m</u>		
TOTAL		1.40	-1.40
<u>Other Asset Management</u>			
Asset replacement <sup>1</sup>	<u>£m</u>	0.50	
Calder Road Barrier Work		0.25	
TOTAL			-0.75
<u>Neighbourhoods</u>	<u>£m</u>		
Drop crossings (£30,000 per Neighbourhood Area)		0.18	
Drainage improvements (£30,000 per Neighbourhood Area)		0.18	
NEP - (£85,000 per Partnership)		1.02	
TOTAL			-1.38
<u>Miscellaneous</u>			
Budget for Inspection, Design & Supervision costs, including TTRO's	<u>£m</u>	1.25	
Contingencies		0.80	
Leith Walk		0.35	
TOTAL			-2.40
<b>TOTAL SPEND</b>			<b>-13.90</b>

<sup>1</sup> Other asset replacement within schemes i.e. footway schemes involving street lighting replacement of columns over 30 years old, street furniture, sign renewal etc.

**Proposed Capital Programme - April 2013 – March 2014**

**Carriageway Schemes**

<b>Carriageway Schemes</b>	<b>Scheme Location</b>	<b>Ward Number</b>	<b>Council Ward</b>	<b>M<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Raw Score</b>	<b>Road Type Multiplier</b>	<b>Bus Use Multiplier</b>	<b>Prioritisation Score</b>
Queensferry Road	Barnton Junction to o/s 634	1	Almond	9,901	15.0	2	1.50	<b>45.00</b>
South Gyle Crescent	o/s No.9 to South Gyle Crescent Lane	3	Drum Brae/Gyle	5,704	17	1.60	1.50	<b>40.80</b>
Broomhouse Drive	Saughton Road to Broomhouse Road	7	Sighthill/Gorgie	7,130	16.0	1.6	1.50	<b>38.40</b>
Fountainbridge	Semple Street to Viewforth	9	Fountainbridge/C'hart	6,381	16.5	1.8	1.25	<b>37.13</b>
Buccleuch Street	At West Crosscauseway	15	Southside/Newington	683	16.0	1.8	1.25	<b>36.00</b>
Easter Road	London Road to Regent Road	11	City Centre	1,220	18.0	1.6	1.25	<b>36.00</b>
Pennywell Gardens	Pennywell Medway to Pennywell Rd	4	Forth	3,631	22.0	1.3	1.25	<b>35.75</b>
Old Liston Road	Newbridge Roundabout to Newbridge Road	1	Almond	3,163	17.0	1.6	1.25	<b>34.00</b>
Riccarton Mains Road		2	Pentland Hills	2,369	17	1.3	1.50	<b>33.15</b>
Oxgangs Avenue	Whole Street	8	Colinton/Fairmilehead	1,351	16.5	1.6	1.25	<b>33.00</b>

**Proposed Capital Programme - April 2013 – March 2014**

**Footway Schemes**

<b>Footway Schemes</b>	<b>Scheme Location</b>	<b>Ward Number</b>	<b>Council Ward</b>	<b>M<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Raw Score</b>	<b>Usage Multiplier</b>	<b>Prioritisation Score</b>
Gullan's Close	Holyrood Road to o/s No 18	11	City Centre	74	18.5	1.6	<b>29.60</b>
Bruntsfield Gardens	Both Sides	10	Meadows/Morningside	805	17.0	1.6	<b>27.20</b>
Iona Street	North Side 17a to 73	12	Leith Walk	161	17.0	1.6	<b>27.20</b>
Melville Drive,	Marchmont Road to Argyle Place - south side	10	Meadows/Morningside	256	17.0	1.6	<b>27.20</b>
Bruntsfield Avenue	West Side	10	Meadows/Morningside	987	16.5	1.6	<b>26.40</b>
Chapel Street	West Side Crichton St to Buccleuch Place, East side West Crosscauseway to Buccleuch Place	15	Southside/Newington	610	16.5	1.6	<b>26.40</b>
Gladstone Terrace	Both Sides	15	Southside/Newington	789	16.5	1.6	<b>26.40</b>
Iona Street	South Side o/s 2-16	12	Leith Walk	415	16.5	1.6	<b>26.40</b>
St Andrew Place	Both Sides	13	Leith	379	16.5	1.6	<b>26.40</b>
Woodville Terrace	North Side Lochend Road to Ashville Terrace	13	Leith	143	16.5	1.6	<b>26.40</b>

