



14 JUNE 2010

Report of the Strategic Director of
Neighbourhoods

Commission Review on Highways and Footways

RECOMMENDATION

1. To a) consider the information and b) hold a dialogue with the Cabinet Member about any further appropriate actions.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

- 2.1 The Commission produced a report in June 2008, following its investigation into relative funding levels and performance for highways maintenance across some other similar highway authorities. The report also included the results of a public consultation exercise, by ward, on the levels of satisfaction with maintenance standards in the city.
- 2.2 For the first of these aspects, results were inconclusive on budgets and performance comparison (via BVPIs) was hampered by changes being made nationally on data collection methods.
- 2.3 For public perception levels, Members noted the significant differences between wards and asked that consideration be given to adjusting spending to reflect these differences.
- 2.4 Following a subsequent report in September 2009, the Commission agreed to a recommendation being made to Council Cabinet in October 2009, which was subsequently approved, as follows:

'To approve the proposal to revisit the two key principles of the recommendations, as set out in paragraph 3.10, in March 2010 and for the Corporate Director of Regeneration and Community, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Planning and Transport, to agree further actions with the Planning and Transportation Commission'

Paragraph 3.10 said

It was agreed with the Commission that there were two key principles of the recommendations that we should review in March. These are:

- The need to compare ourselves against other authorities; from the perspective of performance indicators and the ways in which the highway maintenance services are delivered
- The need to better understand the levels of customer satisfaction with service delivery; covering overall service delivery and whether there are variations in dealing with priorities across the wards in the city.

Since that time therefore, we have undertaken further work in pursuance of these two principles.

- 2.5 There are now only two national indicators for highways maintenance. These are NI168, for principal roads (carriageways) and NI169 for non principal classified roads (carriageways). There are no national PI's for footways. The last year that comparative information is available is 2008/09, which reflects the condition of roads at the end of 2008. Comparative information for 2009/10 will not be available until late 2010.
- 2.5 As reported to Commission Members in September 2009, the Council has now joined a national survey of public perceptions on highway and transport services. The first results for Derby were received in November 2009 and some initial results were reported to the Commission in March 2010. A summary of the overall results is included at Appendix 2.
- 2.6 The survey covers highways maintenance issues, but also a broader range of highways and transportation services. In line with the second key issue, identified in paragraph 2.4, the survey provides a good mechanism for studying customer satisfaction with overall highways and transport service delivery.
- 2.7 In recent months therefore we have concentrated our available staff time on:
- checking the correlation between national BVPI's for highways maintenance and public perception in this area of service.
 - comparing public perception, in wards, of maintenance standards to actual amounts of measured deterioration
 - identifying other authorities showing higher satisfaction levels than Derby, across all highways and transportation service areas, and seeking to open a dialogue regarding their working methods and processes.
- 2.8 The results of this work will be described at the meeting. There will also be the opportunity to have a dialogue with Councillor Poulter, the new Cabinet Member, about any appropriate further actions to take this forward.

For more information contact:	Miss Kully Raju 01332 642013 e-mail: kully.raju@derby.gov.uk
Background papers:	The Commission's Highways and Footways Maintenance Review http://cmis.derby.gov.uk/CMISWebPublic/Binary.ashx?Document=11766
List of appendices:	Appendix 1 – Implications Appendix 2 - National Highways and Transport Public Satisfaction Survey 2009 Overall results for Derby City Council Appendix 3 - National Highways and Transport Public Satisfaction Survey 2009 Benchmarking with other Unitary Authorities

Appendix 1

IMPLICATIONS

Financial

1. None arising from this report.

Legal

2. None arising from this report.

Personnel

3. None arising from this report.

Equalities impact

4. Effective scrutiny will benefit all Derby people.

Corporate Priorities

The maintenance of the city's highways contributes to the Councils 2010-11 priorities and objective of:

- City for Stronger, Safer and Cleaner Communities - SSC2: 'to improve levels of safety and cleanliness and to develop confidence and pride across communities and neighbourhoods'

The work on the Highway Asset Management Plan, HAMP contributes to:

- Council Organisational Development – COD22: 'to deliver value for money across all services'

