

Proposals for a New System of Prioritisation for Roads and Footway Investment

Transport, Infrastructure and Environment Committee

DRAFT

1 Purpose of report

- 1.1 At its meeting on 27th July the Committee called for a report outlining options in relation to the criteria used to prioritise all roads and footway investment in the city. It was further agreed that the report should reflect the priorities set out in the Council's Active Travel Action Plan (ATAP)

2 Summary

- 2.1 Despite a 376% increase in the roads capital budget since 2003/4 the investment requirements of the roads network exceeds the resources available. A system of prioritisation is therefore used to decided how and where investment is deployed.
- 2.2 The Roads capital budget is apportioned 60% to 40% between carriageways and footways, in accordance with the assessment of need set out in the Road Asset Management Plan (RAMP). Within these allocations there is further prioritisation based broadly on the condition of roads and footpaths and on calculations or, where data is not available, assumptions of usage by pedestrians or motor vehicles.
- 2.3 The Committee has 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.
- 2.4 This report sets out a revised categorisation of footways, cycleways and carriageways. It also proposes weightings that can be applied to individual schemes to ensure that they reflect the Councils maintenance and transport strategies.

3 Main report

- 3.1 Investment in the road and footway network throughout the city is funded from the Capital Budget. The budget allocation for 2010/11 is £17.032m and is allocated to schemes based upon a number of factors.
- 3.2 An element of the programme is top-sliced each year to be attributed equally across the twelve Neighbourhood Partnerships. Currently £100,000 is allocated to each Partnership to permit the Neighbourhood Managers to invest in roads, footways and other environmental improvements in their area in line with locally agreed priorities. This provides additional funds outwith the main allocation, decided by this Committee, to respond to the localised issues identified by the Neighbourhood Partnerships. Additional allocations are ring fenced to fund drainage improvement schemes and new dropped crossings. In recent years an allocation has been set aside within the Carriageway budget to provide a thin surface overlay treatment known as Citipave, This approach is used in residential area locations where it is considered that some localised patching repairs and complete road overlay will prolong the life of the road. Citipave treatments are considered to be high value in that the approach delivers large areas of surface treatment at relatively low cost. It also generates high levels of customer satisfaction, currently averaging 93.6% over the last four years. In the carriageway programme for the current year 72 Roads are receiving Citipave treatment at a total cost of £2.5 million.
- 3.3 All roads in Edinburgh are inspected at least every 21 months and the condition is assessed using the criteria based on surface condition, drainage, potential danger to users, etc. The detailed criteria for assessment are set out in Appendix A. This provides a 'raw' score for each road based upon an objective assessment of its condition and anticipated residual life. At this stage no account is taken of its use.
- 3.4 Whilst Edinburgh's Capital Programme has been significantly increased from £3.575m in 2003/5 to £17.032m in the current year and is far in excess of most Scottish Authorities the maintenance need/demand exceeds the levels of funding available. A set of further criteria are therefore applied to
- 3.5 For Carriageways a weighting is applied to reflect usage. This is based on traffic flow and the current weightings are set out in table 1 below.

Table 1	
CARRIAGEWAY TRAFFIC FLOW	
(Daytime average calculated by using traffic count data)	
NB: Traffic Count Data is measured in Million Standard Axles abbreviated as MSA	
(No. of vehicles passing per day)	
(All directions combined)	
Special type over 30 MSA	2.0
C'way Type1: 10-30 MSA	1.8
C'way Type2: 2.5-10 MSA	1.6
C'way Type3: 0.5-2.5 MSA	1.5
C'way Type4: up to 0.5 MSA	1.0

A further weighting of 10% is applied if the Road is on a bus route.

3.6 For Footways a weighting is applied to reflect usage. However, in the absence of hard data on footfall this is a subjective assessment. The weightings are enhanced by 10% if the footway is constructed using Flags rather than being finished in a bituminous or concrete surface. There is no obvious rationale for the application of the 10% enhancement nor any known record of why it might have been applied in the first place. The current weightings are shown in the table below: For the purpose of prioritisation, the assumption is always that we will replace surfaces on a like for like basis. So footpaths surfaced using flags will be replaced using flags. There may be some circumstances where a different surface may be used to restore surfaces to their original condition, for example, to comply with the Council’s Streetscape policies but these are exceptions.