**Footway Schemes**

<b>Footway Schemes</b>	<b>Scheme Location</b>	<b>Ward Number</b>	<b>Council Ward</b>	<b>M2</b>	<b>Raw Score</b>	<b>Usage Multiplier</b>	<b>Prioritisation Score</b>
King's Stables Road	North Side o/s 24-36	11	City Centre	162	13.0	2.0	<b>26.00</b>
Abbeyhill	Various sections, both sides from Abbey Strand to Abbey Loan	11	City Centre	1,472	16.0	1.6	<b>25.60</b>
Abbeymount	Both Sides	11	City Centre	655	16.0	1.6	<b>25.60</b>
Alva Place	Both Sides	12	Leith Walk	267	16.0	1.6	<b>25.60</b>
Bedford Street	20m from Dean Park Street	5	Inverleith	119	16.0	1.6	<b>25.60</b>
Bellevue Crescent	West Side	11	City Centre	414	16.0	1.6	<b>25.60</b>
Broughton Road	West Side Rodney St to McDonald Road, East Side East Claremont Street to McDonald Road	12	Leith Walk	1,402	16.0	1.6	<b>25.60</b>
Calton Road	South Side Weverley Entrance to New Street, North Side at New Street	11	City Centre	987	16.0	1.6	<b>25.60</b>
Claremont Road	Both Sides	13	Leith	804	16.0	1.6	<b>25.60</b>
Collins Place	West Side	5	Inverleith	97	16.0	1.6	<b>25.60</b>
Colville Place	East Side	5	Inverleith	105	16.0	1.6	<b>25.60</b>

**Footway Schemes**

<b>Footway Schemes</b>	<b>Scheme Location</b>	<b>Ward Number</b>	<b>Council Ward</b>	<b>M2</b>	<b>Raw Score</b>	<b>Usage Multiplier</b>	<b>Prioritisation Score</b>
Dundee Street	South Side Dundee Terrace to West Approach	9	Fountainbridge/C'hart	356	16.0	1.6	<b>25.60</b>
Elbe Street	Various Sections	13	Leith	245	16.0	1.6	<b>25.60</b>
Ettrick Road	Both Sides	10	Meadows/Morningside	1,098	16.0	1.6	<b>25.60</b>
Eyre Crescent	Both Sides (Promoted by N'Hood Partnership)	5	Inverleith	542	14.5	1.6	<b>23.20</b>

**Proposed Capital Programme - April 2013 – March 2014**

**Local Roads Schemes**

<b>Local Road Schemes</b>	<b>Scheme Location</b>	<b>Ward Number</b>	<b>Council Ward</b>	<b>M<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Raw Score</b>	<b>Road Type Multiplier</b>	<b>Prioritisation Score</b>
Hillview Cottages	Whole Road	2	Pentland Hills	1,262	19.0	1	<b>19.00</b>
Hawthorn Bank	No.1 to No.18	1	Almond	545	18.0	1	<b>18.00</b>
Dochart Drive	Whole Road	3	Drum Brae / Gyle	2,815	17.0	1	<b>17.00</b>
Long Dalmahoy Road	Haggs Farm to Kaimes Quarry	2	Pentland Hills	799	17.0	1	<b>17.00</b>
Drum Brae Park	Whole Road	3	Drum Brae / Gyle	242	16.5	1	<b>16.50</b>
East Hermiston	Gogar Station Road east for approx 408m	2	Pentland Hills	4,252	16.5	1	<b>16.50</b>
Ferry Road	Service Road Drylaw Place to Groathill Road North	5	Inverleith	1,260	16.5	1	<b>16.50</b>
Lawson Crescent	Whole Road	1	Almond	1,934	16.5	1	<b>16.50</b>
North Gyle Terrace	Maybury Road to North Gyle Grove	3	Drum Brae / Gyle	1,249	16.5	1	<b>16.50</b>
Oxgang's Path	Whole Road	8	Colinton/Fairmilehead	423	16.5	1	<b>16.50</b>
Thorburn Grove	Whole Road	8	Colinton/Fairmilehead	627	16.5	1	<b>16.50</b>