National Highways and Transport Public Satisfaction Survey 2009 Overall results for Derby City Council

Indicator Reference	Benchmarking Indicator	Score (out of 100)	Ranking (of 76)	Scope to Improve	UA rank (of 31)	Year on Year
01. General KBI						
KBI 01	Overall Satisfaction with Highways and Transport (against local importance)	57.70	22	+4.14	11	
KBI 02	Overall Satisfaction with Highways and Transport (against national importance)	57.62	21	+4.00	11	
02. Accessibility KBI						
KBI 03	Ease of Access to Key Services (All People)	78.16	32	+4.84	15	
KBI 04	Ease of Access to Key Services (People with disabilities)	71.70	46	+8.22	19	
KBI 05	Ease of Access to Key Services (No car households)	76.99	22	+7.50	6	
03. Public Transport KBI						
KBI 06	Overall Satisfaction with Local Bus Services	68.10	9	+6.19	3	
KBI 07	Satisfaction with Local Bus Services (BVPI 104)	70.95	13	+5.73	3	
KBI 08	Satisfaction with Local PT Information (BVPI103)	54.84	23	+9.27	6	
KBI 09	Satisfaction with Local Taxi (or mini-cab) Services	71.18	14	+5.97	7	
KBI 10	Overall Satisfaction with Community Transport, eg Dial-a-Ride and volunteer cars.	59.93	21	+3.87	6	
04. Walking/ Cycling KBI						
KBI 11	Overall Satisfaction with Pavements and Footpaths	53.55	49	+16.19	20	
KBI 12	Satisfaction with specific aspects of Pavements and Footpaths	55.83	45	+10.28	20	
KBI 13	Overall Satisfaction with Cycle Routes and Facilities	54.81	17	+13.17	11	
KBI 14	Satisfaction with specific aspects of Cycle Routes and Facilities	50.08	22	+8.73	13	
KBI 15	Overall Satisfaction with The Local Rights of Way Network	59.15	31	+3.61	16	
KBI 16	Satisfaction with specific aspects of The Local Rights of Way Network	53.14	39	+5.76	15	
05. Tackling Congestion KBI						
KBI 17	Overall Satisfaction with Traffic Levels and Congestion ie. queues	42.31	59	+18.26	20	
KBI 18	Satisfaction with Management of Roadworks	51.79	14	+2.96	9	
KBI 19	Satisfaction with Traffic Management	55.42	20	+3.24	9	
06. Road Safety KBI						
KBI 20	Overall Satisfaction with Road Safety Locally	59.95	23	+6.41	13	
KBI 21	Satisfaction with Road Safety Environment	55.33	24	+6.96	15	
KBI 22	Satisfaction with Road Safety Education	47.04	56	+10.21	22	
07. Highway Maintenance/ Enforcement KBI						
KBI 23	Overall Satisfaction with the Condition of Highways ie. roads and pavements	40.62	49	+19.06	19	
KBI 24	Satisfaction with Highway Maintenance	52.11	42	+9.44	19	
KBI 25	Overall Satisfaction with Street lighting	71.85	11	+4.21	6	
KBI 26	Highway Enforcement/ Obstructions	47.73	65	+15.10	28	

DRAFT [further responses are awaited]

National Highways and Transport Public Satisfaction Survey 2009 Benchmarking with other Unitary Authorities

Borough of Poole
Milton Keynes
Kingston upon Hull
Darlington
Redcar and Cleveland
Northumberland
South Gloucestershire
Stockton on Tees
Bournemouth
Halton
Middlesbrough
Hartlepool
Portsmouth
Bristol City
Durham

**Appendix 3 - National Highways and Transport Public Satisfaction Survey 2009
Benchmarking with other Unitary Authorities**

