Pothole Fund Application Form


Only one application form should be completed per local highway authority.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local authority name:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bid Manager Name and position:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Name and position of officer with day to day responsibility for delivering the proposed scheme.

Name: Gordon Anderson Service Delivery Manager
Contact telephone number: 0161 770 4341
Email address: gordon.anderson@unitypartnership.com
Postal address: Unity Partnership
Henshaw House
Cheapside
Oldham
OL1 1NY

When authorities submit a bid for funding to the Department, as part of the Government’s commitment to greater openness in the public sector under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and the Environmental Information Regulations 2004, they must also publish a version excluding any commercially sensitive information on their own website within two working days of submitting the final bid to the Department. The Department reserves the right to deem the business case as non-compliant if this is not adhered to.

Please specify the weblink where this bid will be published:

http://www.oldham.gov.uk/potholefund
**SECTION A – Your Highway**

The Department would like to understand more about the highway assets that fall under your statutory duties.

We already collect data from your authority in regards to road lengths but we would like to understand more about the other assets you are responsible for. Please answer the following in your application:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A1:</strong> What is the number of bridges owned by your authority with span over 1.5 metres?</td>
<td>215 No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A2:</strong> What is the total number of street lighting columns under your authority’s responsibility?</td>
<td>22123 No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A3:</strong> What is the total number of street lighting columns under your authority’s responsibility over 40 years old?</td>
<td>1287 No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A4:</strong> What is the total length of footways under the responsibility of your authority (in miles)?</td>
<td>684 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A5:</strong> What is the total length of off-road cycleways under the responsibility of your authority (in miles)?</td>
<td>14.65 miles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A6:** Please provide a weblink to your authority’s statement of how the flood recovery funding, awarded in March 2014, has/will be spent:

[http://www.oldham.gov.uk/info/200305/roads_pavements_and_highways](http://www.oldham.gov.uk/info/200305/roads_pavements_and_highways)
## SECTION B – Potholes

B1: Which of the recommendations arising from the Pothole Review Report has your authority adopted?

The report can be viewed here:


Please answer the following, including providing supporting information, where applicable:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>All ‘yes’ answers must be supported evidence. Please append supporting information, clearly marking the question number to which the information refers.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Has your authority aligned its maintenance programme to the Government’s highways maintenance funding years (i.e. 2011-2015 and 2015-2021)?</td>
<td>☑ Yes ☐ No</td>
<td>See Appendix B – Section B1-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Has your authority adopted the principle that ‘prevention is better than cure’ in determining the balance between structural, preventative and reactive maintenance activities in order to improve the resilience of the highway network and to minimise the occurrence of potholes in the future?</td>
<td>☑ Yes ☐ No</td>
<td>See Appendix B – Section B1-B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Has your authority ensured that appropriate competencies have been made available to make the right choices when designing and specifying techniques and materials for the maintenance and repair of highways? Note - these competencies can be secured through training, collaboration with neighbouring authorities or external advice.</td>
<td>☑ Yes ☐ No</td>
<td>See Appendix B – Section B1-C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Does your authority co-ordinate with other parties working on the highway short and long term programmes of work activities for up to four years in advance?</td>
<td>☑ Yes ☐ No</td>
<td>See Appendix B – Section B1-D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Has your authority considered the guidance provided in the ADEPT report Potholes and Repair Techniques for Local Highways and adopted as appropriate to your local circumstances?</td>
<td>☑ Yes ☐ No</td>
<td>See Appendix B – Section B1-E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Has your authority developed a detailed highway inspection manual and have put appropriate training in place for your Highway Inspectors?</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Does your authority use technology and systems for the effective identification and management of potholes?</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Does your authority have a public communications process in place that provides clarity and transparency in the policy and approach to repairing potholes? This should include a published policy and details of its implementation, including the prevention, identification, reporting, tracking and repair of potholes.</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Does your authority monitor public satisfaction with road, footway and cycleway condition and report annually through the National Highways and Transport Public Satisfaction Survey or their own surveys?</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Does your authority adopt permanent repairs as the first choice when repairing potholes?</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Has your authority adopted dimensional definitions for potholes based on best practice as part of its maintenance policy?</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B2: Does your authority adopt any innovative methods to help repair potholes? This could include, for example, specialist pothole maintenance crews.</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If yes, please provide details as an annex as part of your bid.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>See Appendix B – Section B2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B3: Does your authority use reporting tools to identify potholes in your local area including:</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CTC Fill that Hole</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council’s Own Web Reporting</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Please specify:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>See Appendix B – Section B3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B4: Does your authority regularly consult and seek feedback on its highways maintenance regime, including potholes, with key stakeholders?

Local Member(s) of Parliament ☑ Yes ☐ No
District, Borough and Parish Councils ☑ Yes ☐ No
Local Residents ☑ Yes ☐ No
(Including neighbourhood Forums) ☑ Yes ☐ No
Business Community ☑ Yes ☐ No
Emergency Services ☑ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please provide details as an annex as part of your bid.

See Appendix B – Section B4

B5: Does your authority have an up-to-date vision and action plan to improve the walking environment and encourage walking?

☑ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please provide a weblink:

See Appendix B – Section B5

B6: Please explain how you deliver your duty under NRSWA to ‘co-ordinate the execution of works of all kinds’, including for example permit schemes, noticing, co-ordination meetings?

See Appendix B – Section B6

B7: What actions does your authority take to ensure road repairs undertaken by other parties (such as utilities companies) meet the standards in the specification?