**APPENDIX A**

**Local Roads Schemes**

<b>Local Road Schemes</b>	<b>Scheme Location</b>	<b>Ward Number</b>	<b>Council Ward</b>	<b>M2</b>	<b>Raw Score</b>	<b>Road Type Multiplier</b>	<b>Prioritisation Score</b>
Allan Park Road	Whole Road	9	Fountainbridge/C'hart	2,465	16.0	1	<b>16.00</b>
Carmel Avenue	Whole Road	1	Almond	509	16.0	1	<b>16.00</b>
Carmel Road	Liston road to Pentland View Road	1	Almond	568	16.0	1	<b>16.00</b>
Claverhouse Drive	Whole Road	16	Liberton/Gilmerton	2,852	16.0	1	<b>16.00</b>
Craigmount Grove	Whole Road	3	Drum Brae / Gyle	2,315	16.0	1	<b>16.00</b>
Liston Road / Drive	Whole Road	1	Almond	1,908	16.0	1	<b>16.00</b>
Marshall Road	Whole Road	1	Almond	514	16.0	1	<b>16.00</b>
Mentone Av / Ramsay Place	Whole Road	17	Portobello/Craigmillar	1,582	16.0	1	<b>16.00</b>
Moat Street	Whole Road	9	Fountainbridge/C'hart	2,293	16.0	1	<b>16.00</b>
Muirhouse Medway	Muirhouse Park to Greendale Park	4	Forth	715	16.0	1	<b>16.00</b>
Parkhead Street	Whole Road	7	Sighthill/Gorgie	487	16.0	1	<b>16.00</b>
Pentland View Road	Whole Road	1	Almond	694	16.0	1	<b>16.00</b>



**Local Roads Schemes**

<b>Local Road Schemes</b>	<b>Scheme Location</b>	<b>Ward Number</b>	<b>Council Ward</b>	<b>M2</b>	<b>Raw Score</b>	<b>Road Type Multiplier</b>	<b>Prioritisation Score</b>
Walter Scott Avenue	Whole Road	16	Liberton/Gilmerton	4,643	16.0	1	<b>16.00</b>
Wester Drylaw Avenue	Whole Road	5	Inverleith	2,519	16.0	1	<b>16.00</b>
Wester Drylaw Drive	O/s 77-135	5	Inverleith	3,976	16.0	1	<b>16.00</b>
Wester Drylaw Drive	Ferry Road to No. 213	5	Inverleith	669	16.0	1	<b>16.00</b>

**Proposed Capital Programme - April 2013 – March 2014**

**Local Footway Schemes**

<b>Local Road Schemes</b>	<b>Scheme Location</b>	<b>Ward Number</b>	<b>Council Ward</b>	<b>M<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Raw Score</b>	<b>Road Type Multiplier</b>	<b>Prioritisation Score</b>
Dunedin Street	North f/way opp 21-22 and South f/way o/s 23-27	12	Leith Walk	252	21.0	1.2	<b>25.20</b>
Riversdale Crescent	South side opp junction with Riversdale Grove to opp 14	6	Costorphine/Murrayf'd	453	21.0	1.2	<b>25.20</b>
Camus Avenue	Both sides o/s 1-25	8	Colinton/Fairmilehead	1,044	20.0	1.2	<b>24.00</b>
Hutchison Gardens	Outer footpath	9	Fountainbridge/C'hart	142	20.0	1.2	<b>24.00</b>
Boswall Square	Both Sides	4	Forth	214	19.5	1.2	<b>23.40</b>

**Additional Capital Road and Footway Budget Allocation**  
**2013/14**

Roads, Footways and Street Lighting Budget	<u>£m</u> 12.00	
<u>Carriageways &amp; Footways</u>	<u>£m</u>	
Budget for Carriageway Works	3.08	
Budget for Local Roads Thin Overlay	1.00	
Budget for Footway Works	0.85	
Budget for Local Footways	0.90	
TOTAL		-5.83
<u>City Centre Improvements</u>	<u>£m</u>	
Pavement & Carriageway Resurfacing	1.00	
TOTAL		-1.00
<u>Neighbourhoods</u>	<u>£m</u>	
Drainage Improvements	0.35	
Local Shopping Area Pavements	0.80	
Ward Allocation (17x£50k)	0.85	
TOTAL		-2.00
<u>Local Carriageway Surface Enhancement</u>	<u>£m</u>	
Carriageway Enhancement Programme	1.80	
TOTAL		-1.80
<u>Other Asset Management</u>	<u>£m</u>	
Capital Footway Street Lighting Improvement	0.25	
TOTAL		-0.25
<u>Miscellaneous</u>	<u>£m</u>	
Inspection, Design, Supervision & TTRO's	0.40	
TOTAL		-0.40
<u>Cycling Improvements</u>	<u>£m</u>	
6% Allocation	0.72	
TOTAL		-0.72
<b>TOTAL SPEND</b>		<b>-12.00</b>

