

Transport and Environment Committee

10.00am, Tuesday, 29 October 2013

Road and Footway Prioritisation Review 2013

Item number	7.9
Report number	
Wards	All

Links

Coalition pledges	P33 , P44 and P45
Council outcomes	CO19 , CO23 and CO26
Single Outcome Agreement	SO1 and SO4

Mark Turley

Director of Services for Communities

Contact: Sean Gilchrist, Roads Renewal Manager

E-mail: sean.gilchrist@edinburgh.gov.uk | Tel: 0131 529 3765

Executive summary

Road and Footway Prioritisation Review 2013

Summary

This report seeks approval for amendments to the procedures currently being used to prioritise road and footway resurfacing throughout Edinburgh.

The purpose of the amendments recommended in this report are to ensure that the condition of the City's roads and footways continues to improve, whilst maintaining the objective that the prioritisation reflects and supports the Council's Local Transport Strategy objectives and, in particular, the Active Travel Action Plan.

Recommendations

It is recommended that the Transport and Environment Committee approves:

- 1 the reduction in the bus weighting as shown in appendix B;
- 2 the allocation for Type 3 and Type 4 carriageways as detailed in 2.4;
- 3 the allocation for local footways as detailed in 2.9; and
- 4 a review of on-road cycle prioritisation, as detailed in 2.11 and 2.12, at a future date.

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 the 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 capital programme and was refined for the current year. It is working well and has enabled the Capital Programme 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 future 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 and 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 future road and footway programmes of work on a scheme by scheme basis.

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 new 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 was the subject of consultation with interest groups. The recommendations have been approved by the prioritisation sub-committee.

Background reading/external references

Prioritisation for a New System of Prioritisation for Road and Footway Investment – November 2010.

Road and Footway Prioritisation Review 2013

1. Background

- 1.1 At its meeting on 27 July 2010 the Transport, Infrastructure and Environment Committee called for a report that outlined options in relation to the criteria used to prioritise roads and pavements investment in the city. The Committee asked for the criteria to be reviewed, to ensure that future prioritisation reflects and supports the Council's Local Transport Strategy objectives and, in particular, the Active Travel Action Plan.
- 1.2 The report on the new system of prioritisation for roads and pavements was agreed on 23 November 2010. It was agreed that these procedures would be reviewed at a future date.
- 1.3 At its meeting on 23 November 2012, this Committee agreed to establish a Member/Officer working group, chaired by Councillor Bill Henderson, to review the road and footway procedures. The other members of this sub-committee are Councillors Doran, Bagshaw, Jackson and Aldridge. This report shows the findings and proposals of the working group.

2. Main report

Carriageway Prioritisation

- 2.1 The existing prioritisation procedures for carriageways are shown in Appendix A. These procedures give a higher prioritisation weighting to carriageways on a bus route.
- 2.2 In addition to the resurfacing of main carriageways, there is also an allocation within the road and pavement capital budget for Local Roads thin overlay process. This approach is used mainly in residential or lightly trafficked areas where it is considered that some localised patching repairs and a complete road overlay will prolong the life of the road. A number of roads are unsuitable for the local roads process, including rural roads with heavy goods/farm traffic.

2.3 Roads are categorised in the table below based on million standard axles (MSA). This takes in to account the number of vehicles passing per day in all directions.

Road Category	MSA
Special	Over 30
Type 1	10 - 30
Type 2	2.5 -10
Type 3	0.5 - 2.5
Type 4	Up to 0.5

2.4 It is accepted that there are many benefits to the existing prioritisation procedures for carriageways. However, it was identified by the working group that many carriageways that were unsuitable for the local roads process are unlikely to be prioritised highly enough, to be included in a programme of works due to their low prioritisation weightings. These were mainly type 3 or type 4 carriageways, which are detailed in Appendix B, that have low bus use. The bus percentage weighting has a significant effect on the carriageways selected for prioritisation. It is accepted that having an additional weighting is important. However, the high percentage weightings currently being used mean that type 1 roads, with a high bus use, are being given top priority regardless of the raw condition score. It is, therefore, proposed to reduce the weighting for bus use. The reduced weightings are shown in Appendix B.