KBI	Description / question asked	Derby rank (out of 31)	Derby Score (out of 100)	Top ranking authorities	Contact established
Highway enforcement and obstructions					
26	How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the way the Council deals with obstructions on pavements?	30	44.38	Borough of Poole (55.50) Bournemouth (53.07) Halton (52.77)	? ✓ ✓
	How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the way the Council keeps roads clear of obstructions, such as skips/scaffolding etc?	28	53.96	Borough of Poole (63.34) Milton Keynes (63.33) Halton (61.39)	? ✓ ✓
	How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the way the Council deals with illegally parked cars?	30	36.83	Borough of Poole (50.46) Kingston upon Hull (48.60) Milton Keynes (47.51)	? ? ✓
Satisfaction with road safety education					
22	How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the following in your local area: road safety training / education given to children?	27	48.81	Darlington (65.33) Hartlepool (64.46) Redcar and Cleveland (61.39)	? ✓ ✓
	How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the following in your local area: road safety training / education given to motorcyclists?	26	48.15	Durham (58.90) Middlesborough (55.97) Redcar and Cleveland (55.91)	✓ ✓ n/a
	How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the following in your local area: road safety training / education given to young drivers?	21	44.16	Middlesborough (52.68) Durham (51.61) Plymouth (50.13)	✓ ✓ n/a
Overall satisfaction with traffic levels and congestion i.e. queues					
17	Thinking about roads and transport locally, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with: traffic levels and congestion, i.e. queues?	20	42.31	Milton Keynes (60.57) Redcar and Cleveland (57.56) Northumberland (57.54)	✓ ✓ ?
Overall satisfaction with pavements and footpaths					
11	Thinking about roads and transport locally, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with: pavements and footpaths?	20	53.55	Borough of Poole (63.03) South Gloucestershire (61.55) Portsmouth (60.87)	✓ ✓ n/a

✓ = contact established and waiting for feedback

? = no contact established yet

n/a = no attempt made to make contact on this question

**National Highways and Transport Public Satisfaction Survey 2009
Benchmarking with other Unitary Authorities**

KBI	Description / question asked	Derby rank (out of 31)	Derby Score (out of 100)	Top ranking authorities	Contact established
Satisfaction with specific aspects of pavements and footpaths					
12	Thinking about the local area, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with each of these: the condition of pavements?	20	49.97	Borough of Poole (61.09) Bristol City (59.52) South Gloucestershire (59.10)	? ✓ ?
	Thinking about the local area, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with each of these: pavements being kept clear of obstructions (e.g. parked cars)	25	38.26	Borough of Poole (53.12) Bournemouth (48.94) Kingston upon Hull (48.84)	? ✓ ?
Overall satisfaction with the condition of highways i.e. roads and pavements					
23	Thinking about roads and transport locally, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with: the condition of highways, i.e. roads and pavements?	19	40.62	Portsmouth (54.73) Bristol (52.45) Stockton on Tees (51.78)	✓ ✓ ✓
Satisfaction with highway maintenance					
24	Thinking about the local area, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with each of these: the condition of pavements?	20	49.97	Borough of Poole (61.09) Bristol City (59.52) South Gloucestershire (59.10)	? ✓ ?
	How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with each if these locally: condition of road surfaces?	18	41.48	Portsmouth (58.60) Stockton on Tees (55.08) Redcar & Cleveland (54.53)	✓ ✓ ✓
	How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with each if these locally: condition of road markings (e.g white lines)?	22	58.54	Portsmouth (66.20) Stockton on Tees (65.34) Borough of Poole (64.73)	✓ ✓ ?
	How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with each if these locally: speed of repair to damaged roads and pavements?	18	32.28	Portsmouth (46.25) Bristol (43.43) Middlesborough (42.34)	✓ ✓ ✓
	How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with each if these locally: maintenance of highway verges, trees and shrubs?	26	47.60	Milton Keynes (58.89) Bournemouth (57.82) Stockton on Tees (56.95)	✓ ✓ ✓
	How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with each if these locally: keeping drains clear and working?	14	51.41	Milton Keynes (59.75) Stockton on Tees (59.49) Borough of Poole (59.08)	✓ ✓ ?

**National Highways and Transport Public Satisfaction Survey 2009
Benchmarking with other Unitary Authorities**

KBI	Description / question asked	Derby rank (out of 31)	Derby Score (out of 100)	Top ranking authorities	Contact established
Ease of access to key services (people with disabilities)					
4	How easy or difficult do you find travelling to the following places (by any form of transport): Hospital?	25	65.12	Milton Keynes (76.34) Borough of Poole (75.24) Durham (73.16)	✓ ? ✓