**Main Carriageways**

Carriageway Schemes	Scheme Location	Ward Number	Council Ward	M <sup>2</sup>	Raw Score	Road Type Multiplier	Bus Use Multiplier	Prioritisation Score
Haymarket Terrace	Magdalene Crescent to Rosebery Crescent	11	City Centre & Leith	2097	16.0	1.8	1.50	<b>43.20</b>
Freelands Road	Freelands Way west for 332m	2	South-West	2710	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Hillwood Terrace	3 Sections	1	West	1304	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Peffermill Road	Westbound Carriageway at Craigmillar Park	17	East	1100	16.0	1.8	1.50	<b>43.20</b>
Corstorphine Road	Westbound Carriageway No.37 to Murrayfield Road	6	West	755	15.5	1.8	1.50	<b>41.85</b>
Stenhouse Road	Full length	7	South-West	5933	15.0	1.8	1.50	<b>40.50</b>
Broomhouse Road	Roundabout at Broomhouse Drive	7	South-West	2074	14.5	1.8	1.50	<b>39.15</b>
Chambers Street	3 Sections	11	City Centre & Leith	1091	19.5	1.6	1.25	<b>39.00</b>
Pennywell Road	Southbound Ferry Road Avenue to Ferry Road	4	North	674	16.0	1.6	1.50	<b>38.40</b>
Stenhouse Cross	Roundabout	7	South-West	2002	14.0	1.8	1.50	<b>37.80</b>
Lindsay Road Ph3	No 4 Annfield to no 2 Anchorfield, eastbound side.	13	City Centre & Leith	1377	13.5	1.8	1.50	<b>36.45</b>
Lauriston Place	Heriot Terrace to Tollcross	10	South	3247	16.0	1.8	1.25	<b>36.00</b>
Comiston Road	Braid Crescent to Greenbank Terrace	10	South	2352	13.0	1.8	1.50	<b>35.10</b>
Murrayburn Road	Longstone Road to Drumbryden Gardens	7	South-West	10383	17.5	1.6	1.25	<b>35.00</b>
Starbank Road	Roundabout at Pier Place	4	North	962	15.5	1.8	1.25	<b>34.88</b>
Ravelston Dykes	At Murrayfield Road	6	West	659	17.0	1.6	1.25	<b>34.00</b>
A1 Musselburgh By-Pass	350m from The Jewel to the Jewel Roundabout	17	East	3345	15.0	1.8	1.25	<b>33.75</b>
Builyleon Road	Echline Roundabout to No.16	1	West	n/a	15.0	1.8	1.25	<b>33.75</b>
Crewe Road North	Pilton Avenue to Boswall Parkway	4	North	5691	15.0	1.8	1.25	<b>33.75</b>
Lanark Road West	Statlon Loan to Newmills Road	2	South-West	3252	15.0	1.8	1.25	<b>33.75</b>
Dundas Street,	Henderson Row to Fettes Row	5	North	2485	15.0	1.8	1.25	<b>33.75</b>
Gilmerton Dykes Street	From Lasswade Road to Burdiehouse Burn	16	South	2072	16.5	1.6	1.25	<b>33.00</b>
Marchmont Rd Beaufort Rd	At Junction	15	South	573	16.5	1.6	1.25	<b>33.00</b>
Comiston Road	Buckstone Road to No.116	8	South-West	3320	14.5	1.8	1.25	<b>32.63</b>

