

ANGUS COUNCIL

COMMUNITIES COMMITTEE – 28 MAY 2019

SCOTS ROAD PERFORMANCE RESULTS 2017/18

1. INTRODUCTION

This report outlines the Council's performance in 2017/18 for the delivery of roads services as recorded by the Society of Chief Officers of Transportation in Scotland (SCOTS).

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The Audit Scotland "Maintaining Scotland's Roads" report, recommend in August 2016 in their "Follow-up Report" that "Councils should implement methods for assessing and comparing Councils' roads maintenance efficiency with the aim of identifying and learning from Councils delivering services more efficiently". It is a fundamental requirement of the Audit Scotland Report 2011 "Maintaining Scotland's Roads: A follow-up report" and the Audit Scotland Report 2013 "Maintaining Scotland's Roads: An audit update on Councils' progress" that authorities measure performance and undertake meaningful benchmarking work. Additionally, the "SCOTS RAMP (Roads asset Management Plan) Project: National Audit/Review RAMP Practices, 2015" makes the following recommendation "continue to support the efforts of the Performance Group in trying to improve the reliability and use of the PI (performance indicator) data collected in conjunction with APSE" (Association for Public Service Excellence).
- 2.2 Additionally, the Scottish National Road Maintenance Review (NRMR) aimed to identify how those responsible for, and working in, Scotland's roads maintenance sector could deliver efficiently managed roads for all within the budgets available, and identify opportunities for innovation, collaborative working and the sharing of services. To assist with the aims of the Review, Option 26 of the report states that a consistent unit cost benchmarking methodology across all roads authorities should be developed and implemented and Option 30 states that the optimal delivery of road maintenance services should be explored including joint collaboration/working arrangements/operational collaboration between all roads authorities. National funding has facilitated work to be undertaken in relation to the development of unit cost rates and Phase 2 of this development work is now underway.
- 2.3 The collection of performance information for financial year 2017/18 is considered by SCOTS and APSE to have been very successful in terms of the number of submissions made. All 32 Councils made full submissions and the majority of Councils took part in Family Group workshops to validate and verify data. It is recognised through the quality and quantity of data provided that some authorities are more proactive than others in taking part in the benchmarking opportunities that this task provides. It is hoped that there will be 100% attendance at future Family Group workshops in recognition of the emphasis that SOLACE and the Improvement Service are putting on measuring and managing performance.
- 2.4 The data collected will allow road maintenance activities to be benchmarked in a number of ways: in family groups; nationally; year on year for individual authorities; and ultimately with the private sector to assess value for money in service provision.
- 2.5 The data collected will allow authorities to measure their performance against their own internal levels of service and to set targets and drive improvement where it is required. The Year on Year report is beneficial in this respect, allowing data for several years to be displayed at once and used in the management of the road maintenance service.
- 2.6 Safety, serviceability and sustainability are key areas in terms of measuring performance in the road maintenance environment. Customer service, in terms of providing effective consultation and information; providing efficient enquiry and complaints management and delivering satisfaction in terms of timeliness and quality of work are all important performance measurement areas which are being looked at through the SCOTS Performance Management and Benchmarking Focus Group.

3. PERFORMANCE SUMMARY

- 3.1 The attached SCOTS PI Data Report (**Appendix 1**) shows the 2017/18 results for Angus Council against other local authorities in Scotland.
- 3.2 The data collection for the preparation of the 2018/19 Report commenced in May 2019.
- 3.3 The Report assesses performance for the following areas, for which some of the headline figures for Scotland 2017/18 are detailed with the Angus Council performance in section 4 below.
- 3.4 The results from 2017/18 show that Angus Council's overall performance compares very well with other Scottish local authorities with Angus Council scoring:
- ✓ better than average performance in 20 out of 23 comparable indicators (87%); and
 - ✗ worse average performance in 3 out of 23 comparable indicators (13%).
- 3.5 Comparing results from 2017/18 with 2016/17 shows that overall performance for comparable indicators shown:
- ↑ improved in 7 of 21 (33%);
 - ⇒ remained level in 9 of 21 (43%); and
 - ↓ deteriorated in 5 of 21 (24%).
- 3.6 It is notable that Angus Council has been nominated in the following APSE Performance Network Awards:
- Best Performers - Roads, highways and winter maintenance 2018 and 2017
 - Best Performers - Street lighting 2018, 2017 and 2016
 - Most improved performer - Street lighting 2016.

