

TITLE:	On-Street Parking/Verge Hardening
TO/ON:	Executive
PORTFOLIO:	Health
BY:	Executive Member for Health
STATUS:	Report

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To advise Members on progress of prioritisation of works as requested by Executive at the meeting of 3rd October 2005.
- 1.2 To consider Derwentside contributing 50% of the costs of such works to match fund Durham County Council.
- 1.3 To consider the requests from Ward Councillors for verge hardening works.

2.0 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 Works within the highway verge to alleviate difficulties of access for service and emergency vehicles, and reduce the consequential risk of accidents, are essentially issues for the County Council to take on board. However they have failed to give verge hardening schemes the priority they deserve, and the County Council have made it clear that schemes will only be carried out if the local authority provides match funding.
- 2.2 At the Executive meeting in November 2005, Members determined not to approve a funding bid for verge hardening works subject to the following conditions;

“Recommendation 4.1 in the report be agreed - to not approve the provision of matched funding to verge hardening schemes detailed in the report, with a condition that Officers seek an early meeting with Durham County Council to discuss prioritisation and a way of assessing the needs of all Wards across the District.

Reasons:

- (1) The works are not of sufficient priority to justify the expenditure against other capital schemes.
- (2) The prioritisation of the areas has not been carried out in a robust way with no opportunity for other locations to be considered.”

- 2.3 As a consequence of that decision, all Ward Members were invited to submit areas or locations which would benefit from this type of work. A significant number of areas were identified by Councillors and work is ongoing to locate and measure the specific problem areas. However, literally dozens of locations have been identified and it would be inappropriate to commit staff time to this work if Members determine not to proceed. Therefore only an overview has so far been established. Consultation has also been ongoing with Durham County Council who have given a written undertaking to contribute 50% of the cost of such works, but only up to a maximum value of £40,000 per annum. A commitment in principle has also been given to continue the programme in following years.
- 2.4 To this end a bid has been made through this Council's Asset Management Group for matched funding through the Capital Programme. The bid is for a 3 year project to deliver verge hardening in Derwentside to a value of £80,000 with 50% match funded by Durham County Council. The bid scored well on the prioritisation matrix, scoring 27 points, which placed the scheme within the 'gold band'. Therefore, subject to the approval of the recommendations contained within this report, this project would be included in the next report of the Director of Finance for release of resources.
- 2.5 Prioritisation is a fundamental tool to ensure that this project meets the needs of the residents of Derwentside and to this end Durham County Council have offered a prioritisation matrix which meets the aim of the project, namely;
- Less damage to grassed verges and the associated improvement in appearance;
 - Better access for public services including buses and ambulances and the Council's own refuse fleet;
 - Less damage to individual vehicles through minor knocks etc;
 - Reduced risk of accidents through more structured parking, although it could also be argued that the parked vehicles act as speed restrictors.

The matrix is attached to this report.

3.0 RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS

- 3.1 There are a number of options open to the Executive.
- 3.2 **Option 1:** Recognise the contribution this project makes to the aims of the Council and the partnership working with Durham County Council and agree to the project proceeding through to the Capital Programme assessment stage. This would need to be considered at the next review of the unapproved Capital Programme. Also, accepting this option would recognise the contribution this project would make to the work programme of your Highways maintenance staff.

- 3.3 By way of a first full year programme it is suggested that of the schemes identified previously to Executive, set out in the table below, are given priority for next financial year, should the bid be approved at the Capital Programme review.

Table 1 Original List of schemes drawn up prior to Ward Member input:

Description	Budget	2005-06 Commitment
	£	£
Tyne Road East (Rear), South Stanley		17,000
<i>Castle View, Hamsteels Estate, Esh Winning (50% Contribution)</i>		16,750
<i>Hollyhill Gardens, South Stanley (50% Contribution)</i>		5,500
Northgate, Annfield Plain		3,250
Palmer Street (rear), South Moor		13,000
Woodlands View Bungalows, Delves Lane (50% Contribution)		7,500
St Heliers Way/Fellside Close, East Stanley		7,750
<i>Pikesyde, Stanley (50%Contribution)</i>		5,000
Pine Street (rear), South Moor		19,250
Opposite North View-Greylingstadt Terrace, The Middles		25,000
Berry Edge Road, Consett		15,000
B6532 Durham Road/Wear Road		
Unclassified Hollyhill Gardens, South Stanley		
Total Reconstruction Costs:	£135,000	£135,000

Suggested prioritised schemes:

	Total Cost	Derwentside Contribution
Scheme Name		
B6532 Durham Road/Wear Road. This location is one of the important approaches to Stanley and presents an unsightly image to visitors and commuters alike.	£46,000	£23,000
Castle View, Hamsteels Estate, Esh Winning. This is a site which has been identified for some time, as problems occurred when a garage site was removed.	£16,750	£8,375
Total		£31,375.00

- 3.4 **Option 2:** Accept the need for the project, but consider alternative schemes to proceed, with the following years' work programme being generated by the prioritisation matrix.
- 3.5 **Option 3:** Not proceed with the project.

4.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 4.1 The option at 3.1 is recommended as this will deliver works which will materially improve the environment and life style of our residents where on street parking causes conflict and concern. The verge hardening programme only to progress on the basis of match funding from the County Council.
- 4.2 On the basis that the £40,000 budget is agreed for this year, the budget spend is fully committed by another project to be chosen from the identified work programme, set out within the table at paragraph 3.3.

Peter Reynolds
Director of Environmental Services

This report has been prepared by John Shepherd, Head of General Services.

50. ON-STREET PARKING/VERGE HARDENING

Councillor Johnson presented the report the purpose of which was (i) to advise on outstanding requests for provision of on-street parking by hardening of grass verges; (ii) to consider a proposal for Derwentside to contribute 50% of the costs of such works to Durham County Council and (iii) to consider requests from Burnopfield Ward Members for similar works within their Ward.

Scrutiny Board had agreed to support recommendation 4.1 in the report and to seek an early meeting with Durham County Council officials on the issue.

Councillor Watson advised that there needed to be a strategic approach to these issues, also none of the schemes were within the agreed 3 year capital programme.

Options: Whether to agree, reject or ask for amendments to the proposals for on-street parking/verge hardening as detailed in the report.

RESOLVED: that:-

Recommendation 4.1 in the report be agreed - to not approve the provision of matched funding to verge hardening schemes detailed in the report with a condition that Officers seek an early meeting with Durham County Council to discuss prioritisation and a way of assessing the needs of all Wards across the District.

Reasons:

- (1) The works are not of sufficient priority to justify the expenditure against other capital schemes.
- (2) The prioritisation of the areas has not been carried out in a robust way with no opportunity for other locations to be considered.

Verge Hardening Assessment Criteria

Site Location

Assessment Criteria	Scoring		Notes	Site Score
Access Requirements including Refuse Vehicles Emergency Vehicles Delivery Vehicles	Degree of Difficulty			
	Severe	10		
	Moderate	5		
	Little	1		
Causes of Verge Damages External	Shops School Other None			
Internal – Residents	Alternative Parking Arrangements Yes No			
		5		
		1		
Congestion	Classified Road	2-5	Degree of difficulty/benefit	
	Unclassified Road	2-5	Safety/Damage considerations	
Bus Route	Yes		Based on Frequency of Service	
	No			
Environmental Impact of Damage	Degree of Damage	1-10		
	Severe	10		
	Moderate	5		
	little	1		
Index of Deprivations				