**Local Road Carriageways**

**APPENDIX C**

Local Road Schemes	Scheme Location	Ward Number	Council Ward	M <sup>2</sup>	Raw Score	Road Type Multiplier	Prioritisation Score
South Gray Street	Whole Road	15	Southside/Newington	744	17.00	1.0	17.00
Oxgangs Drive/Place	Whole Road	8	Colinton/Fairmilehead	887	17.00	1.0	17.00
Oxgangs Gardens	Whole Road	8	Colinton/Fairmilehead	613	15.50	1.0	15.50
Cargil Terrace	Whole Road	4	Forth	1,395	16.50	1.0	16.50
Deanpark Bank	Whole Road	2	Pentland Hills	807	16.00	1.0	16.00
Marchbank Place	Whole Road	2	Pentland Hills	303	16.00	1.0	16.00
Redgauntlet Terrace	Whole Road	16	Liberton/Gilmerton	1,700	16.00	1.0	16.00
Buckstone Court	Whole Road	8	Colinton/Fairmilehead	1,260	16.00	1.0	16.00
Queen's Gardens	Whole Road	5	Inverleith	950	16.00	1.0	16.00
Deanpark Place	Whole Road	2	Pentland Hills	1,537	16.00	1.0	16.00
Thomson Crescent	Whole Road	2	Pentland Hills	2,669	15.50	1.0	15.50
Muir Wood Road	Whole Road	2	Pentland Hills	3,748	15.50	1.0	15.50
Woodhall Grove	Whole Road	8	Colinton/Fairmilehead	589	16.00	1.0	16.00
Redhall Drive	No.44 to Inglis Green Road	7	Sighthill/Gorgie	1,756	16.00	1.0	16.00
Dalhousie Terrace	Whole Road	10	Meadows/Morningside	1,140	16.00	1.0	16.00
Ethel Terrace	Whole Road	10	Meadows/Morningside	1,074	16.00	1.0	16.00
Eildon Street	o/s 24 to 37	5	Inverleith	696	16.00	1.0	16.00
Albion Road Ph1	Albion Place to Terrace	12	Leith Walk	406	16.00	1.0	16.00
Ferry Road	Service Road 664-740	4	Forth	3,246	15.50	1.0	15.50
Telford Drive	Whole Road	5	Inverleith	2,969	15.50	1.0	15.50
Dean Bank Lane & Saxe Coburg	8 Dean Bank to 15 Saxe Coburg	5	Inverleith	2,269	15.50	1.0	15.50
Silverknowes Avenue	Whole Road	1	Almond	2,480	15.50	1.0	15.50

## Main Footways

## APPENDIX C

Footway Schemes	Scheme Location	Ward Number	Council Ward	M <sup>2</sup>	Raw Score	Usage Multiplier	Prioritisation Score
Sommerville Gardens	At Scotstoun Avenue	1	West	248	18.00	1.60	<b>28.80</b>
Market Street	Both Sides Mound to Waverley Bridge	11	City Centre & Leith	964	14.00	2.00	<b>28.00</b>
Bell Place - Glenogle P	Both Sides	5	North	122	17.00	1.60	<b>27.20</b>
Washington Lane	West Footway	7	South-West	133	17.00	1.60	<b>27.20</b>
Ferry Road	Opposite Inverleith Gdns	4	North	729	17.00	1.60	<b>27.20</b>
Queensferry Road	North Side No.91 to Orchard Road	5	North	1,004	16.50	1.60	<b>26.40</b>
Whitehouse Loan	West Side Thirlestane Road to Strathearn	10	South	440	16.50	1.60	<b>26.40</b>
Niddrie Mains Road	South Footway Niddrie Farm Road to Cra	17	East	474	17.00	1.60	<b>27.20</b>
Gorgie Road	South Side at Westfield Road	9	South-West	242	16.50	1.60	<b>26.40</b>
Rochester Terrace	Both Sides	10	South	156	16.50	1.60	<b>26.40</b>
Lauriston Street	Outside No.23	11	City Centre & Leith	60	16.00	1.60	<b>25.60</b>
St Leonard's Street	At Parkside Street	15	South	372	16.00	1.60	<b>25.60</b>
Melville Drive	South Side Argyle Place to Hope Park Cr	15	South	720	16.00	1.60	<b>25.60</b>
Millerfield Place	Both Sides	15	South	277	16.00	1.60	<b>25.60</b>
Union Street	Both Sides	11	City Centre & Leith	651	13.00	2.00	<b>26.00</b>

## Local Footways

Local Road Schemes	Scheme Location	Ward Number	Council Ward	M <sup>2</sup>	Raw Score	Usage Multiplier	Prioritisation Score
Forrester Road	Both Sides	6	Costorphine/Murrayf'd	1520.71	17.00	1.2	<b>20.40</b>
Hillpark Avenue & Gardens	Both Sides	5	Inverleith	2390	17.00	1.2	<b>20.40</b>
Allan Park Crescent & Loan	Both Sides	9	Fountainbridge/C'hart	1,308	17.00	1.2	<b>20.40</b>
Easter Drylaw Place	Easter Drylaw Loan to Easter Drylaw Bank	5	Inverleith	679	19.50	1.2	<b>23.40</b>
Easter Drylaw Place	Groathill Road North to Easter Drylaw Loan	5	Inverleith	978	19.50	1.2	<b>23.40</b>
Wilkieston Road	Craigpark Avenue to Hallcroft Park	2	Pentland Hills	352	18.50	1.2	<b>22.20</b>
Succoth Gardens	Both Sides	6	Costorphine/Murrayf'd	442	18.50	1.2	<b>22.20</b>
Ryehill Grove	Both Sides	13	Leith	356	18.50	1.2	<b>22.20</b>

## **PRIORITISATION OF MAINTENANCE SCHEMES**

Schemes are prioritised based on a condition assessment carried out by a Roads Inspector. The condition score is then multiplied by a prioritisation weighting to give the priority score.