4. PERFORMANCE RESULTS

Carriageway Assets

Across all authorities who responded (25 authorities/78% response rate), **85.13% of CAT 1 defects were repaired within the target repair time** (2016/17 - 88.46%).

Angus Council scored 100% (2016/17 – 100%), which is better than average and shows a level trend.



Across all authorities who responded (32 authorities/100% response rate), **36.55% of all roads should be considered for some repair treatment** (2016/17 - 36.30%).

Angus Council scored 36.70% (2016/17 – 31.23%), which is worse than average and shows a negative trend.



Across all authorities who responded (28 authorities/87.5% response rate), **the highest % of carriageway length treated** was 6.40% (2016/17 - 11.24%) and the lowest was 1.29% (2016/17 - 0.85%), and an **average of 3.81%**. This is a decrease at the higher end but an increase at the lower end compared to 2016/17.

Angus Council scored 3.32% (2016/17 – 3.32%), which is worse than average and shows a level trend.



72.92% of authorities budgets are spent on planned maintenance, 18.24% spent on reactive and 8.83% on routine maintenance. (2016/17 – 73.21% of authorities budgets were spent on planned maintenance, 18.25% spent on reactive and 8.54% on routine maintenance). This is similar to 2016/17 and positive that over 70% of the total budgets being spent is on planned maintenance.

Angus Council spent 48.70% on planned maintenance; 9.41% on reactive and 41.90% on routine maintenance. (2016/17 – 36.88%/25.23%/38.09%).

Across all authorities, **the average expenditure on maintaining the carriageway per km was £6,114**, (2016/17 - £5,967 per km). This is very similar to 2016/17. Highest level of expenditure £13,921 per km, lowest £1,948 per km. The correlation between the level of expenditure, road condition & investment per km will be reflected in later years.

Angus Council expenditure was £5,005 per km of carriageway (2016/17 – £3,703 per km), which is lower than average and shows a positive trend.



Across all authorities who responded (25 authorities/78% response rate), **the most commonly used resurfacing treatment was surface dressing, 1.72% of total network** (2016/17 1.96%).

Angus Council treated 2.52% of carriageway by surface dressing (2016/17 – 2.45%), which is better than average and shows a positive trend.



Across all authorities who responded (25 authorities/78% response rate), **93.30% of safety inspections were completed as scheduled** (2016/17 - 90.84%).

Angus Council scored 100% (2016/17 – No data), which is better than average.



Footway Assets

Across all authorities who responded (19 authorities/59% response rate), there **were 572 category 1 defects on footways reported to authorities with an average of 27**.

Angus Council had 1 (2016/17 – 0), which is better than average and shows a negative trend.



Across all authorities who responded (20 authorities/62% response rate), **73.77% of category 1 defects on footways were made safe within the authorities' response times** (2016/17 – 69.48%).

Angus Council scored 100% (2016/17 – No data), which is better than average.



Across all authorities who responded (22 authorities/69% response rate), **83.07% of footway safety inspections were completed on time** (2016/17 – 81.84%).

Angus Council scored 100% (2016/17 – 100%), which is better than average and shows a level trend.



27 Councils reported the **number of third party claims relating to their footway network**, with numbers ranging from 0 to 188, with an **average of 31**.

Angus Council had 8 (2016/17 – 9), which is better than average and shows a positive trend.