☑ Inspections regime
☑ Scoring programme
☑ Performance bench-marking
☑ Meetings
☑ Other (please specify)

See Appendix B – Section B7
### SECTION C – Asset Management

**C1: Has your authority adopted the recommendations arising from the Asset Management Strategy Guidance published in May 2013 –**


- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

Please answer the following, including providing supporting information, where applicable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>All ‘yes’ answers must be supported evidence.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has your authority got an up to date asset management policy and strategy?</td>
<td>[ ] Yes [ ] No</td>
<td>If yes, please provide a weblink. See Appendix C – Section C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your authority communicate relevant information associated with asset management through engagement with your relevant stakeholders when you set requirements, make decisions and report performance?</td>
<td>[ ] Yes [ ] No</td>
<td>See Appendix C – Section C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your authority have an asset management register?</td>
<td>[ ] Yes [ ] No</td>
<td>See Appendix C – Section C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your authority follow lifecycle planning principles which are used to review the level of funding and which will help support investment decisions including long term investment in your assets?</td>
<td>[ ] Yes [ ] No</td>
<td>See Appendix C – Section C1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**C2: As part of your last L-Pack return for Whole Government Accounting requirements for the accounting period 2012/13, can you confirm you submitted the following return:**

| Carriageway and Footways                        | [ ] Yes [ ] No |
| Lighting                                       | [ ] Yes [ ] No |
| Structures                                     | [ ] Yes [ ] No |
| Street Furniture                               | [ ] Yes [ ] No |
**SECTION D – Efficiencies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D1: Is your authority actively engaged with securing efficiencies for highways maintenance?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☒ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If yes, please provide additional information on what your authority has done since 2011 including what % efficiency savings (where efficiency savings are defined as delivering a similar or a better outcome at a lower cost) your authority has achieved year on year and what savings you hope to achieve by end of 2014/15.

See Appendix D – Section D1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D2: Is your authority exploring or has it already joined with neighbouring local highway authorities or a Highways Maintenance Alliance to achieve economies of scale?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☒ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If yes, please provide additional information. For example the names of other authorities or the Alliance.

See Appendix D – Section D2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D3: Is your authority sharing its efficiency experience and/or case studies with other local highway authorities via the Highways Maintenance Efficiency Programme or other good practice networks?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☒ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If yes, please provide state where.

See Appendix D – Section D3
### SECTION E – Other

**E1: Please provide details on which of the following good practice activities your authority is undertaking for its highways management activities.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Invest to save</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross boundary collaboration</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Appendix E – Section E1

**E2: Do you consider your authority to be an exemplar authority in tackling potholes and undertaking highway maintenance?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

If yes, please explain why.

See Appendix E – Section E2

If yes, would your authority be willing to share its experiences more widely with other authorities / organisations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

See Appendix E – Section E2
### SECTION F: Declarations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F1. Senior Responsible Owner Declaration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As Senior Responsible Owner for the Pothole Fund Application I hereby submit this request for approval to DfT on behalf of Oldham Borough Council and confirm that I have the necessary authority to do so.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I confirm that Oldham Borough Council will have all the necessary statutory powers in place to ensure the planned timescales in the application can be realised.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Elaine McLean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position:</td>
<td>Executive Director Neighbourhoods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signed: [Signature]
Appendix A

No additional information provided for Section A
Appendix B - Potholes

Supporting information for Sections B1 (A to K) to B7
**Section B1 - Question A**

Has your authority aligned its maintenance programme to the Government's highways maintenance funding years (i.e. 2011-2015 and 2015-2021)?

**Response for Section B1 - Question A**

The Authority's highway maintenance spending programmes are fully aligned to the Government's four year highway maintenance funding years (i.e. 2011-2015 and 2015-2021) through the Greater Manchester Local Transport Plan process.

**2011 – 2015: Greater Manchester Third Local Transport Plan**

Greater Manchester published its third Local Transport Plan in April 2011, setting out the plans and spending priorities of Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM), the ten Greater Manchester Councils, including Oldham, and other key partners in the short, medium and longer term, including for highway maintenance.

The Plan included a Long-Term Strategy outlining a transport vision for the next fifteen years, together with a series of detailed Local Area Implementation Plans, including Oldham Council’s Implementation Plan, which set out our collective spending plans for the four year period up to 2015, including for highway maintenance.

A well maintained road network and its associated bridges, structures and lighting infrastructure is regarded as essential to achieving the prosperous and sustainable economy that Greater Manchester aims to support through its LTP and transport strategy. It is also essential both for a successful passenger transport system and for encouraging more people to walk and cycle.

Many aspects of the Greater Manchester Transport Strategy that we are committed to deliver depend on a high-quality, reliable and serviceable highway network. Poor and declining conditions on roads, footways and their associated structures (e.g. lighting):

- cause an increase in the accident rate and accident compensation claims rate;
- add to congestion, increase traffic emissions and reduce air quality;
- act as a significant barrier to the promotion of cycling;
- poor pavement conditions act as a significant barrier to making walking journeys, and walking to public transport for onward travel;
- cause lower air quality due to the slow-down, speed-up effect where poor road conditions exist;
- increase future financial liabilities for maintenance; and
- challenge carbon reduction targets due to increased congestion.

The LTP3 approach to maintenance is supported by the Greater Manchester Transport Asset Management Strategy and Highway Maintenance Plan as well as individual local authority Local Area Implementation Plans and Transport Asset Management Plans.

Delivery of GMLTP3 is assessed through a suite of key performance indicators (KPIs), which include maintenance:

- carriageway maintenance - principal roads: proportion of principal roads where structural maintenance should be considered; and
carriageway maintenance - non principal, classified roads: proportion of non-principal classified roads where maintenance should be considered.

To achieve delivery of the locally and regionally agreed GMLTP targets, the Greater Manchester Combined Authority is awarded Highways Capital programme funding by the DfT and distributes allocations to the Councils of Greater Manchester. In 2011, the Greater Manchester Combined Authority agreed that the distribution of the Greater Manchester LTP maintenance block funding should be in line with the DfT’s distribution formula for the full 4-year period. In support of this, Oldham Council’s Capital Strategy annually passports the non-ring fenced LTP capital maintenance allocation to support the delivery of Oldham’s LTP3 Local Area Implementation Plan and its capital spending plans for 2011/12 to 2014/15 for investment in and maintenance of the transport network.

A full version of Greater Manchester’s third Local Transport Plan can be found at:
http://www.tfgm.com/journey_planning/LTP3/Pages/default.aspx

The supporting Transport Asset Management Strategy can be found at:

Oldham’s Local Area Implementation Plan 2011/12 - 2014/15 identifies maintaining and improving the condition of the highway network and improving the safety of its users as priorities for the Plan period.

Oldham’s full Local Area Implementation Plan can be found at:

We are currently in the final year of delivering the LTP3 Strategy.

2015-2021: Greater Manchester Fourth Local Transport Plan and the Greater Manchester Growth and Reform Plan Transport Strategy

The development of Greater Manchester’s fourth Local Transport Plan (GMLTP4) has commenced and will be published later in 2014. Through GMLTP4 we will continue the approach of aligning highway maintenance spending programmes with the next Government funding period 2015 – 2021.