A condition assessment will be carried out to identify potential carriageway and footway schemes that require capital investment. A condition assessment is initiated by one or more of the following methods:

**Neighbourhood Inspectors walkabout inspection:** Neighbourhood inspectors rate the carriageways on a scale from 1 to 5. Anything that scores a 5 will be given a condition assessment.

**Detailed Visual Inspection (DVI):** Carried out by 1 inspector on the carriageway over an 18 month period. It highlights areas that require a condition assessment.

**Scottish Road Maintenance Condition Survey data (SRMCS):** Vehicle scan of the carriageways that highlights areas of the carriageway that should be investigated further.

**Footway Network Survey (FNS):** Carried out by 1 inspector on the carriageway over an 18 month period. It highlights areas that require a condition assessment.

Schemes are prioritised based on a condition assessment carried out by a Roads Inspector. The condition score is then multiplied by a prioritisation weighting to give the priority score.

## **CARRIAGEWAY EVALUATION**

The evaluation of the Carriageway involves a visual condition assessment of the road surface by qualified staff, together with a potential danger assessment.

The criteria used for the assessment are as follows:

- Drainage Condition
- Surface irregularity/Deformation
- Whole Carriageway Deterioration
- Deterioration beyond Cyclic Maintenance Levels
- Will Exclusion Cause Danger

## Condition Scoring

### 1. Drainage Condition

Ideally in purely drainage schemes this rating should be given after a period of bad weather. This will obviously not always be possible, so the existence of any gullies, grips, piped grips and ditches should be taken into account.

- Rating 0 = Sufficient drainage facilities, no standing water after rainfall.
- Rating 1 = Carriageway surface allowing minor standing water, although most of the water is draining away.
- Rating 2 = Drainage facilities severely lacking, causing standing water over large proportion of the carriageway.
- Rating 3 = Severe flooding, lasting long after rain has dried in surrounding area, causing major disruption to vehicle movements.

### 2. Surface Irregularity/Deformation

Here the ratings relate to the overall continuity of the surface of the carriageway, i.e. wheel track rutting, pushing, general shape, etc.

- Rating 0 = Completely uniform surface.
- Rating 1 = Slight undulation of surface.
- Rating 2 = Minor rutting or pushing of surface.
- Rating 3 = Rutting noticeable to drivers, giving uncomfortable journey.
- Rating 4 = Surface shape giving indications of deeper structural damage.
- Rating 5 = Severe undulations indicating major deep structural damage.

### 3. Whole Carriageway Deterioration

The rating should indicate the actual condition of the surface material of the carriageway.

- Rating 0 = New looking surface, no material loss
- Rating 1 = Slight crazing of the main running surface
- Rating 2 = Start of wheel track cracks and some patches already exist.
- Rating 3 = Cracking both horizontally and vertically Existing patches starting to break up.
- Rating 4 = Serious wheel track cracking and crazing of surface, existing patches failure.
- Rating 5 = Surface breaking up and liable to cause injury.



## 4. Has Section deteriorated beyond Cyclic Maintenance levels?

This section has been provided to allow the assessors to rate the overall scheme condition. The rating is given between 0 and 5.

- Rating 0 = Very good condition, probably more than 10 years residual life  
 Rating 1 = Good condition, probably 5-10 years residual life  
 Rating 2 = Still in good condition, starting to wear in areas but still probably 5-7 years residual life.  
 Rating 3 = Reasonable condition, wear and tear starting to show, probably 2-5 years residual life.  
 Rating 4 = Poor condition, giving pedestrians difficulties, requires maintenance in the next 2 years.  
 Rating 5 = Requires maintenance urgently.

## 5. Will exclusion cause danger?

Here, the assessor should be thinking “If this Scheme is not included in this year’s maintenance list, would danger be increased before next year’s assessment?”