Table 2	High Usage	Standard Use	Cycleways	Rural
Footway (Bituminous or concrete)	1.8	1.6	1.4	1.0
Footway (flagged)	1.98	1.76	1.54	1.0

The rating given in the table 3 below is a reflection of the amenities within or around the boundaries of the proposed works that are liable to increase pedestrian movement. If the assessor notes a clinic, the GIS database adds one point to the multiplied-up score. The maximum figure allowable is therefore 4.

Table 3			
Proximity of a Clinic / Doctor’s Surgery	High Usage by persons with Visual Impairment	Proximity of a School	High Usage by elderly persons
1	1	1	1
Additional Point	Additional Point	Additional Point	Additional Point

These factors add between 1 and 4 additional points to the weighted figure. However, they are not multipliers and, as such, only have a marginal impact on the final score.

- 3.7 Notwithstanding all of the above, a final over-riding factor has been in place since the autumn of 2008. At its meeting on the 25 November 2008, the Committee approved a re-profiling of the roads investment programme to avoid creating further conflicts with Tram works and other large Utility works. Essentially, projects which could not be undertaken without causing significant disruption are now re-programmed for delivery after completion or further significant postponement of the tram route. City Centre works and those on arterial routes into and out of the City have been postponed. This has had the benefit of allowing a greater proportion of residential roads and footways to be included on the programme. However, it must be remembered that these postponed schemes will need to be reinstated once construction of the tram route has been completed or construction further delayed. This will be the subject of a future report to Committee. Depending upon the level of capital resources being available at that time the proportion of residential streets on the programme will decrease, from the current level, post-Tram construction.

A list of schemes for carriageways and footways deferred to date is included at Appendix B. The total value of these deferred schemes is £9.61M

4 Changes and Improvements Already Underway

- 4.1 The planning, management and delivery of the Road Services Capital Programme is already undergoing a fundamental review as part of SfC's Right First Time programme of service improvement in order to ensure:
- The delivery of high quality outcomes.
 - The demonstrable achievement of Value for Money.
 - Full compliance with the requirements of the Scottish Road Works Register.

A copy of the Brief for this review is attached at Appendix C

- 4.2 A new 'Timeline' has been developed to provide greater time and opportunity for neighbourhood consultation, the involvement and input of the Streetscape team, design and local consultation, programme planning, and compliance with the advanced notification requirements of the Road Works Register. A copy of the 'Timeline' is attached as Appendix D. One key outcome of this new approach is that the draft Capital Programme will need to be submitted to this Committee in the autumn of the previous year and not, as at present, after the start of the Council year when the programme should already be underway. The 2011/12 programme is scheduled to be considered at the next meeting of this Committee.
- 4.3 The review is focusing upon the development of accurate and relevant methods for the inspection and assessment of the carriageway and footway. It will draw upon best practice nationally to inform and, where necessary improve, the Council's practice in completing formal condition assessment.

The outcome and any proposed changes will be reported to a future meeting of the Committee in November.

- 4.4 Given the overall comprehensive review being undertaken it is timely that a review of the criteria for footways and carriageway work be undertaken at this time. The application of weightings to prioritise investment in the roads assessed as requiring major repair or renewal will ensure that the Council's expenditure will be targeted to reflect, support and deliver its transport and asset management policies.

5 Proposed Prioritisation - Footways and Cycleways

5.1 The Active Travel Action Plan being considered elsewhere on this Committee Agenda identifies and categorises every road in Edinburgh in terms of high, medium and low pedestrian use. A map showing this breakdown is included in Appendix E. This categorisation provides an excellent basis for prioritisation of investment. In consultation with officers from the City Development Department proposals have been developed to refine still further this 3 category model to include 2 further categories than can be used to prioritise footway renewal. The additional two categories are:

- 'Super High Use' enabling us to differentiate and prioritise footways such as Princes Street, the Royal Mile and George Street from other High Use streets.
- 'Ultra Low Use' drawing out very low pedestrian use of rural roads with pavements.

So, the Prioritisation/Weighting table for Footways would be:

Table 4					
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

5.2 A modelling exercise has been undertaken to compare the current prioritisation scheme (Appendix G1) against the proposed new prioritisation scheme using the weightings shown above (Appendix G2).