GMLTP4 will build upon the Transport Strategy submitted to Government at the end of March 2014 as part of the Greater Manchester Growth and Reform Plan, which contains proposals for Government to agree greater freedoms and flexibilities around highway maintenance to achieve greater efficiencies in service delivery.

In 2013, the DfT established the Highway Maintenance Efficiency Programme (HMEP) with the target of delivering 15% savings by 2015 and 30% or more by 2020. The Greater Manchester authorities began a review process in late 2013 and are working collaboratively to achieve these efficiency targets. Highway maintenance funding regimes are included within the review process with a view to identifying opportunities to best align local and national funding regimes. The review will incorporate all four areas of operation identified under the HMEP principles, namely:
• Operational services;
• Technical services;
• Back Office Services; and
• Management Services.

The outcome of this review will be reflected in the 4-year spending programme included in the emerging LTP4 highway maintenance spending plans, including Oldham’s.
Section B1 - Question B

Has your authority adopted the principle that ‘prevention is better than cure’ in determining the balance between structural, preventative and reactive maintenance activities in order to improve the resilience of the highway network and to minimise the occurrence of potholes in the future?

Response for Section B1 - Question B

Oldham Council has completely integrated the HMEP principle of “prevention is better than cure” into its latest asset management plan, as discussed later, and its actual approach to joint programmes of highways work funded by revenue, central government / LTP capital funding and prudential borrowing arrangements by the council itself.

By combining effectively all funding streams from an asset management perspective, and by applying good quality and smart data gathered, the HMEP toolkit has been used to develop whole life deterioration models and scenarios to maintain carriageways to agreed conditions that have helped target where and when carriageway residual lives will be enhanced by appropriate combinations of interventions including jet patch repairs, traditional quality patch repairs, then sealed and overlaid by techniques such as Microasphalt. These preventative techniques are judiciously used together with adjacent full reconstruction (generally HRA) repairs where absolutely necessary to achieve both an immediate improvement to considerable lengths of the highway along whole corridor routes for the user whilst also increasing the residual life and reducing the need for revenue based reactive maintenance in the medium term.

By combining both LTP funds together with Oldham Council prudential funds amounting to over £12m over the last 4 years consisting of the £10m Highways Improvement Programme (HIP) and £2m Gateways & Corridors Programme so far, and applying asset management principles including the use of the HMEP toolkit, significant lengths of classified roads within Oldham now require much reduced unplanned maintenance. This is allowing scarce revenue funds to be prioritised for the remaining unclassified routes in Oldham requiring unplanned maintenance.

The Gateways Corridor Programme continues this current financial year and is planned over a five year period, together with the commencement of a Secondary Corridor Plan to deal with the remainder of the classified routes within the Borough. Ultimately a 20 year approach is intended to be produced, and across the entire network. It is also planned to add bitumen preservative methods to the intervention options available provided the current trial proves successful and viable. This method would be used to seal the majority of the works carried out within the HIP where appropriate thus actually enhancing the preventative effect of that programme further.

A further Oldham Council investment programme into the Town Centre’s roads of around £2.2m to support the arrival of Metrolink in the town from a public realm and connectivity point of view is being implemented utilising the same asset management principles. This is enabling a Town Centre enhanced pallet to be implemented in such a way that it achieves its goal of regeneration, whilst allowing maintenance regimes to be planned for its future upkeep, and further reduce the current unplanned revenue burden as already discussed.

The culmination of the effects of reducing revenue expenditure of significant sectors of the network as detailed in the initiatives above means that the proportionally larger remaining revenue funds as compared with the remaining network can be dealt with using planned and preventative techniques, not just unplanned maintenance. This in itself further enhances the effectiveness of the remaining revenue budget, firmly embedding across the entire network that “prevention is better than cure.”
All integrated programmes above in addition to their technical and asset management driven goals are helping support significant regeneration within Oldham, and are endorsed in direct discussions with the Councils political leadership, as evidenced further in Section B1, Question H response.
Section B1 - Question C

Has your authority ensured that appropriate competencies have been made available to make the right choices when designing and specifying techniques and materials for the maintenance and repair of highways? Note - these competencies can be secured through training, collaboration with neighbouring authorities or external advice.

Response for Section B1 - Question C

Oldham Council’s Partnership with Mouchel named The Unity Partnership has ensured that the relevant expertise is always available for every technical aspect of Highways. Combining Oldham Council Local Authority knowledge with Mouchel’s extensive highways technical and project management expertise together with Mouchel’s considerable relationship management experience with other large local authorities has helped provide an innovative model for Highways Asset Management.

Collaboration with Mouchel has provided close links with many external companies and suppliers ensuring that the correct decisions are made when identifying solutions for the maintenance of the highway.

Access to the private sector in such a flexible way provides significant benefits, including access to learning and professional networks via alternative routes to. All arrangements add specific value, however we have found consistently that having additional options is helpful in numerous ways.

Carriageway Repair Process

As part of an initiative to find superior carriageway repair technique to the current model, in 2012, Oldham Council carried out a series of patching trials to identify the correct technique to compliment the condition of the existing roads and climatic location. In addition to repairing the Cat 1 and Cat 2 defects this patching technique also had to be compatible with intervention materials that were identified as part of the asset management approach.

Following a successful trial with the company Jet Patcher, discussions with neighbouring authorities took place to gain further evidence that the process could be successful. Engineers at Bury Council and Salford Council who were using the process, worked closely with Oldham Council providing evidence and site visits to ensure enough information was available to make a decision.

Following productive talks with the neighbouring authorities and a second successful trial a 1000 series Jet patcher was procured. To ensure that Jet Patcher was used to its full potential, Oldham Council hired in staff from the supplier to work alongside Oldham Council employees. This period provided the best possible training for the operatives and management for the maintenance and application of the process.

Following a period of material failure during the winter months, Unity Partnership invited a representative of TRL, with which Unity has developed a professional partnership, to assess the process and material of the Jet Patching. Following recommendations from TRL and other experts, a new supplier for both emulsions and aggregates was procured. This has resulted with an improved longer lasting end product providing a better value for money.
Section B1 - Question D

Does your authority co-ordinate with other parties working on the highway short and long term programmes of work activities for up to four years in advance?

