
Meeting of Executive Members for City Strategy and Advisory Panel

30 October 2006

Report of the Director of City Strategy

PETITION FROM RESIDENTS OF THIRD AVENUE, HEWORTH REQUESTING FOOTWAY AND CARRIAGEWAY REPAIRS WITHIN THE STREET

Summary

1. This report advises Members of the receipt of a petition from 13 residents on the odd numbered side of Third Avenue, between Sixth Avenue and Second Avenue.
2. It asks for the footway, driveways and carriageway along this length of Third Avenue to be repaired and reconstructed. The residents also mention, that whilst they have not consulted on this or included in the petition, the section of Third Avenue from Second Avenue to Melrosegate is in a similar condition.
3. A copy of the residents letter and petition is attached as Annex 1.
4. Members are asked to consider the options outlined in the report and approve the recommendations to include Third Avenue in our assessments for a possible inclusion in our resurfacing and reconstruction programmes for next year as detailed in Option 3.

Background

5. Members will be aware that officers undertake an annual inspection each year in June, of all the roads and footways within the Council's area.
6. This inspection, together with all the safety inspection reports and other reports from members of the public, Councillors, and other third parties, is used as a database which shows the general condition of all the Council's road and footways.
7. All those areas, found to be in a poor condition from this inspection are subsequently reassessed, usually in October and November to prioritise our planned programme of work for the forthcoming financial year.
8. A section of the footway in Third Avenue, on the even numbered side between Sixth Avenue and Third Avenue was resurfaced in the 2004/05 financial year.
9. The June 2005 condition survey and the recently completed survey for 2006 have identified the condition of both the remaining sections of footway in Third Avenue and the carriageway to be in an average condition.

10. As such the scheme will not be included in further assessment works, carried out in October and November on the 'poor' condition lengths of carriageway and footway to determine the priorities for the R&R programme in 2007/08.
11. A plan of the area is attached as Annex 2 and photographs supplied by the petitioners and those taken by officers will be available at the meeting.

Options

12. **Option 1** - Leave the footway and carriageway until its condition has deteriorated sufficiently to achieve a priority position in a subsequent year's programme but ensuring that safety is not compromised by carrying out any necessary minor repairs.
13. **Option 2** - Carry out works to the footway and carriageway this financial year by dropping a scheme from this year's approved programme.
14. **Option 3** - Arrange to make safe any defects that breach the Council's investigatory levels, monitor the conditions of both the footway and carriageway and even though the condition survey has identified the footway to be in average condition, officers would include the scheme in the assessment of the 'poor' condition schemes for next year. This provides the opportunity for a possible inclusion in next year's resurfacing and reconstruction programme to be approved by Members later in the year.

Analysis

15. **Option 1** –The condition of the footway does not need major works at this time. However this does not support the views expressed by the petitioners.
16. **Option 2** – Members should note that if Option 2 were chosen, the cost to reconstruct the footways, driveways and resurface part of the carriageway would be in the region of £71,000. These costs could only be found if one of this year's programmed schemes of a similar price was dropped from the approved programme. However, at this time the majority of the footway and carriageway schemes have either been completed, committed or programmed into the workload of both the consultancy and our term maintenance contractors.
17. **Option 3** – Any necessary repairs to be carried out will be funded from the existing service budget for day to day maintenance. This option will ensure our approved programmes for the current financial year are not disrupted and any proposed scheme will be rated on a worst first basis in any future years programmes.

Corporate Priorities

18. The improvement to the conditions of the highway network meets the Corporate aims "to improve the actual and perceived condition and appearance of the city streets, housing estates and publicly accessible spaces".

Implications

Financial

19. All areas that require future repair, until such time that a scheme is approved, will be attended to from the Council's revenue basic maintenance budget.

Human Resources (HR)

20. There are no human resource implications.

Equalities

21. There are no equality implications.

Legal

22. The City of York Council in its capacity as the local highway authority, has a duty under Section 41 of the Highways Act 1980 to maintain the public highway.

Crime and Disorder

23. There are no crime and disorder implications.

Information Technology (IT)

24. There are no IT implications.

Property

25. There are no property implications.

Other

26. There are no other implications.

Risk Management

27. In compliance with the Council's risk management strategy, the main risks that have been identified in this report are risks arising from hazards to assets and people (Physical), those which could lead to financial loss (Financial), and non-compliance with legislation (Legal & Regulatory).

28. Measured in terms of impact and likelihood, the risk score all risks has been assessed at less than 16. This means that at this point the risks need only to be monitored as they do not provide a real threat to the achievement of the objectives of this report.

Recommendations

29. That the Advisory Panel advice the Executive Member to:

- 1) Note the receipt of the petition
- 2) Approve Option 3 (paragraph 14)

Reason:

To ensure the available highway maintenance budgets are expended in the most cost effective way based on assessed priorities.

Contact Details

Author:

Robin Sweetman
Engineer – Highway Infrastructure
Tel 01904 551649

Chief Officer Responsible for the report:

Damon Copperthwaite
Acting Assistant Director
(City Development & Transport)

Report Approved



Date 4 October 2006

Specialist Implications Officer(s)

There are no specialist implications.

Wards Affected

Heworth



For further information please contact the author of the report

Background Papers:

None.

Annexes

Annex 1 – Residents' letter and petition.

Annex 2 – Plan of area.

4 October 2006

RKS/SPR

L:\DOCUMENT\WORDDOC\COMM\EMAP-P&T\301006 - Petition from Residents of 3rd Avenue.doc