- 5.3 Off-road cycleways would continue to be treated as part of the footways allocation but would be ranked separately depending upon their usage. It is considered that 3 categories would be sufficient:

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

- 5.4 Currently there is only one cycleway identified within the sample list of schemes as the general condition of off-road cycleways is good. It has not therefore been possible to model the effect of this prioritisation. However, for comparison purposes a high use Cycleway such as Middle Meadow Walk would receive the same prioritisation as a High Use Footway such as St. Andrew Square, Cowgate or Broughton Street. The North Edinburgh Cycle Network would fall into the Medium Category with the more rural cycle network being typical of the Low Use Category.

6 Proposed Prioritisation - Carriageways

- 6.1 Any prioritisation of carriageway investment needs to take account of bus use not only to reflect the Council's local transport policies but also because of heavy wear and tear that buses inflict on the road. The current 10% uplift to the weighting that is applied to roads on bus routes is considered to be inadequate to reflect these factors and needs to be re-thought. Any revised prioritisation should also reflect and discriminate between high, medium and low levels of bus use. Some roads carry in excess of 100 buses per hour at peak times whilst others may be as low as 4 buses per hour.
- 6.2 Currently the carriageway prioritisation weighting utilises the five types of carriageway set out in paragraph 3.6 above. The Weighted Score is increased by 10% irrespective of bus volumes. A more refined system has been developed to reflect different peak hour bus use. A map has been supplied by Lothian Buses which shows roads with low bus use defined as less than 15 buses per hour; medium bus use – 15 to 50 buses per hour and high bus use – over 50 buses per hour. The map is reproduced in Appendix F
- 6.3 A proposed prioritisation for carriageways based on the current Road Categorisation system and the bus usage is set out in table 6:

Road Category	Weighting	Low Bus Use	Medium Bus Use	High Bus Use
	Not on Bus Route	Less than 15 Buses per hour	15 to 50 Buses per hour	More than 50 Buses per hour
Special	2.0	Increase by 25%	Increase by 50%	Increase by 75%
Type 1	1.8	Increase by 25%	Increase by 50%	Increase by 75%
Type 2	1.6	Increase by 25%	Increase by 50%	Increase by 75%
Type 3	1.3	Increase by 25%	Increase by 50%	Increase by 75%
Type 4	1.0	Increase by 25%	Increase by 50%	Increase by 75%

- 6.4 A modelling exercise has been undertaken to compare the current prioritisation scheme against the proposed weightings shown above. Appendix H2 shows the prioritised list of roads that would result from the application of the weightings shown in Table 6 above. For illustrative purposes the roads that are on bus routes are highlighted using shading within that Appendix.
- 6.5 It is proposed to retain an allocation within the Carriageway Programme for 'Citipave'-type schemes as described in paragraph 3.2. Citipave treatment schemes will be identified as a separate element within the proposed draft annual programme submitted to this Committee. The amount of allocation will vary but will depend on the total Capital budget for Roads and Footways and the Tram conflict issues in paragraph 3.7, but will likely be between 10-20%.

7 Weightings Used

- 7.1 The weightings applied to carriageway, footway and cycleway schemes are not a precise calculation. There is no scientific basis for the weightings chosen. They are a matter of judgement for the Committee. Whilst being objective in their application, to ensure a fair and equitable treatment of all roads across the City, the weightings have been subjectively developed in an attempt to ensure that the Council's policies are reflected in practical application. The only real test that they have is in the impact they have on the prioritisation of roads for investment that result from their application.
- 7.2 It should be noted that these indicative priorities are notwithstanding the City Centre and Arterial Route Embargos explained in paragraph 3.7 above. Any schemes falling into this category would be postponed until after completion of the Tram construction project.

8 Financial Implications

- 8.1 The proposals contained in this report will result in no overall change to the level of expenditure.

9 Environmental Impact

- 9.1 The proposed revisions to the prioritisation of the capital programme are designed to reflect and support the delivery of the Council's important Local Transport Strategies and, in particular, the promotion and development of walking, cycling and bus travel.