Response for Section B1 - Question D

Greater Manchester has consistently placed connectivity and transport at the heart of our economic strategy, with a clear understanding of the role of effective and reliable transport networks in connecting businesses with their supply chains, their customers and their labour markets. Our network of 9,000km local highways and 200km Highways Agency routes faces a particularly complex array of challenges in managing the local, commuter and strategic demands in supporting growth, and we believe that effective management and maintenance is critical to the achievement of that growth. This is reflected in the initial highways coordination functions that were granted to Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM) in 2011, through the establishment of GMCA, and the encouragement of initial collaborative models, which have been established since then, to deliver both service improvement and efficiency savings.

A review has been underway since late 2013 to build on these transport governance and delivery arrangements and establish optimal models of devolution that secure the efficiency benefits of service delivery at scale, whilst retaining a local highways provision that is responsive and accountable to local communities. The review, overseen by a panel of GM Leaders and Chief Executives, will provide a new level of integration across the ten local highways authorities and Highways Agency to secure economies of scale where possible and ensure that priorities are addressed at a strategic economy-wide level. In terms of highway maintenance, the key outcomes will be to develop a delivery model that will:

- meet the challenges of maintenance funding limitations and a growing highways asset maintenance backlog, which threatens to undermine the long-term reliability of the GM network; and
- consistently target maintenance investment on strong asset management to support the long-term economic viability of the city-region.

While we are still in the process of establishing an optimal delivery model, our existing co-operative arrangements ensure that each of the ten Highway Authorities have the opportunity to work closely to ensure economies of scale.

The Greater Manchester Road Authority Permitting Scheme (GMRAPS)

The Greater Manchester Road Activity Permit Scheme (GMRAPS) went live on 29th April 2013. This is the culmination of a collaborative joint initiative across the ten Greater Manchester Authorities and Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM). All activities requiring a permit on the highway are now submitted to the Central Service Centre (CSC) and initially checked to ensure the basic information has been provided. The checked permit application is then submitted to the appropriate local authority for processing.

In addition to the works from Utility Companies, GMRAPS has required that all Local Authority in-house operators submit permit applications for all their works requiring a permit. This has had a significant impact across Greater Manchester with greater visibility of works on the network.
Street Lighting PFI

Oldham Council entered into Partnership with Rochdale Council to procure and Project Manage a Street Lighting Private Finance Initiative due to the age profile and poor condition of the street lighting assets.

The Contract was awarded to The Community Lighting Partnership and its Operating Sub – Contractor Eon on the 20th April 2011 and the Service Commenced on 4th July 2011.

The project will see 80% of the street lighting infrastructure replaced within the first 5 years of the 25 year term of the contract and the remaining 20% of the assets will start to be replaced in year 13 of the Contract, which will see the residual life of the apparatus in excess of 5 years at the end of the Contract.

The Service Provider will design, install and maintain the asset including the Management Information System and Inventory in line with The Output Specification. It defines the Service and outputs the Authorities require the Service Provider to provide under the Contract that aligns with associated standards and codes of practices.

Utility Company Initiatives

Within Oldham we have instigated a number of initiatives with the main Utility Companies including:

- Co-ordinated joint trench working
- NJUG Meeting – Streetworks Innovation Forum

The initiatives have provided a mechanism for longer term discussions around aspiration to be aired. The co-ordination has included discussion around a number of mutually beneficial areas, including support in the development of a plan to instigate a combined database for future long term planning. The information provided has the potential to lead to greater co-ordination throughout the country and ensure greater longevity of road surfaces.

United Utilities Gateway Corridor Partnership

As part of Oldham Council’s plans to make the Gateway Corridor defect free using preventative maintenance techniques, a partnership with United Utilities was created to ensure that all ironwork was replaced / reset prior to any improvement works taking place. Joint inspections were carried out between Oldham Council and United Utilities to identify and agree all defected ironwork that required upgrade. United Utilities provided a programme to dovetail with Oldham Council to ensure minimum disruption and targeted delivery.

Town Centre Utility Agreement

The Oldham Town Centre Improvement Programme includes a footway upgrade scheme that provides a Public Realm material pallet using Asset Management principals. The footway design provides a flexible surface in small sections with a sett paved delineation. Any excavation works that are carried out in the upgraded footway will have to replace the full section of footway which remove the unsightly trench reinstatements and colour matching. This proposal has been carried out on agreement with all relevant Utility Companies.
Section B1 - Question E

Has your authority considered the guidance provided in the ADEPT report Potholes and Repair Techniques for Local Highways and adopted as appropriate to your local circumstances?

Response for Section B1 - Question E

Oldham Council have adopted a number of techniques that correspond with the guidance.

Formation Mechanisms

The majority of the highways in Oldham are evolved roads and are characteristically thin in terms of construction. Following the ADEPT report, more emphasis has been placed on the repair of the surface course and the strain compatibility. A £10m Highways Investment Programme focused primarily on carriageway inlay and increased road thickness where possible. Due to local topography, Oldham has areas of its network that are more susceptible to water and freeze thaw. A surface treatment programme has been developed to ‘seal’ the pot hole repairs at appropriate locations.

Repair

Oldham council continue to trial repair techniques and procedures to ensure that the best hot and cold lay options for the asset are available. The following patching techniques are currently being carried out by Oldham Council:

- HRA Patching
- Bitmac Patching
- Jet Patching (patchmaster)

More emphasis has been placed on the importance of preparation with the introduction a portable ‘Hot Box’ which has resulted in the material being kept at an optimum temperature to ensure a quality repair can be achieved first time.

A first time repair approach is carried out to the following process:

- Saw Cut edges
- Bitumen emulsion tack coat
- Rapid set cold poor for vertical joints

Oldham Council currently have two full time HRA Patching teams repairing potholes with a Matrix dominated hot mix asphalt to ensure longevity of the repair.

Maintenance Treatments

As part of the £10m Highways Investment Programme, Oldham Council followed the prevention is better that the cure approach and the final year of the investment focused solely on preventative maintenance.

Between April 2013 and March 2015, Oldham Council will have invested £2.5million in surface treatments. These treatments are carried out at the correct intervention level for the carriageway ensuring effective life cycle pavement management.

The thin treatment is generally only used on roads with less that 5% pre patching required as anything more than this is often a precursor for wider stress in the carriageway.
Trials are currently being carried out to monitor the effectiveness of applying Restorative Clause 950 Bitumen Preservative. Following the outcome of these trials it is intended that it will provide an additional intervention to the life cycle pavement management.

**Managing the asset**

Oldham Council has adopted an asset management approach that invests in timely treatment to ensure that the residual engineering capacity is not compromised.