2.5 Reducing the bus weighting will still help to ensure that the type 1 and type 2 carriageways (Appendix B), that require resurfacing, will be prioritised for treatment. However, this does not go far enough to address the issue of type 3 and 4 roads that are unlikely to merit inclusion in a capital programme of works. It is proposed to top-slice an allocation for both type 3 and type 4 roads that are unsuitable for the local roads process. This allocation will be 15% for type 3 and 10% for type 4 of the main carriageway allocation and will be dependent on budget. Appendix C shows how this will benefit these types of carriageways.

2.6 Introducing a top-sliced allocation for type 3 and 4 roads will also be beneficial for cyclists as it will ensure that the roads in the worst condition will be prioritised for resurfacing. Many type 3 and type 4 roads form part of the on-road sections of the Family Friendly Cycle Network.

Footway Prioritisation

- 2.7 The existing prioritisation procedures for footways are shown in Appendix A. These procedures give a higher prioritisation weighting to footways with high footfall.
- 2.8 It is accepted that there are many benefits to the existing prioritisation procedures for footways. However, it was identified by the working group that there are many footways, with low footfall, that are unlikely to be included in a programme of capital works.
- 2.9 At its meeting on 23 November 2012, this Committee approved the introduction of a top-sliced allocation for Local Footways. This allowed resurfacing works to be carried out on footways with low footfall.
- 2.10 It is proposed to include an allocation for local footways in all future capital programmes of works. This allocation will be 25% of the main footway allocation.

Cycle Prioritisation

- 2.11 In 2010, Spokes highlighted the issue that there was no prioritisation weighting for cyclists using carriageways. At present there are no usage figures available for cycle use on carriageways. It is, therefore, not possible to introduce prioritisation weightings for on-road cycle use.
- 2.12 This issue is currently being investigated to ensure that all areas of cycle use are reviewed at to enable the introduction of procedures that will benefit cyclists throughout Edinburgh. The findings will be reported to this committee at a date yet to be decided.

3. Recommendations

- 3.1 It is recommended that the Committee approves:
- 3.1.1 the reduction in the bus weighting as shown in appendix B;
 - 3.1.2 an allocation for Type 3 and Type 4 carriageways as detailed in 2.4;
 - 3.1.3 the allocation for local footways as detailed in 2.9; and
 - 3.1.4 a review of on-road cycle prioritisation, as detailed in 2.11 and 2.12, at a future date.

Mark Turley

Director of Services for Communities

Links

Coalition pledges	P33 – Strengthen Neighbourhood Partnerships and further involve people in decisions on how Council resources are used P44 – Prioritise keeping our streets clean and attractive P45 – Spend 5% of the transport budget on provision for cyclists
Council outcomes	CO19 – 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 CO23 – Well engaged and well informed – Communities and individuals are empowered and supported to improve local outcomes and foster a sense of community CO26 – The Council engages with stakeholders and works in partnership to improve services and deliver on agreed objectives
Single Outcome Agreement	SO1 – Edinburgh’s economy delivers increased investment, jobs and opportunities for all SO4 – Edinburgh’s communities are safer and have improved physical and social fabric
Appendices	Appendix A – Prioritisation of Maintenance Schemes Appendix B – Proposed Carriageway Prioritisation Weightings Appendix C – Type 3 & Type 4 Carriageways

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:

Table 1				
Road Category (As shown in Table 2 below)	Weighting	Low Bus Use	Medium Bus Use	High Bus Use
	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:

Table 2	
Type	MSA
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:

Table 3					
Usage Category	Super High Use	High Use	Medium Use	Low Use	Ultra Low Use
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:

Table 5			
Usage Category	High	Medium	Low
Weighting Multiplier	2.0	1.5	1.0

Proposed Carriageway Prioritisation Weightings

Appendix B

Road Category	Weighting Not on a Bus Route	Low Bus Use Less than 15 Buses per hour	Medium Bus Use 15 to 50 Buses per hour	High Bus Use More than 50 Buses per hour
Special	2	Increase the score by 10%	Increase the score by 25%	Increase the score by 50%
Type 1	1.8	Increase the score by 10%	Increase the score by 25%	Increase the score by 50%
Type 2	1.6	Increase the score by 10%	Increase the score by 25%	Increase the score by 50%
Type 3	1.3	Increase the score by 10%	Increase the score by 25%	Increase the score by 50%
Type 4	1	Increase the score by 10%	Increase the score by 25%	Increase the score by 50%

The Table below shows how the road type is determined

Road Category	MSA
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

Type 3 Carriageways

Appendix C

New Capital Position	Existing Capital Position	Scheme Name	Usage	Condition Assessment Score	Final Score	Council Ward	Ward Number	N'Hood
1	42	Moredun Park Road*	Cway Type 3	19.0	30.88	Liberton/Gilmerton	16	South
2	65	Kingsknowe Road South	Cway Type 3	18.0	29.25	Pentland Hills	2	South-West
3	66	Annandale St East London St RAB	Cway Type 3	15.0	29.25	City Centre	11	City Centre & Leith
4	67	East London Street	Cway Type 3	15.0	29.25	City Centre	11	City Centre & Leith
5	74	Clovenstone Drive	Cway Type 3	17.5	28.44	Pentland Hills	2	South-West
6	75	Restalrig Road South RAB	Cway Type 3	17.5	28.44	Craigentinny/Dudd'n	14	East
7	83	Constitution Street Ph1	Cway Type 3	17.0	27.63	Leith	13	City Centre & Leith
8	84	Mountcastle Drive North	Cway Type 3	17.0	27.63	Craigentinny/Dudd'n	14	East
9	85	Mansfield Road	Cway Type 3	17.0	27.63	Pentland Hills	2	South-West
10	86	North Bughtlin Road	Cway Type 3	17.0	27.63	Drum Brae / Gyle	3	West
11	87	Greenbank Drive	Cway Type 3	17.0	27.63	Fountainbridge/C'hart	9	South-West
12	96	Cockburn Crescent	Cway Type 3	16.5	26.81	Pentland Hills	2	South-West
13	97	Silverknowes Road East Ph2	Cway Type 3	16.0	26.00	Almond	1	West
14	99	Westburn Avenue	Cway Type 3	16.0	26.00	Sighthill/Gorgie	7	South-West
15	102	Wilkieston Road	Cway Type 3	16.0	26.00	Pentland Hills	2	South-West
16	106	Ferry Road Ph5	Cway Type 3	15.5	25.19	Forth	4	North
17	107	Scotstoun Avenue	Cway Type 3	15.5	25.19	Almond	1	West
18	108	Craigleith Crescent	Cway Type 3	15.5	25.19	Costorphine/Murrayf'd	6	West
