North Yorkshire County Council

Business and Environmental Services

Executive Members

22 May 2020

Highways Capital Programme 2020/21

Report of the Assistant Director – Highways and Transportation

1.0 Purpose of Report

1.1 The purpose of this report is to seek agreement from the Corporate Director, Business and Environmental Services (BES), in consultation with BES Executive Members, for additions to the Highways Capital Works Programme for Structural Highway Maintenance for 2020/21 identified since the last Highways Capital Programme report dated 23rd August 2019

1.2 The intention is to minimise the duration between the identification of schemes and them being agreed for inclusion in the Capital Works Programme.

2.0 Background

2.1 The Highways Capital Programme is made up of four specific elements; these are Street Lighting; Bridges and Structures; Integrated Transport and Structural Highway Maintenance. Each of these elements is subject to prioritisation methods based upon an assessment of the required outcomes.

2.2 BES Executive Members will be aware that usual practice is to present two main reports per year; one in the summer, when the following years schemes are reported; followed by a winter report, when necessary changes to the programme are reported along with the headline allocations for the programme for the year after.

2.3 In line with 2.2 above, the report was considered at the BES Executive Members meeting held on 23 August 2019.

2.4 Although advanced planning is maximised through the implementation of a three-year rolling capital works programme, there are occasions when it is necessary, for sound operational reasons, to introduce new schemes into the in-year programme.

3.0 New Schemes Introduced in the 2020/21 Capital Works Programme

3.1 The following scheme is proposed to be added to the 2020/21 programme, in advance of the next scheduled Highways Capital Programme report:

3.2 Lillinghall Culvert
Further details can be found in Appendix 1.

4.0 Financial Implications

4.1 Any additional costs associated with implementation of the scheme/s named in Appendix 1 will be accounted for as part of the routine strategic management of the Highways Capital Works Programme. This approach seeks to ensure that the programme is delivered on time and to budget.

4.2 The contents of this report make no changes to the BES Capital Plan expenditure limits

5.0 Equalities Implications

5.1 An Equality Impact Assessment screening form was included as part of the Capital Programme overall and this found that an Equality Impact Assessment was not required. As these schemes are typical maintenance schemes it is deemed that the original screening form included schemes of this type and that there will be no Equality Implications arising from this recommendation. See Appendix 2

6.0 Legal Implications

6.1 The County Council, as Local Highway Authority, Street Authority and Traffic Authority has a wide range of statutory duties imposed by a variety of legislation.

6.2 Although the decision to carry out this scheme has been made in-year, it was developed and prioritised in line with the relevant legislation and approved Council policies.

6.3 It is the view of officers that there are no legal implications in terms of adding this scheme to the capital programme.

7.0 Recommendation

7.1 It is recommended that the Corporate Director, BES and the BES Executive Members agree the additional scheme for delivery in the 2020/21 financial year

.

BARRIE MASON
Assistant Director
Highways and Transportation

Author of Report: Allan McVeigh

Background Documents: None

Appendix 1

New Schemes Introduced in the 2019/20 Capital Works Programme

District		Location	Address	Est Cost/£	Reason for addition
Ryedale		Lillinghall Culvert	C93	£68,000	Collapsed culvert causing damage to carriageway

Appendix 2

Initial equality impact assessment screening form
(As of October 2015 this form replaces 'Record of decision not to carry out an EIA')

This form records an equality screening process to determine the relevance of equality to a proposal, and a decision whether or not a full EIA would be appropriate or proportionate.

Directorate	Business and Environmental Services
Service area	Highways & Transportation
Proposal being screened	Highways Capital Programme 2020/21 - Approval of schemes not included at previous BES Executive Members meeting.
Officer(s) carrying out screening	**Kirstine Rudd**
What are you proposing to do?	Agree additions to the capital programme in advance of the next scheduled capital programme BES Executive Member report.
Why are you proposing this? What are the desired outcomes?	Minimise the duration between scheme identification and agreement for inclusion on the agreed capital programme
Does the proposal involve a significant commitment or removal of resources? Please give details.	No, the proposal will result in reprioritisation of the current allocations to enable the additional schemes to be delivered.

Impact on people with any of the following protected characteristics as defined by the Equality Act 2010, or NYCC's additional agreed characteristic
As part of this assessment, please consider the following questions:

- To what extent is this service used by particular groups of people with protected characteristics?
- Does the proposal relate to functions that previous consultation has identified as important?
- Do different groups have different needs or experiences in the area the proposal relates to?

If for any characteristic it is considered that there is likely to be a significant adverse impact or you have ticked 'Don't know/no info available', then a full EIA should be carried out where this is proportionate. You are advised to speak to your Equality rep for advice if you are in any doubt.

Protected characteristic	Yes	No	Don't know/No info available
Age		✓	
Disability		✓	
Sex (Gender)		✓	
Race		✓	
Sexual orientation		✓	
Gender reassignment		✓	
Religion or belief		✓	
Pregnancy or maternity		✓	

Marriage or civil partnership		✓		
NYCC additional characteristic				
People in rural areas		✓		
People on a low income		✓		
Carer (unpaid family or friend)		✓		
Does the proposal relate to an area where there are known inequalities/probable impacts (e.g. disabled people's access to public transport)? Please give details.	**No, the proposals do not negatively affect any groups of people.**			
Will the proposal have a significant effect on how other organisations operate? (e.g. partners, funding criteria, etc.). Do any of these organisations support people with protected characteristics? Please explain why you have reached this conclusion.	**No, the proposal will have no effect on how other organisations work.**			
Decision (Please tick one option)	EIA not relevant or proportionate:	✓	Continue to full EIA:	
Reason for decision	The allocation of funding is based on the 'manage, maintain and improve' (MMI) hierarchy set out in LTP4 which has been the subject of a full EIA. This concluded that the introduction of fewer improvement schemes may have a greater impact on people with mobility difficulties or without access to private vehicles as there will be fewer new facilities provided e.g. pedestrian crossings, dropped kerbs, bus stop accessibility improvements; however, it is also considered that prioritising maintenance, particularly for footways, through the MMI hierarchy is likely to produce a net benefit for people with the same protected characteristics; particularly in terms of age and disability.			
Signed (Assistant Director or equivalent)	*Barrie Mason*			
Date	*13/05/20*			