To reduce the burden on the Revenue Budget, Oldham Council has provided capital funding for the nine 'gateway corridors' that emanate from Oldham Town Centre. These are the 9 busiest roads in Oldham and provide a significant Traffic Management cost. By carrying out preventative maintenance on these roads using the capital budget it provides more revenue for the remainder of the network.
Section B1 - Question F

Has your authority developed a detailed highway inspection manual and have put appropriate training in place for your Highway Inspectors?

Response for Section B1 - Question F

The main purpose of highway maintenance is to maintain the highway network for the safe and convenient movement of people, traffic and goods. However, even the best maintained roads will still be subject to deterioration. Therefore the Highways Safety Inspection Policy has been developed to establish procedures for inspection and repair, which will reduce the potential for accidents to occur and provide evidence that safe systems are in place in the event that accident claims are made against the Council.

The Policy gives due regard to the Council’s statutory obligations and is based upon the principles contained within the document “Well Maintained Highways – Code of Practice for Highways Maintenance Management July 2005, updated January 2012” (WMH), together with other similar codes of good practice and appropriate legislation.

The WMH recommends the following core objectives for maintenance strategy:

- **Network Safety**
  - Complying with Statutory obligations and meeting users’ needs for safety.

- **Network Serviceability**
  - Ensuring availability, achieving integrity, maintaining reliability and enhancing condition.

- **Network Sustainability**
  - Minimising cost over time, maximising value to the community and maximising environmental contribution.

The Policy deals specifically with Network Safety Inspections and is designed to deliver a consistent approach across the Borough.

In order to comply with their duty of care the Council carries out a variety of safety inspections which are specifically designed to enable Inspectors to focus on identifying hazardous defects which represent, in varying degrees, a danger to users of the highway.

The person undertaking the inspection is responsible for the accuracy of that inspection and the recorded information. Each Inspector is provided with a copy of the Highway Safety Inspection Policy (HSIP) and the Highway Safety Inspections Manual (HSIM). The HSIM augments the information provided within the HSIP and gives detailed examples for reference purposes.

Each Inspector has a ‘Personal Development Review’ (PDR) to identify their training needs. The PDR is a rolling process with two formal discussion meetings which, provides Managers and the Inspectors with the opportunity to assess and agree progress against past and current objectives and set new objectives. The process also assists individuals in identifying development needs required for their role and opportunities to develop and achieve their career aspirations.

At present we are reviewing the training needs of all inspectors to ensure there is a consistent high standard of inspections achieved, not only across our own inspectors, but those across the whole of Greater Manchester. To this end we are investigating the benefits of having increasingly better qualified inspectors and through the HAMP Sub-groups.
A sample of inspections is reviewed each month to assess the quality of information recorded and any items of concern discussed with the individual inspector. The information gathered from this exercise is used to ensure a consistent approach to Safety Inspections is achieved by all the inspectors.

Regular team meetings are held to discuss issues in relation to the inspection process allowing it to be continually improved.
Section B1 - Question G

Does your authority use technology and systems for the effective identification and management of potholes?

Response for Section B1 - Question G

Much of highways maintenance activity is based upon statutory powers and duties contained in legislation and precedents developed over time as a result of claims and legal proceedings.

The main legislation relating to highway safety inspections is contained within the Highways Act 1980. In particular Section 41 imposes a duty upon the Highway Authority to maintain the adopted highway network (i.e. those highways maintainable at public expense) in such a way so as to ensure the safe passage of all highway users. Almost all claims against the Authority arise from an alleged breach of this duty.

Section 58 of the Act provides a statutory defence against a claim for the above, on the grounds that the Authority has taken such care as in all circumstances was reasonably practicable to ensure that the highway in question was safe for highway users.

In effect this requires the Highway Authority to:

1. Consider what constitutes a danger to road users.
2. To regularly inspect the highway in search of such defects, and
3. To repair such defects in a timely fashion.

In order to comply with their duty of care the Council carries out a variety of safety inspections which are specifically designed to enable Inspectors to focus on identifying hazardous defects which represent, in varying degrees, a danger to users of the highway.

Safety inspections may be carried out as a result of two actions:

- They may be part of a planned, cyclic safety inspection regime
- They may take the form of an “ad-hoc safety inspection” following a specific enquiry / complaint regarding the condition of the highway

Records of cyclic safety inspections and inspections following ad-hoc requests are currently held on a combination of computer databases supplemented by paper records.

All ad-hoc requests are registered within the Correspondence Database, provided with a unique reference number and an acknowledgement is provided. All subsequent communication is identified with the unique reference number. Appropriate triage of the request is undertaken and the outcome is assigned accordingly.

All potholes identified on the network are recorded within the Works Order Database. Each works order is uniquely referenced and cross reference is made with the Correspondence Database. The databases are updated daily and monitored to ensure compliance with statutory and best practise requirements.

We are constantly investigating new technology developments and remain open to the adoption of new systems and infrastructure if it can be demonstrated to deliver a benefit. A recent example of this is the adoption of a central system to support the recording of permit applications through the GMRAPS system which has allowed us to close certain other modules of our asset management software package Exor, hosted by Bentley. We will continue to look
for ways to enhance our service in this way either individually or through collaborative discussions.
Section B1 - Question H

Does your authority have a public communications process in place that provides clarity and transparency in the policy and approach to repairing potholes? This should include a published policy and details of its implementation, including the prevention, identification, reporting, tracking and repair of potholes.

Response for Section B1 - Question H

Oldham Council has a variety of communication processes in place to provide transparency in our pothole repairing approach using a range of channels to reach as many audiences as possible.

We have a dedicated website section from our homepage at:

www.oldham.gov.uk

Site visitors choose to ‘Report it!’ are taken through a simple step-by-step process online.

This includes an explanation of our pothole policy, what issues there might be about who owns the highway (adopted, unadopted or owned by an organisation like a supermarket), a number to call if the pothole represents an immediate threat to safety, and an explanation of what is an ‘acceptable defect’ to be repaired.

The Council has been very proactive in publicising our pothole policy and in encouraging residents to report problems. This has included the recent launch promotion of a Tumblr blog, which can be viewed at http://oldhamcouncil.tumblr.com/ (NOTE: It has not been updated recently due to the Purdah pre-election period). This aims to explain and educate the public about potholes and the work being done by our highways repair team.