19	109	Kingsknowe Road North	Cway Type 3	15.5	25.19	Sighthill/Gorgie	7	South-West
20	110	Woodhall Road	Cway Type 3	15.5	25.19	Colinton/Fairmilehead	8	South-West
21	113	Murrayfield Road	Cway Type 3	15.0	24.38	Costorphine/Murrayf'd	6	West
22	114	Myreside Road	Cway Type 3	15.0	24.38	Meadows/Morningside	10	South
23	115	Granton Crescent Ph1	Cway Type 3	15.0	24.38	Forth	4	North
24	116	Baird Road	Cway Type 3	15.0	24.38	Almond	1	West
25	117	A7 Old Dalkeith Road Ph4	Cway Type 3	15.0	24.38	Liberton/Gilmerton	16	South
26	118	Moredunvale Road	Cway Type 3	15.0	24.38	Liberton/Gilmerton	16	South
27	119	Ravelston Dykes	Cway Type 3	15.0	24.38	Costorphine/Murrayf'd	6	West
28	123	Duddingston Row	Cway Type 3	14.5	23.56	Portobello/Craigmillar	17	East
29	124	Silverknowes Road	Cway Type 3	14.5	23.56	Almond	1	West
30	125	Main Street, Ratho	Cway Type 3	14.5	23.56	Pentland Hills	2	South-West
31	126	Shandon Place	Cway Type 3	14.5	23.56	Fountainbridge/C'hart	9	South-West
32	127	Marchmont Road	Cway Type 3	14.5	23.56	Meadows/Morningside	10	South
33	128	Morningside Drive	Cway Type 3	14.5	23.56	Meadows/Morningside	10	South
34	129	Whitehouse Road	Cway Type 3	14.5	23.56	Almond	1	West
35	130	West Saville Terrace @ Mayfield Road	Cway Type 3	14.5	23.56	Southside/Newington	15	South
36	133	Whitehouse Loan	Cway Type 3	18.0	23.40	Meadows/Morningside	10	South
37	134	Restalrig Crescent	Cway Type 3	18.0	23.40	Craigentinny/Dudd'n	14	East
38	135	Oswald Road	Cway Type 3	18.0	23.40	Southside/Newington	15	South
39	143	Hallcroft Park	Cway Type 3	14.0	22.75	Pentland Hills	2	South-West
40	144	Bingham Avenue	Cway Type 3	14.0	22.75	Portobello/Craigmillar	17	East
41	145	Craighouse Road	Cway Type 3	14.0	22.75	Meadows/Morningside	10	South
42	146	Baberton Mains Drive	Cway Type 3	14.0	22.75	Pentland Hills	2	South-West
43	149	Wester Hill	Cway Type 3	17.0	22.10	Fountainbridge/C'hart	9	South-West
44	152	Drum Brae Drive	Cway Type 3	11.0	21.45	Drum Brae / Gyle	3	West
45	153	Whitehouse Loan	Cway Type 3	16.5	21.45	Meadows/Morningside	10	South
46	154	Manse Road, Kirkliston	Cway Type 3	16.5	21.45	Almond	1	West
47	155	Cliftonhall Industrial Est	Cway Type 3	16.5	21.45	Almond	1	West
48	156	Curriehill Road	Cway Type 3	16.5	21.45	Pentland Hills	2	South-West
49	157	Greenbank Drive	Cway Type 3	16.5	21.45	Fountainbridge/C'hart	9	South-West
50	158	Featherhall Avenue	Cway Type 3	16.5	21.45	Costorphine/Murrayf'd	6	West