- Rating 0 = Definitely no increase in danger.  
 Rating 1 = No increase in danger levels should be expected  
 Rating 2 = Slight possibility of rise in minor damage to vehicles  
 Rating 3 = Possibility of rise in more serious damage to vehicles  
 Rating 4 = High risk of injury to pedestrians / damage to vehicles  
 Rating 5 = Too dangerous to be excluded from the maintenance list this year.

**Prioritisation**

Table 1 below shows the value of the priority rating, which is applied to the condition score:

<b>Road Category (As shown in Table 1 above)</b>	<b>Weighting</b>	<b>Low Bus Use</b>	<b>Medium Bus Use</b>	<b>High Bus Use</b>
	Roads not on Bus Route	Roads with less than 15 Buses per hour	Roads with 15 to 50 Buses per hour	Roads with more than 50 Buses per hour
Special	2.0	Increase the score by 25%	Increase the score by 50%	Increase the score by 75%
Type 1	1.8	Increase the score by 25%	Increase the score by 50%	Increase the score by 75%
Type 2	1.6	Increase the score by 25%	Increase the score by 50%	Increase the score by 75%
Type 3	1.3	Increase the score by 25%	Increase the score by 50%	Increase the score by 75%
Type 4	1.0	Increase the score by 25%	Increase the score by 50%	Increase the score by 75%

Table 2 below shows how the Type of the carriageway is determined:

<b>Table 2</b>	
<b>Type</b>	<b>MSA</b>
Special	Over 30
Type 1	10 - 30
Type 2	2.5 - 10
Type 3	0.5 – 2.5
Type 4	Up to 0.5

Traffic count data is measured in Million Standard Axels (MSA). It takes into account number of vehicles passing per day will all direction combined.

Once the condition score is multiplied by the prioritisation score a list of schemes can be sorted. The list shows highest priority to lowest priority.

These schemes are then passed to the Design Team to allocate costs to give an estimate of repair depending on the extent of reconstruction required.

Once these estimates are placed on the priority list and the annual budget allocation has been determined the list of schemes which can be carried out can be determined.

### **Local Roads**

Local Roads Thin Overlay carriageways are assessed in the same way as the main carriageways. They all have a prioritisation multiplier of 1 as they are all Type 4 roads that are not on a bus route.

### **FOOTWAY EVALUATION**

The evaluation of the Footway is carried out in the same way as the Carriageway assessment and involves a visual condition assessment of the surface by qualified staff together with a potential danger assessment.

The criteria used for the assessment are as follows:

- Kerb Upstand
- Kerb Deterioration/Alignment
- Footpath/Footway Deformation
- Footpath/Footway Deterioration
- Surface Water
- Deterioration beyond Cyclic Maintenance Levels
- Will Exclusion Cause Danger

A needs assessment form is completed and numerical values given to each of the 7 criteria within the bands given on the sheet.

### Condition Scoring

#### 1. Kerb Upstand:-

This element should be evaluated giving a rating between zero and three e.g. where a kerb upstand should be 110 mm. the rating applied shall be as follows:-

Rating 0 =	Upstand	110 - 100 mm.
Rating 1 =	Upstand	100 - 70 mm.
Rating 2 =	Upstand	70 - 40 mm.
Rating 3 =	Upstand	40 - 0 mm.

#### 2. Kerb Deterioration/Alignment

The rating of this element should reflect the actual appearance of the kerb with respect to the condition and the continuity of the level.

Rating 0 =	New looking kerbs, no unnecessary rise and fall, no trips.
Rating 1 =	Slightly chipped edges/missing corners, slight rising of few kerbs, occasional trips.
Rating 2 =	Some kerbs may be cracked/spalling, rising of kerbs causing major trips.
Rating 3 =	Missing kerbs/major deterioration, rising of kerbs liable to cause injury.

#### 3. Footpath/Footway Deformation

Here the ratings relate to the overall continuity of the surface of the footpath/footway, i.e. sunken flags, raising of sand carpet by tree roots etc.

Rating 0 =	Completely flat.
Rating 1 =	Slight undulation of surface.
Rating 2 =	More serious movement in the surface.
Rating 3 =	Undulation severe, causing difficulty walking.

#### 4. Footpath/Footway Deterioration

The rating should indicate the actual condition of the surface material of the footpath/footway.

Rating 0 =	New looking surface, no material loss.
Rating 1 =	Slight material loss or damage to flags.
Rating 2 =	Approx. 25% material loss, broken flags.
Rating 3 =	Serious material loss, missing flags, etc. liable to cause injury.