We also issue regular PR updates to attain media publicity and raise awareness about our highways work – such as announcements of new Government funding or equipment. Recent examples include:

http://www.oldham.gov.uk/press/article/654/funding_boost_for_borough_roads


http://www.oldham.gov.uk/press/article/581/council_provides_24-hour_repair.promise_on_gateway_roads

Oldham Council’s Press Office always responds to queries about potholes from local and national media in an attempt to explain, educate and engage in the issues raised.

We also answer all queries about this submitted to us via Twitter and FaceBook by members of the public.

Our pothole work is also highlighted in our quarterly residents’ magazine which goes out to every household across the borough: again to raise awareness and enable reporting of problems.

The Council Leader, Jim McMahon, also has a weekly blog which – given the salience of these issues with the public - regularly refers to highways issues. An example can be seen at:

http://oldhamcouncil.wordpress.com/2012/12/12/getting-a-grip-of-oldhams-roads/
Oldham is committed to developing a co-operative future; one where citizens, partners and staff work together to improve the borough and create a confident and ambitious place to live, work and play. We want all members of the community to be able to play an active part in building our co-operative borough.

To this end, the Highway Safety Inspection Policy (HSIP) is available on Oldham Council’s webpage with a simple form which can be used for reporting a pothole.
Section B1 - Question I

Does your authority monitor public satisfaction with road, footway and cycleway condition and report annually through the National Highways and Transport Public Satisfaction Survey or their own surveys?

Response for Section B1 - Question I

We now monitor public satisfaction with road, footway and cycle conditions through two key initiatives.

Firstly, we have a Reputation Tracker survey independently carried out for us every six months.

As well as generic questions about satisfaction with various services, this also includes questions to members of the public about how they rate:

- Road maintenance
- Pavement maintenance
- Gritting of roads and pavements

Residents are also asked – alongside a range of other topics – how highly they rate ‘road maintenance’ against others as the most important for the council to improve in the next 12 months.

In addition, we now hold regular forums (every three to four months) with specific groups of people to discuss problems with highways.

These were launched in March as part of our constant drive to improve and enhance services and have already included a Taxi Drivers forum, and a Cyclists’ Forum. The range of these forums is to be expanded to take in new groups in the summer.

Senior councillors and officers attend these forums, which have a question and answer format and are open to anyone to attend. There is a valid exchange of views, sharing of information and encouragement of residents to assist us in our work by reporting pothole defects or unsafe footway/cycleways.
Section B1 - Question J

Does your authority adopt permanent repairs as the first choice when repairing potholes?

Response for Section B1 - Question J

Oldham council continue to trial repair techniques and procedures to ensure that the best hot and cold lay options for the asset are available. The following patching techniques are currently being carried out by Oldham Council:

- HRA Patching
- Bitmac Patching
- Jet Patching (patchmaster)

More emphasis has been placed on the importance of preparation with the introduction a portable ‘Hot Box’ which has resulted in the material being kept at an optimum temperature to ensure a quality repair can be achieved first time.

A first time repair approach is carried out to the following approach:

- Saw Cut edges
- Bitumen emulsion tack coat
- Rapid set cold poor for vertical joints

Oldham Council currently have two full time HRA Patching teams repairing potholes with a Matrix dominated hot mix asphalt to ensure longevity of the repair.
Section B1 - Question K

Has your authority adopted dimensional definitions for potholes based on best practice as part of its maintenance policy?

Response for Section B1 - Question K

The safety inspections are designed to identify those defects likely to create a hazard to highway users. The purpose of the inspection is to allow the risk of danger to be assessed on site and to enable any defect identified as a Category 1 or 2 to be given an appropriate priority response for either making safe or repair.

- **Category 1** - those defects that require prompt attention because they represent an immediate or imminent danger to road users.
- **Category 2** - all other actionable defects.

Safety inspections will either be walked or driven. Where a driven inspection is carried out it will be done from a slow moving vehicle. The vehicle shall be equipped with appropriate signs and lights in order to warn other road users that inspections are being undertaken.

When undertaking walked inspections the Inspector will proceed slowly along the footway scrutinising the adopted part of the highway from the rear of the footway to the centre of the carriageway. On completion of one side of the street the inspector will cross over and repeat the inspection process on that side. If parked vehicles are present the inspector will as far as is reasonably practicable look under the vehicle to ascertain the condition of the footway or carriageway beneath. This may also involve crossing the road to look underneath the vehicle from its opposite side. As the inspector may not be able to see every defect under a parked vehicle, the location of the parked vehicles will be noted on the inspection sheet.

Additional ad-hoc Safety Inspections of specific defects are carried out in response to reports or complaints from members of the emergency services, the public and other road users. In such instances these inspections will be carried out within 5 working days from receipt of enquiry dependent upon volume of enquiries and availability of inspectors.

The inspector shall record details of the weather conditions, surface conditions and any unusual features of the method of inspection for each safety inspection on the inspection sheet or hand held capture device as appropriate.

Scheduled Safety Inspections shall identify any actionable defects associated with the following:

- carriageways
- drainage
- footways
- ironwork
- kerbing
- safety fencing and barriers
- street furniture
- traffic signs/bollards/ights/signals
- trees and vegetation

Any other hazards will also be noted for action by the appropriate utility.

The dimensional criteria adopted by the authority are indicated in the following table for the appropriate Category 1 and 2 defects:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inspection Frequency</th>
<th>Category 1 Defects</th>
<th>Category 2 Defects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Month Walked</td>
<td>Collapse, missing gully or significant risks to public or property. Footway defects =&gt; 50mm and carriageway defects =&gt; 75mm. Kerbing - missing / collapsed in urban areas and loose kerbs likely to fall into carriageway in rural areas.</td>
<td>Footway defects =&gt; 20mm in pedestrianised areas and =&gt;25mm in other areas. Carriageway defects =&gt;40mm (except at designated pedestrian crossing points =&gt;25mm). Kerbing defects - difference between adjoining kerbs exceeding 75mm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Month Driven</td>
<td>Collapse, missing gully or significant risks to public or property. Carriageway defects =&gt; 75mm. Kerbing - missing / collapsed in urban areas and loose kerbs likely to fall into carriageway in rural areas.</td>
<td>Footway defects =&gt; 20mm in pedestrianised areas and =&gt;25mm in other areas. Carriageway defects =&gt;40mm (except at designated pedestrian crossing points =&gt;25mm). Kerbing defects - difference between adjoining kerbs exceeding 75mm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Months</td>
<td>Collapse, missing gully or significant risks to public or property. Footway defects =&gt; 50mm and carriageway defects =&gt; 75mm. Kerbing - missing / collapsed in urban areas and loose kerbs likely to fall into carriageway in rural areas.</td>
<td>Footway defects =&gt;25mm. Carriageway defects =&gt;40mm (except at designated pedestrian crossing points =&gt;25mm). Kerbing defects - difference between adjoining kerbs exceeding 75mm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>Collapse, missing gully or significant risks to public or property. Footway defects =&gt; 50mm and carriageway defects =&gt; 75mm. Kerbing - missing / collapsed in urban areas and loose kerbs likely to fall into carriageway in rural areas.</td>
<td>Footway defects =&gt;25mm. Carriageway defects =&gt;40mm (except at designated pedestrian crossing points =&gt;25mm). Kerbing defects - difference between adjoining kerbs exceeding 75mm.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Category 1 Defects**