N.B. The schemes listed are a snapshot to highlight the improved scheme position and may not be representative of a future capital programme.

Type 4 Caqriageways

Appendix C

New Capital Position	Existing Capital Position	Scheme Name	Usage	Condition Assessment Score	Final Score	Council Ward	Ward Number	N'Hood
1	150	Market Street and East Market Street	Cway Type 4	14.5	21.75	City Centre	11	City Centre & Leith
2	171	Gibson Street	Cway Type 4	20.0	20.00	Leith Walk	12	City Centre & Leith
3	177	Dean Path	Cway Type 4	19.5	19.50	Inverleith	5	North
4	180	Bonaly Road	Cway Type 4	15.5	19.38	Colinton/Fairmilehead	8	South-West
5	183	New Swanston	Cway Type 4	15.0	18.75	Colinton/Fairmilehead	8	South-West
6	184	Overton Farm Road	Cway Type 4	18.5	18.50	Almond	1	West
7	185	Muirhouse Avenue	Cway Type 4	18.5	18.50	Forth	4	North
8	190	Cammo Road	Cway Type 4	18.0	18.00	Almond	1	West
9	191	Comely Bank Street	Cway Type 4	18.0	18.00	Inverleith	5	North
10	192	Cammo Road	Cway Type 4	18.0	18.00	Almond	1	West
11	193	Cockburnhill Road	Cway Type 4	17.0	18.00	Pentland Hills	2	South-West
12	194	Cockburnhill Road	Cway Type 4	17.0	18.00	Pentland Hills	2	South-West
13	195	Captain's Row / Captain's Drive	Cway Type 4	17.0	18.00	Liberton/Gilmerton	16	South
14	200	Torduff Road	Cway Type 4	17.5	17.50	Colinton/Fairmilehead	8	South-West
15	201	Bonaly Crescent	Cway Type 4	17.5	17.50	Colinton/Fairmilehead	8	South-West
16	202	Glengyle Terrace	Cway Type 4	17.5	17.50	Meadows/Morningside	10	South
17	203	Hope Lane	Cway Type 4	17.5	17.50	Portobello/Craigmillar	17	East
18	204	Long Dalmahoy Road	Cway Type 4	17.5	17.50	Pentland Hills	2	South-West
19	205	Rutland Square	Cway Type 4	17.5	17.50	City Centre	11	City Centre & Leith
20	206	Cockburnhill Road	Cway Type 4	17.0	17.00	Pentland Hills	2	South-West
21	207	Cockburnhill Road	Cway Type 4	17.0	17.00	Pentland Hills	2	South-West
22	208	Long Dalmahoy Road	Cway Type 4	17.0	17.00	Pentland Hills	2	South-West
23	209	West Pilton Bank	Cway Type 4	17.0	17.00	Forth	4	North
24	210	Kirkgate	Cway Type 4	17.0	17.00	Pentland Hills	2	South-West
25	211	Haughhead Road	Cway Type 4	17.0	17.00	Pentland Hills	2	South-West
26	212	Learmonth Gardens	Cway Type 4	17.0	17.00			#N/A
27	213	Rutland Street	Cway Type 4	17.0	17.00	City Centre	11	City Centre & Leith
28	214	Hyvot Loan	Cway Type 4	17.0	17.00	Liberton/Gilmerton	16	South
29	215	Orchard Road	Cway Type 4	17.0	17.00	Inverleith	5	North
30	216	Parkhead Avenue	Cway Type 4	17.0	17.00	Sighthill/Gorgie	7	South-West
31	217	Crewe Bank	Cway Type 4	17.0	17.00	Forth	4	North
32	218	Lochend Road, Newliston	Cway Type 4	17.0	17.00	Almond	1	West
33	219	Canning Street	Cway Type 4	17.0	17.00	City Centre	11	City Centre & Leith
34	220	Pittville Street Lane	Cway Type 4	16.5	16.50	Portobello/Craigmillar	17	East
35	221	Parkgrove Path	Cway Type 4	16.5	16.50	Drum Brae / Gyle	3	West
36	222	Clermiston Green	Cway Type 4	16.5	16.50	Drum Brae / Gyle	3	West
37	223	Lauriston Street	Cway Type 4	16.5	16.50	City Centre	11	City Centre & Leith
38	224	Bellevue Road	Cway Type 4	16.5	16.50	Leith Walk	12	City Centre & Leith
39	225	West Pilton Crossway	Cway Type 4	16.5	16.50	Forth	4	North
40	226	Harlaw Road	Cway Type 4	16.5	16.50	Pentland Hills	2	South-West
41	227	Ravelrig Road	Cway Type 4	16.5	16.50	Pentland Hills	2	South-West
42	228	Corstorphine Bank Drive	Cway Type 4	16.5	16.50	Costorphine/Murrayf'd	6	West
43	229	Hermitage Park	Cway Type 4	16.5	16.50	Leith	13	City Centre & Leith
44	230	Tylers Acre Avenue	Cway Type 4	16.5	16.50	Costorphine/Murrayf'd	6	West
45	231	Inverleith Terrace	Cway Type 4	16.5	16.50	Inverleith	5	North
46	232	East Hermiston	Cway Type 4	16.5	16.50	Pentland Hills	2	South-West
47	234	Craighleith Hill Avenue	Cway Type 4	16.0	16.00	Inverleith	5	North
48	235	St Leonard's Hill	Cway Type 4	16.0	16.00	Southside/Newington	15	South
49	236	Chalmers Street	Cway Type 4	16.0	16.00	Meadows/Morningside	10	South
50	237	Burdiehouse Avenue	Cway Type 4	16.0	16.00	Liberton/Gilmerton	16	South

N.B. The schemes listed are a snapshot to highlight the improved scheme position and may not be representative of a future capital programme.