## 5. Surface Water

This section allows the assessor to indicate the extent of the problem caused by the footpath/footway surface allowing surface water to stand after the rest of the area has dried.

- Rating 0 = No standing surface water.
- Rating 1 = 0-10% of surface covered with shallow pools of standing water.
- Rating 2 = 10-40% of surface covered with shallow pools of standing water.
- Rating 3 = Greater than 40% of surface with major water problems.

## 6 Has section deteriorated beyond Cyclic Maintenance Levels?

This section has been provided to allow the assessor to rate the overall scheme condition. The rating is given between zero and five.

- Rating 0 = Very good condition, probably more than 10 years residual life.
- Rating 1 = Good condition, probably 5-10 years residual life.
- Rating 2 = Still in good condition, starting to wear in areas but still probably 5-7 years residual life.
- Rating 3 = Reasonable condition, wear and tear starting to show probably 2-5 years residual life.
- Rating 4 = Poor condition, giving pedestrians difficulties, requires maintenance in the next 2 years.
- Rating 5 = Requires maintenance urgently.

## 7 Will exclusion cause danger?

Here, the assessor should be thinking "If this scheme is not included in this year's maintenance list, would danger be increased before next year's assessment?"

- Rating 0 = Definitely no increase in danger
- Rating 1 = No increase in danger levels should be expected
- Rating 2 = Slight possibility of rise in minor injuries to pedestrians
- Rating 3 = Possibility of rise in more serious injuries to pedestrians
- Rating 4 = High risk of injury to pedestrians
- Rating 5 = Too dangerous to be excluded from the maintenance list for this year

## Prioritisation

Table 3 below shows the value of the priority rating, which is applied to the condition score:

<b>Table 3</b>					
<b>Usage Category</b>	<b>Super High Use</b>	<b>High Use</b>	<b>Medium Use</b>	<b>Low Use</b>	<b>Ultra Low Use</b>
Weighting Multiplier	2.5	2.0	1.6	1.2	1.0

Once the condition score is multiplied by the prioritisation score a list of schemes can be sorted. The list shows highest priority to lowest priority.

These schemes are then passed to the Design Team to allocate costs to give an estimate of repair depending on the extent of reconstruction required.

Once these estimates are placed on the priority list and the annual budget allocation has been determined the list of schemes which can be carried out can be determined.

The priority list keeps the Footway and Carriageway schemes separated.

## Off-Road Cycleways

Off-Road cycleways are treated as part of the Footways allocation but are ranked separately depending on their usage.

Table 4 below shows the value of the priority rating, which is applied to the condition score:

<b>Table 5</b>			
<b>Usage Category</b>	<b>High</b>	<b>Medium</b>	<b>Low</b>
Weighting Multiplier	2.0	1.5	1.0



## Road Services Proposed Footway Schemes

APPENDIX E

### Local Shopping Areas

Footway Schemes	Scheme Location	Ward Number	Council Ward	M <sup>2</sup>	Raw Score
Oxgangs Road North	Co-Op	8	Colinton/Fairmilehead	2237	16
Saughtonhall Drive	Co-Op	6	Costorphine/Murrayf'd	1219	16
Northfield Broadway	No 82-100	14	Craigtinny/Dudd'n	1617	15.5
Montagu Terrace	From Ferry Road to Royston Terrace	5	Inverleith	1266	16
St Stephens Street	Full Length	5	Inverleith	386	15.5
Rannoch Terrace	Both Sides	3	Drum Brae/Gyle	691	16

**Cycling Allocation**

<b>Location</b>	<b>Scheme Description</b>
A90	Bringing forward the completion of the A90 cycle route improvements from 2015 to 2014. This will improve the overall route from Haymarket to the Forth Bridge for pedestrians and cyclists with new signs and access improvements and the widening of narrow and poorly surfaced sections of this National Cycle Network route which are frequently overgrown by vegetation.
Leith-Portobello	With equal matched funding applied for from Sustrans - further improvements to the Leith - Portobello route (widening and resurfacing of footways and paths in Leith Links). This will improve the quality of path surfaces for pedestrians and cyclists and provide more width for them to pass each other more comfortably.
Carrick Knowe	With equal matched funding applied for from Sustrans - surfacing/lighting of the Carrick Knowe rail path to the new Balgreen tram stop - . This will upgrade this path from an unlit dirt track to a tarmac surfaced and lit path that will bring it up to a suitable standard for its new role as a pedestrian and cycle route from Corstorphine to the new tram stop at Balgreen.