Category 1 defects are those defects which are deemed to represent an immediate or imminent hazard to the public.

There may be circumstances where a defect poses a very high and immediate risk of serious injury or fatality. In these instances, the Inspector will aim to make safe themselves or remain on site and take any and all practicable steps to warn the public of the danger until the danger has been removed.

**Category 2 Defects**

Category 2 defects are those defects which are deemed not to represent an immediate or imminent hazard to the public.

Although such defects may have safety implications these are considered to be of a lesser significance than Category 1 defects. Their main implication is one of overall network maintenance.
Section B2 Question

Does your authority adopt any innovative methods to help repair potholes? This could include, for example, specialist pothole maintenance crews

Response for Section B2

Oldham Council’s Partnership with Mouchel (Unity Partnership) has ensured that the relevant expertise is always available for every technical aspect of Highways. Combining Oldham Council Local Authority knowledge with Mouchel’s highway knowledge has helped provide an innovative model for Highways Asset Management.

Collaboration with Mouchel has provided close links with many external companies and suppliers ensuring that the correct decisions are made when identifying solutions for the maintenance of the highway.

Carriageway Repair Process

As part of an initiative to find superior carriageway repair technique to the current model, in 2012, Oldham Council carried out a series of patching trials to identify the correct technique to compliment the condition of the existing roads and climatic location. In addition to repairing the Cat 1 and Cat 2 defects this patching technique also had to be compatible with intervention materials that were identified as part of the asset management approach.

Following a successful trial with the company Jet Patcher, discussions with neighbouring authorities took place to gain further evidence that the process could be successful. Engineers at Bury Council and Salford Council who were using the process, worked closely with Oldham Council providing evidence and site visits to ensure enough information was available to make a decision.

Following productive talks with the neighbouring authorities and a second successful trial a Jet patcher was procured. To ensure that Jet Patcher was used to its full potential, Oldham Council hired in staff from the supplier to work alongside Oldham Council employees. This period provided the best possible training for the operatives and management for the maintenance and application of the process.

Following a period of material failure during the winter months, Unity Partnership invited a representative of TRL to assess the process and material of the Jet Patching. Following recommendations, a new supplier for both emulsions and aggregates was procured. This has resulted with an improved longer lasting end product providing a better value for money.
Section B3 Question

Does your authority use reporting tools to identify potholes in your local area?

Response for Section B3

In addition to the reporting mechanisms listed in Appendix B - Section B1 Question H – Response, the authority through its partner The Unity Partnership responds to enquiries received through other national web sites including but not limited to:

- www.fixmystreet.com
- www.fillthathole.org.uk
- www.ctc.org.uk/campaign/fill-hole
- www.raag-online.org.uk

All communications received from a third party site are responded to in the same manner as for enquiries received directly.

Oldham is committed to developing a co-operative future; one where citizens, partners and staff work together to improve the borough and create a confident and ambitious place to live, work and play. We want all members of the community to be able to play an active part in building our co-operative borough.

We will always encourage users of third party reporting tools to visit Oldham Council’s webpages and view the Highway Safety Inspection Policy (HSIP). The HSIP provides clear and concise information identifying roles and responsibilities and provides the following information:

- Duty of care
- Network hierarchy and inspection regime including inspection frequency
- Items for inspections and defect classification and response times
- Staff development
- Plans of district centres

This provides clear information about what constitutes a pothole and encourages the user to submit a simple reporting form.
Section B4 Question

Does your authority regularly consult and seek feedback on its highways maintenance regime, including potholes, with key stakeholders?

Response for Section B4

In addition to the work undertaken to determine public satisfaction as detailed in Appendix B – Section B1 – Question I Response the authority regularly consults and seeks feedback on its highway maintenance regime through consultation with third parties, organisations and regular public and member forums.

Oldham is a Borough of contrasts. From the vibrant urban towns in the west of the Borough that sit adjacent to Manchester City Centre, to the picturesque villages of Saddleworth that provide a gateway to the Peak District National Park. It is a proud and thriving Borough that is home to approximately 220,000 people, 40% of whom are between 16 and 44 years of age and one fifth under the age of 15.

The borough is split into six districts each sub-split into a number of wards. Each ward is represented by three councillors. Throughout the year, public and member meetings are operated across each ward and district and they provide the forum for feedback on the highways maintenance regime. In addition, various sub-groups exist, for instance the Saddleworth Transport Sub-group which meets bi-monthly to discuss all transport related issues within the Saddleworth and Lees areas. The sub-group contains a cross section of members including Parish councillors and local residents groups. We include representations from bus groups and Network Rail when appropriate.

The Council Cabinet is made up of a Leader, a Deputy Leader and up to 9 councillors appointed by the Leader. The Cabinet is responsible for strategic decisions and recommends proposals for approval by full Council on the budget, Council Tax levels and the Council’s policy framework. The Cabinet can form committees, working groups and panels. Cllr Hibbert has responsibility within the Cabinet for Highways and we work closely with him, attending bi-weekly meetings, to ensure delivery of the maintenance regime is aligned with the overall aspirations of the Council. In addition to meeting with Cllr Hibbert, regular meetings are held with The Council Leader, Jim McMahon and the Chief Executive, Carolyn Wilkins.

