

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**  
**CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS**

**DATE: 14 April 2020**

**LEAD OFFICER:** Katie Stewart  
 Executive Director for Environment, Transport & Infrastructure

**SUBJECT:** Update to Capital Prioritisation Policy for Highways Assets

**COMMUNITY VISION OUTCOME:** Place



**SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

This policy outlines the criteria used to prioritise schemes on Surrey's capital funded planned maintenance programmes.

This revision will introduce scoring criteria for prioritisation of Intelligent Traffic Systems.

The member influence score will be removed from road and footway asset scoring criteria to better reflect recommended programme development advised in the Highway Infrastructure Asset Management Guidance document.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

It is recommended that the Cabinet Member for Highways approves the Capital Prioritisation Policy for Highways Assets: Roads, Footways, Structures, Drainage, Safety Barriers & Intelligent Traffic Systems (April 2020) – version 5.0

**REASON FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Inclusion of criteria for Intelligent Traffic Systems means the policy now has comprehensive coverage of all key highway assets with planned maintenance activities.

Previous criteria for roads & pavements provide a non-specific inclusion of a Member Influence score. The wording stated, "local committees will be consulted to identify whether consideration can be given to local concerns".

In order to clarify inclusion of member concerns the Member Influence score is removed completely and replaced with a new process for members to identify candidate schemes.

**DETAILS**

**Capital Prioritisation Policy for Highway Assets:**

**Introduction**

1. This policy was last updated in December 2018 following the undertaking of a review when the council adopted the latest version of 'Well-Managed Highway Infrastructure – A Code of Practice'. The existing [prioritisation policy](#) is on the public web pages.
2. The policy is now aligned to the methodology criteria to 'optimise schemes in forward programme' using best practise found in the code of practice.
3. This revision has updated the introduction to reflect the priorities for Surrey, as set out in the [Community Vision for Surrey in 2030](#) (the Vision)

### **Roads & Footways**

4. Removing the inclusion of a Member Influence score will mean the remaining criteria adopts best practise in Asset Management with an impartial and transparent methodology for prioritising capital improvements to highway assets. Schemes will now be selected on criteria which includes condition, road hierarchy and risk.
5. A new process for members to identify candidate schemes has already been put in place. This process complements the identification of schemes based on need through analysis of condition data.

### **Intelligent Traffic Systems**

6. This revision now includes criteria for prioritisation of Intelligent Traffic Systems.

### **CONSULTATION:**

7. All officers with lead responsibility for their individual asset type and programme creation have been consulted.
8. The Cabinet Member for Highways was consulted in December 2019 to update him on the proposed changes. The changes are considered within the remit of delegated authority put in place during December 2018 policy updates.

### **RISK MANAGEMENT AND IMPLICATIONS:**

9. Surrey has adopted a risk-based approach in accordance with the Code of Practice. The use of data and evidence collected and retained during its usual business activities will support the application of criteria in this policy.
10. None of the updated policy documents are considered to have a negative impact compared to the existing policy.

### **Financial and value for money implications:**

11. All actions relating to this policy involve how capital programmes are prioritised and budgets are allocated to schemes. The business case for expenditure is already determined during budget setting at full council.

12. The changes to the scoring criteria will further improve how maintenance budgets are targeted at assets that provide best value to residents and highway users.

**Section 151 Officer commentary:**

13. Although significant progress has been made over the last twelve months to improve the Council's financial position, the medium term financial outlook is uncertain as it is heavily dependent on decisions made by Central Government. With no clarity on these beyond 2020/21, our working assumption is that financial resources will continue to be constrained, as they have been for the majority of the past decade. This places an onus on the Council to continue to consider issues of financial sustainability as a priority in order to ensure stable provision of services in the medium term.
14. The Section 151 Officer supports the revised Capital Prioritisation Policy which will help to improve how capital maintenance works are prioritised and therefore improve value for money.

**Legal implications – Monitoring Officer:**

15. The County Council has a statutory duty under s41 of the Highways Act 1980 to maintain the fabric of the publicly maintainable highway, which includes drainage.
16. The County also has a duty under s130 of that Act to assert and protect the right of the public to the use and enjoyment of any highway.
17. The national Code of Practice for Highway Maintenance seeks to be useful guidance for authorities to incorporate when developing their approach in accordance with local needs, priorities and affordability. While its status is guidance and adoption of the recommendations within the document is a matter for each Highway Authority. Such guidance informs best practice nationally and is persuasive.

**Equalities and diversity:**

18. Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA) checklist has been completed. The checklist indicated that a Full EQIA was not necessary.

**Other implications:**

19. The potential implications for the following Council priorities and policy areas have been considered. Where the impact is potentially significant a summary of the issues is set out in detail below.

<b>Area assessed:</b>	<b>Direct Implications:</b>
Corporate Parenting/Looked After Children	No significant implications arising from this report
Safeguarding responsibilities for vulnerable children and adults	No significant implications arising from this report

Environmental sustainability	Set out below
Public Health	No significant implications arising from this report

**Environmental sustainability implications:**

- 20. An Environmental Sustainability Assessment (ESA) is not required for this policy.
- 21. Following best practice in asset management, as described in this policy, to intervene at the right time to extend asset life wherever possible helps reduce carbon output. Carbon output calculated for the lifecycle of the asset can be attributed to the maintenance of the asset as well as contribution from vehicular usage increasing when road condition deteriorates.

**WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:**

- 22. This updated version will be published on Surrey’s web pages with previous superseded versions being removed and archived.
- 23. The criteria will be applied to all existing schemes identified as deteriorating and in need of maintenance soon. This will inform the schemes for the 2021/22 programme and future schemes for consideration. This information will be published on Surrey’s web pages via our [Horizon Schemes Map](#).

**Contact Officer:**

Matthew Gallop, Asset Policy & Programme Team Leader, 07792142633

**Consulted:**

Amanda Richards, Network & Asset Management Group Manager  
 Richard Bolton, Local Highway Services Group Manager  
 Lucy Monie, Director of Infrastructure Operations  
 Dan Squibb, Asset Planning Team Manager  
 Daniel Robinson, Asset Programme Manager (Structures & Slopes)  
 Glen Westmore, Flood Risk Asset Planning & Programme Team Leader  
 Alan McLean, Senior Asset Project Manager (Structures & Slopes)  
 Tim Brown, Traffic Operations Team Leader

**Annexes:**

Annex 1 Capital Prioritisation Policy for Highways Assets: Roads, Footways, Structures, Drainage, Safety Barriers & Intelligent Traffic Systems (April 2020) – version 5.0

**Sources/background papers:**

- [Well-managed Highway Infrastructure](#) – A Code of Practice (Oct 2016)
- HMEP UKRLG [Highway Infrastructure Asset Management Guidance](#)