On average, **0.79% of footway length received maintenance treatment** (27 Councils) (2016/17 – 1.04%), with **1.78% for Angus Council** (2016/17 – 1.94%), which is better than average and shows a negative trend, of which:

- **0.3% area surface treated with 0.63% for Angus Council**
- **0.41% area resurfaced with 1.10% for Angus Council**
- **0.10% area reconstructed with 0.0% for Angus Council**
- **0.03% area of planned patching with 0.05% for Angus Council**



Across all authorities who responded (23 authorities/72% response rate), **the average maintenance expenditure on footways was £949 per kilometre** (lowest £220/km, highest £1,781/km) (2016/17 - £1,009/km).

Angus Council expenditure was £1,707 per km (2016/17 – £1,281 per km), which is better than average and shows a positive trend.



Across all authorities who responded (28 authorities/87.5% response rate), **8.76% of the footway network is subject to precautionary salting treatment** of which 8 Councils returned 0% (2016/17 11.21%, 28 councils - 7 returned 0%).

Angus Council treated 35.94% (2016/17 – 36.03%), which is better than average and shows a negative trend.



Structures Assets

Across all authorities who responded (26 authorities/81% response rate), **the percentage of Scheduled Principal Inspections carried out on time is 78.51%**.

Angus Council scored 100% (2016/17 – 100%), which is better than average and shows a level trend.



Across all authorities who responded (29 authorities/91% response rate), **the percentage of Scheduled General Inspections carried out on time is 88.68%**.

Angus Council scored 100% (2016/17 – 100%), which is better than average and shows a level trend.



Across all authorities who responded (30 authorities/94% response rate), **the average value of the BSCI Ave is 86.33**.

Angus Council scored 87.52% (2016/17 – 87.43%), which is better than average and shows a positive trend.



Across all authorities who responded (30 authorities/94% response rate), **the average value of the BSCI Crit is 78.23**.

Angus Council scored 83.32% (2016/17 – 83.71%), which is better than average and shows a negative trend.



Across all authorities who responded (28 authorities/87.5% response rate), **the percentage of bridges with a weight restriction is 1.51%**.

Angus Council has 0% (2016/17 – 0%), which is better than average and shows a level trend.



Across all authorities who responded (28 authorities/87.5% response rate), **the percentage of bridges with a width restriction is 0.94%**.

Angus Council has 0% (2016/17 – 0%), which is better than average and shows a level trend.



Across all authorities who responded (29 authorities/91% response rate), **the percentage of bridges that failed European Standard Assessment (prior to restriction) is 3.77%**.

Angus Council scored 0.17% (2016/17 – 0.17%), which is better than average and shows a level trend.



Across all authorities who responded (31 authorities/97% response rate), **the percentage of bridges being monitored is 2.77%**.

Angus Council scored 0.17% (2016/17 – 0.17%), which is better than average and shows a level trend.



Traffic Management Systems

Across all authorities who responded (27 authorities/84% response rate), **93.33% of all reported traffic signal faults were rectified within their target time**.

Angus Council scored 98.10% (2016/17 – 98.03%), which is better than average and shows a positive trend.



On average across all authorities who responded (22 authorities/69% response rate), **58.21% of Traffic Management Systems expenditure is planned maintenance spend (traffic lights, etc).**

Angus Council scored 55.37% (2016/17 – 70.57%).

Street Furniture

On average across all authorities who responded (28 authorities/87.5% response rate), **2.04% of total roads and lighting expenditure is spent on street furniture.** The very large range of values, from 0.27% to 11.97%, suggests that item coverage may be inconsistent and confidence in this statistic should remain low.

Angus Council scored 0.27% (2016/17 – 1.91%).

Street Lighting Assets

Across all authorities who responded (25 authorities/78% response rate), **the average annual electricity running cost per street light was £34.76.**

Angus Council cost £28.25 per street light (2016/17 – £32.20 per street light), which is better than average and shows showing a positive trend.



REPORT AUTHOR: Walter Scott, Service Leader – Roads & Transportation
EMAIL DETAILS: Communities@angus.gov.uk

List of Appendices:

Appendix 1 – SCOTS PI Data Report 2017-18