

THE VALE OF GLAMORGAN COUNCIL

CABINET: 19TH OCTOBER, 2023

REFERENCE FROM ENVIRONMENT AND REGENERATION SCRUTINY
COMMITTEE: 19 SEPTEMBER, 2023

“362 REVISED HIGHWAY MAINTENANCE THREE YEAR PLAN 2022 – 2024
(REF) –

The reference from Cabinet of 20th July, 2023 was presented by the Neighbourhood Manager Highway Maintenance.

It was advised that the Highway Maintenance Three Year Resurfacing Plan 2022 to 2024 identified carriageways requiring treatment to prevent further surface and structural deterioration that would be undertaken in financial year 2022/23 onward and superseded the previous Plan 2019 to 2021. The carriageways listed within the Plan for resurfacing had been assessed in accordance with the 'Highway Maintenance Scoring Matrix' which was attached at Appendix B to this Report.

The 'Highway Maintenance Scoring Matrix' identified several criteria and data factors which enabled a score to be derived and the prioritised three-year plan for resurfacing to be established.

Locations for resurfacing that were listed at Appendix A that were showing no score had been brought to the Council's attention following highway inspector or stakeholder requests. Those locations remained on the list until scored for the purpose of monitoring and record keeping for the Highway Maintenance team.

It was reported that resurfacing works was costly, and that form of treatment generally related to major and heavily trafficked routes. Roads that would receive surfacing works in financial year 2023/24 would be selected from the prioritised resurfacing list.

Councillor C. Ianucci queried whether there were any plans or what the timeline was for including smaller potholes that might be a risk to cyclists. In reply, the Neighbourhood Manager Highway Maintenance stated that generally the Council used the 40 millimetres intervention criteria and so the response would be within the allocated timescales with the approved external contractor. It was, however, unclear if the Council would respond more quickly if the pothole was an active travel route, so that was something that required further consideration. Councillor M. Hooper stated that it was very important for cyclists to be given further consideration particularly as one of the main reasons for the 20mph speed limits was to encourage more people to cycle. Therefore, it was vital for the roads and routes to be safe. The Committee agreed for that to be a formal recommendation to Cabinet.

Councillor I. Perry referred to the A48 as being a strategic route which needed resurfacing, but it was low down on the Council's list. In the meantime, the surface of the A48 was noisy and unsafe which was not covered in the Council's criteria. Councillor Perry also stated that the Council's app needed to be looked at as it could be more user-friendly. He also outlined that there was no definition of what was an essential part of a defective highway, and he suggested that the road scoring matrix should be reviewed with noise given greater consideration. The Neighbourhood Manager Highway Maintenance clarified that noise was not considered as part of the Council's scoring matrix. It was also advised that when resurfacing roads, the Council would use the best material to reduce road noise. Councillor Perry's recommendation regarding the inclusion of noise on the scoring matrix, having been seconded and voted upon, was not carried.

Councillor S. Lloyd-Selby queried whether the individual needs of residents with a disability were considered as part of the scoring criteria. In reply, the Neighbourhood Manager Highway Maintenance stated that individual needs of disabled residents were not currently considered under the criteria, however lots of residents would reach out the Council so these were recorded.

Councillor A.M. Ernest referred to Rectory Road in Penarth for which the road works required approval. The Neighbourhood Manager Highway Maintenance stated clarified that it had received Cabinet approval.

Subsequently, it was

RECOMMENDED –

- (1) T H A T both the Cabinet reference and the appended report be accepted.
- (2) T H A T Cabinet be requested to review the Council's criteria matrix to reflect properly the needs of cyclists and to ensure that roads and routes are suitable.

Reasons for recommendations

- (1) Having regard to both the Cabinet reference and the appended report and discussions at the meeting.
- (2) In order to request an assessment to ensure that the needs of cyclists are reflected within the Council's Policy."