10 Conclusions

- 10.1 In summary, the main changes that are being proposed are to prioritise roads, footways and cycleways for major repair and renewal using weightings which are designed to reflect the Council's Local Transport Policies. For footways this involves re-categorising all footways based on pedestrian volumes using the system adopted within the draft Active Travel Action Plan. For carriageways the changes involve the general increase in the weighting applied to all roads on bus routes to give them greater priority over roads not used by buses. Further, the changes are also designed to give different priorities to roads used by buses by creating three separate weightings to reflect roads with high, medium and low bus volumes. Cycleways will also be categorised into high, medium and low use to bring them into line with the system used for roads and footways.
- 10.2 The criteria and weightings have been reviewed in collaboration with colleagues in City Development to reflect and support the priorities more closely, within the Council's Local Transport Strategy in general and the draft Active Travel Action Plan in particular.
- 10.3 If agreed, the weightings proposed in this report will be used to prioritise the proposed roads investment capital programme for 2011/12 and beyond scheduled to be considered by this Committee at its next meeting.

11 Recommendations

It is recommended that the Committee:

- a) Agree the new categorisation of footways and the proposed weightings, as discussed in paragraph 5.1;
- b) Agree the separate categorisation of off road cycleways and the proposed weightings, as discussed in paragraph 5.3;
- c) Agree the new methodology for recognising different levels of this usage on roadways and the proposed weightings, as discussed in paragraph 6.3;
- d) Agree that all of the new weightings be applied to prioritise all roads capital programme schemes with effect from April 2011 onwards.

Mark Turley
Director of Services for Communities

Appendices	Appendix A – Prioritisation of Maintenance Schemes Appendix B – Deferred Maintenance Schemes Appendix C – Roads Capital Programme Review Appendix D – Capital Programme ‘Timeline’ Appendix E – Map showing Draft Pedestrian Priority Corridors & Areas Appendix F – Map showing High, Medium and Low Bus Use Appendix G – Modelled Weighting for Footways Appendix H – Modelled Weighting for Carriageways
Contact/tel/Email	Tony Lear Tel 529-3436 tony.lear@edinburgh.gov.uk
Wards affected	All
Single Outcome Agreement	National Outcome (15) – Our public services are high quality, continually improving, efficient and responsive to local people’s needs.
Background Papers	Report to TIE Committee 27 July 2010 ‘Road and Footway Investment – Prioritisation of Works & Programme for 201/11

PRIORITISATION OF MAINTENANCE SCHEMES

A list of road maintenance schemes is prepared from local knowledge, information supplied by Road Services Inspectors walkabout inspection reports, the Detailed Visual Inspector's reports, Scottish Road Maintenance Condition Survey data and suggestions from members of the public and their elected representatives.

Schemes are evaluated/prioritised by applying the following rating system using standardised sheets attached.

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

Rating System

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 the 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 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.

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.

Table 3 below shows the value of the priority rating, which is allocated to the scheme.

TABLE 3

CARRIAGEWAY TRAFFIC FLOW (Daytime average calculated by using traffic count data)

Traffic Count Data is measured in Million Standard Axles abbreviated as MSA

(No. of vehicles passing per day)

(All directions combined)

Special type over 30 MSA	2.0
C'way Type1: 10-30 MSA	1.8
C'way Type2: 2.5-10 MSA	1.6
C'way Type3: 0.5-2.5 MSA	1.5
C'way Type4: up to 0.5 MSA	1.0

Once a Total Rating has been calculated the scheme is input into the GIS database which applies a multiplying factor in accordance with Table 3 above and adds 10% if the

carriageway is a bus route. The GIS can then export data and the 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 has been determined the list of schemes which can be carried out can be determined.

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 seven criteria within the bands given on the sheet.

Footway Rating System

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

Draft Version 0.8

- 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

Once a Total Rating has been calculated the scheme is input into a database which sorts the list of schemes. 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 has been determined the list of schemes which can be carried out can be determined.

Table 1 allows the assessor to indicate how important the footway/footpath is, within the whole network. E.g. If the assessor indicates High Usage, the GIS database multiplies the "raw score" by 1.8 (1.98 in the case of a flagged footway). Note that the maximum figure allowable is 1.8 e.g. A very busy shopping area would be given priority rating of 1.8 and a rural footway 1.0.

TABLE 1	High Usage	Standard Use	Cycleways	Rural
Footway (Bituminous or concrete)	1.8	1.6	1.4	1.0
Footway(flagged)	1.98	1.76	1.54	1.0

The rating given in Table 2 is an indication of the amenities within the boundaries of the proposed works and in the surrounding area, that are liable to cause high pedestrian movement. If the assessor notes a clinic, the GIS database adds one point to the multiplied-up score. Note that the maximum figure allowable is 4.

