

10.1.19

First meeting on Carriageway & Footway Renewal consultation processes

This formal approach to early consultation on road renewals is thanks to the Cllr Chas Booth amendment at 20.6.18 TEC. For the original report and the successful amendment, see para 1806 here...

www.spokes.org.uk/documents/members-campaigning/edinburgh/road-maintenance-policies-edinburgh-council

Present

Sean Gilchrist, CEC Road Asset Manager

Phil Noble, CEC Head of Active Travel Team

LS – David Spaven, David Hunter

Spokes – Dave du Feu, Martin McDonnell, David French

This is not a full report of the meeting, just selected points I thought of particular interest.

1. **Future meetings** - Sean suggested meeting more frequently (maybe 4 a year) rather than the once a year suggested by TEC. Next meeting early April, date tba, which will include discussion of some major renewal schemes.

2. A **3-year rolling road renewals programme** will be the new approach, so that major carriageway/ footway schemes which have a significant AT and/or place potential can be identified at an early stage.

- **Major schemes with significant potential**, and where the road renewal can be postponed for 1-3 years, will be passed over from the renewals team to an AT project manager, to enable wide consultation and time for any necessary TROs. They called these *Innovative Schemes*.
- **All other renewal/surfacing schemes** will remain with the Renewals team but still subject to the Street Design Guidance, and there will be consultation with relevant stakeholders – for example, similar to the limited consultation we had over Lothian Rd and South Bridge.

3. Difficult issues

- **Conflict between road condition requirements and AT/placemaking schemes** – the latter often needs significantly more cash and staff input (e.g. widening footways, drainage implications). If the cash/staff come from the same budget then fewer deteriorating roads can be renewed. The earlier that major schemes can be identified, the greater hope of getting additional cash and staff resources from other budgets or outside grants.
- **Existing backlog** – there is a big backlog of schemes which have been approved by TEC and therefore have to be implemented. This will have an impact on how rapidly the above new full 3-year process can be implemented.

4. Priorities for the renewals team

- Produce the 3-year programme
- Categorise projects into 'standard/basic' and 'innovative' – i.e. as in (2) above.
- Clear the backlog of already-approved schemes – as in (3) above.

5. Some specific other points raised by Spokes [Chris's points]

- **Sharing online proposals drawings** – this will be done when scheme are consulted on
- **Central hatching** – this will be considered for removal in any schemes, but it may have to remain in certain cases where it is considered to be a safety measure which cannot be replicated by other means (such as road narrowing/ cycle lanes/ footway widening).
- **Coordination of small adjacent schemes** - to ensure consistent cycle provision (as did not happen at Dundas Street where the new cycle lanes was not continued through the junction). This point was noted and agreed it should be considered in such cases.

6. Documents

The following were circulated on paper and (I think) Sean said he would email them to us.
NB: these lists are *long!!*

- Backlog schemes as in (3) above
- Draft 3-year proposals 19/20-21/22 for footways (including any offroad cycleways)
- Draft 3-year proposals 19/20-21/22 for carriageways

7. Spokes follow-up

They welcome any initial comments on the above lists, particularly any schemes on the lists which we would like to see made into major 'innovative' projects - see (2) above.