

Draft Highways and Footways Maintenance Review

Introduction

- 1.1 At its meeting on 11 June 2007 the Planning and Transportation Commission considered a number of possible work plan options and selected highway maintenance as the subject of a review of 2007/08.
- 1.2 Commission Members met with Christine Durrant, Assistant Director - Highways and Transport, John Hansed - Head of Street Care, the Chair and Vice Chair, and the Co-ordination Officer on 28 June 2007 to determine how the review should be carried out
- 1.3 It was agreed that there were two particular areas in which it was thought that a review by the Commission could add value and might provide information that would be of particular use to the Regeneration and Community Department. These areas were:
 - The funding of highway maintenance by local authorities
 - The Derby public's perception of the state of our roads and the highway maintenance carried out by the City Council.
- 1.4 It was therefore proposed to conduct a review to investigate:
 - a) The ways in which other local authorities fund highway maintenance, the way in which they split their expenditure between planned maintenance and responsive repairs to deal with defects, and their comparative performance in respect of the relevant BVPIs
 - b) The public perception of the highway and footway maintenance in Derby.

Research

- 1.5 Evidence for this review has come from 2 questionnaires. The first was distributed to 16 Unitary Authorities that are comparable with Derby City Council. The second questionnaire was sent to 475 Members of Derby's Pointer Panel to collect the views of local people about Derby's Maintenance Programme.

Summary of Findings

- 1.6 The conclusions drawn from the local Authorities questionnaire were:
- a) The data from the other local authorities shows a similar approach to that taken by Derby City Council.
 - b) There are no obvious funding streams that are not being utilised by Derby City Council for funding Highway and Footway Maintenance.
 - c) It may however, be worth investigating why Leicester's LTP Allocation was £1,533,000 higher than Derby's LTP Allocation
 - d) Intervention levels for potholes and uneven surfaces were similar across the responses however compensation payout levels were varied. Warrington's was particularly low and the reasons behind this may be worth further investigation.
 - e) Although Derby City Council's performance against the BVPI varies, performance eye demonstrates we are meeting our targets and are improving.
- 1.7 The findings from the responses to the Pointer Panel questionnaire included:
- a) Respondents are most likely travel around Derby by car, walking or by bus. Older respondents in particular are most likely to use the bus to travel around.
 - b) Roads in local areas were said to be good, however footpaths were said to be poor. This indicates that footpaths may in some areas require attention before roads.
 - c) If elements of the highways are perceived as being poor in local areas, respondents are also more likely to say that these elements are poor across Derby as a whole.
 - d) Overall, reducing potholes and uneven road surfaces was the main improvement to the highways listed. Respondents who travel around Derby by motorcycle and bicycle were most likely to say this needs improving.

Suggested Recommendations to Council Cabinet Member

- 1.8 To be determined by the Commission.