TABLE 2			
clinic	blind	school	OAPs

The priority list keeps the Footway and Carriageway schemes separated.

DEFERRED SCHEMES

Carriageway Scheme Location
Frederick Street
Gorgie Road
West Coates
Circus Place
Buccleuch Street
West Approach Road
Peffermill Road
Howe Street
Canon Street
Eyre Place
Henderson Gardens & Street
Portobello High Street
Portobello High Street
Murrayburn Road
Pennywell Gardens
Russell Road
Randolph Crescent
Lochend Road
Pennywell Road
Lawnmarket
Balgreen Road
Newcraighall Road
Seafield Road East
Dundas St / Great King Street Junction
Kirk Brae

Footway Scheme Locations
Ferry Road
Queensferry Street Lane
Buccleuch Street
Inverleith Row
The Wisp south from Niddrie Mains Road
Roseburn Terrace
Thistle Street Lane NW and SW
Queen Charlotte Street/Elbe Street
Lady Lawson Street
Bernard Street
Henderson Street
Shore
St John's Road
Ravelston Dykes Road
North Gray's Close
Brighton Street
West Register Street
Largo Place
Queen Charlotte Lane
Brandon Street
Brandon Terrace
London Road
Regent Road
North St David's Street, St Andrew's Square to North St Andrew's Lane
Easter Road
Great Junction Street
Hamilton Place
Glencairn Crescent
West Granton Road
Thistle Street North East Lane
Abbeyhill
Henderson Row
Mayfield Gardens / Craigmillar Park
Queensferry Road
Broughton Street
Deanhaugh Street
Henderson Street
Hope Park Crescent
Inverleith Row
Inverleith Row Ph2
Newhaven Main Street
Eva Place
Ferry Road Craighall Rd to No182
Gorgie Road
Queensferry Road
Stenhouse Road
Broughton Road

Footway Local Schemes continued
Duke Street
Dundas Street
Dundas Street
Eglinton Crescent
Gorgie Road
Hillhouse Road
Lindsay Road Ph4
Melville Street
Morrison Street
Pier Place
Shore
Torphichen Street
Hermitage Place and Vanburgh Place
Calton Road Ph2
Charlotte Square
George Street
Royal Terrace
North Junction Street
Borthwick's Close
Fleshmarket Close
Riversdale Grove
Comely Bank Road
Commercial Street
Frederick Street
Inverleith Row
Morningside Road Ph6
Pleasance
South Clerk Street
George IV Bridge
Queen Street : North side Hanover St to North St David St
Lochend Road Ph1
Armillan Terrace

ROADS CAPITAL PROGRAMME REVIEW

BRIEF

1. To plan, develop and deliver the 2011/12 Road Services Capital Programme in line with the 'Right First Time' Timeline.
2. To review the strategies, policies and methods for capital investment in the roads infrastructure in line with the approach developed by the RFT Capital Quality Group and agreed by RSMT. Specifically to address the following:
 - Inspection – To develop a comprehensive and co-ordinated approach to inspection and condition assessment drawing upon best practice nationally. To ensure that factors such as accident data are fully taken into account.
 - Prioritisation – To review the weighting and prioritisation awarded to schemes to ensure that it reflects the Council's policy objectives. Again this should draw on best practice from other Authorities.
 - Design – Working with the Roads and City Development Design Teams to ensure that the design process conforms to accepted national best practice and, in particular, that effective site investigations works are undertaken to inform the design decisions.
 - Delivery – Working with Road Operations and City Development Teams to ensure the correct processes for planning and delivery of capital schemes.
 - Quality Assurance – Ensure that all processes and practices are Quality Assured to achieve the desired outcomes consistently.
 - Value for Money - To ensure that all proposals deliver excellent value for money for the Council assessed across the short, medium and long term.
 - Process Efficiency and Effectiveness - To work closely with the RFT team to apply and utilise the 'lean management' approach across all elements of this work including the accurate assessment of the resources required to plan, manage and deliver the programme.

CAPITAL PROGRAMME 'TIMELINE'

See attached PDF

APPENDIX E

MAP SHOWING PEDESTRIAN PRIORITY CORRIDORS & AREAS