Oldham is a Borough with a deep-rooted tradition for enterprise and entrepreneurship evidenced by a strong business base of over 6,000 businesses which span a range of key sectors including advanced manufacturing, construction, digital and creative and financial and professional services. The Borough is also home to a number of national and international brands and companies including the Mirror Group, Diodes Incorporated, Ferranti Technologies, Innovative Technologies as well as Oldham Athletic Football Club.

It is therefore important to listen to the needs of the business community and ensure their requirements are incorporated into future plans and current maintenance activities. Any restrictions of traffic flows can have an impact upon businesses, therefore we undertake consultation to ensure any disruption is minimised as far as possible.

Oldham has excellent transport links. The extension of the Metrolink through the town centre and borough will provide fast, efficient access to the town from the countryside and back again. The Borough also has direct access to the national motorway network providing quick and easy links to Manchester International Airport and to Leeds and beyond.
Good communication is key, and listening to the needs of the community through the various forums is vital to the delivery of the highways maintenance regime.
Section B5 Question

Does your authority have an up-to-date vision and action plan to improve the walking environment and encourage walking?

Response for Section B5

The authority's vision for walking is contained within the third Greater Manchester Local Transport Plan and the supporting Oldham Local Area Implementation Plan 2011/12 – 2014/15.

The Greater Manchester Local Transport Plan 3 strategy for improving the active travel environment can be found at:


Oldham's Local Area Implementation Plan can be found at:


See section 6.6 (page 21) ‘Encouraging walking and cycling’

Improvements to the walking environment will continue to be delivered through Greater Manchester’s fourth Local Transport Plan (GMLTP4), development of which has commenced with a view to it being published later in 2014. GMLTP4 will build upon the Transport Strategy submitted to Government at the end of March 2014 as part of the Greater Manchester Growth and Reform Plan, which promotes improvements to routes for active travel, including routes to town centres, employment areas and public transport.

Examples of the type of actions and projects we are currently taking to improve the walking environment and encourage walking are given below:

- **Improve walking routes to Metrolink stops and key destinations** such as town and district centres and employment sites, including the provision of new and improved links from existing networks:
  - We are currently installing pedestrian crossing facilities at key junctions on pedestrian routes to Metrolink stops where none currently exist through the Local Sustainable Transport Fund.
  - We have also just completed the installation of a new pedestrian signage scheme in Oldham town centre: this covers the key town centre pedestrian routes from key visitor arrival points such as the Metrolink stops, bus stations and car parks to the town centre and its individual destinations.

- **Delivering our Sustainable Modes of Travel to School Strategy, produced under the Education and Inspections Act:**
  - A key action for the current financial year includes completion of a programme to install 'school keep clear' markings at all schools where there are none or markings are faded. Associated signing, lining and Traffic Regulation Orders will all be amended where necessary to enable the Council’s school safety camera car to operate outside all schools, all with the aim of improving the safety of the pedestrian environment for outside the Borough’s schools.
• **Improving street lighting:**
  - We are currently replacing thousands of street lights, signs and bollards to bring our lighting infrastructure up to modern standards, providing a safer environment, particularly for pedestrians.

• **Improving footway surfaces:**
  - Highway inspectors regularly check all adopted footpaths for defects including potholes. Planned maintenance (such as footway reconstruction and refurbishment) treats the areas of greatest need and slows down deterioration of the network by carrying out less expensive treatments where they will be most cost effective. Our £10 million 4-year Highways Investment Programme for highway maintenance includes a £0.5 million budget specifically for footway improvements, while many carriageway resurfacing schemes include adjacent footways, all aimed at reducing slip trip and fall claims against the council.

• **Improving Public Rights of Way, and other green infrastructure such as canal towpaths, that meet local travel needs in line with our Rights of Way Improvement Plan:**
  - We are, for example, currently upgrading the canal towpath for pedestrians and cyclists between Chadderton and Middleton through the Local Sustainable Transport Fund.
Section B6 Question

Please explain how you deliver your duty under NRSWA to 'co-ordinate the execution of works of all kinds', including for example permit schemes, noticing, co-ordination meetings?

Response for Section B6

The council discharges its duties under the New Roads and Street Works Act through the management and use of a permitting system and by employing a team of qualified Street Works Inspectors, headed by a Street Works Manager, to monitor and co-ordinate all works on the network.

As part of the wider conurbation of Greater Manchester, Oldham Council utilises the Greater Manchester Road Activity Permit Scheme (GMRAPS) to monitor and control all permit applications made to the authority by all works promoters. Approval of a permit is granted following a considered review by the Street Works Manager (and through consultation with the Traffic Manager) who is responsible for ensuring that we meet the network management duty as required under the Traffic Management Act 2004.

The Street Works Manager maintains continuous contact with representatives from all works promoters through email and/or telephone and, if necessary, by meeting them on site to discuss more complex issues. In addition, the authority holds quarterly co-ordination meetings with representatives from each of the major utilities to review their planned programmes of works. For schemes across the authority’s border, the neighbouring authority is also consulted.

We recognise that all works promoters need to carry out works in the highway and work co-operatively with all parties to ensure that their needs are met whilst minimising disruption to all users of the highway. We treat our own works, utility works and those of our PFI partners with parity and monitor this using the Traffic Performance Indicators (TPIs) submitted to Geoplace quarterly.

The Street Works Manager ensures that the team of inspectors monitor daily the activities of the works promoters through a review of the permit applications in the system and, more importantly, through site visits. High quality photographs and notes are taken by the inspectors as evidence of the site visits and their findings; these notes are used to evidence any potential claims made by the authority against the works promoters in the event of delays and/or poor performance.

The authority carries out a 100% inspection regime to ensure maximum compliance by the works promoters.
Section B7 Question

What actions does your authority take to ensure road repairs undertaken by other parties (such as utilities companies) meet the standards in the specification?

Response for Section B7

The authority operates a 100% visual inspection regime across all works carried out on the highway. Qualified Street Works Inspectors are employed to ensure that all reinstatements meet the criteria set out in the Specification for the Reinstatements of Openings in the Highway (SRoH). In the event that a reinstatement is found to be non-compliant the promoter is served with a defect under powers granted by NRSWA.

In addition, the council also operates a structured coring programme following the guidance set out in the Highway Authorities & Utilities Committee (HAUC) best practice guide. Therefore, a proportion of reinstatements that are found to be visually compliant will be put forward for the coring programme. A contractor with United Kingdom Accreditation Service (UKAS) certification has been selected to undertake the testing.

Testing of the samples starts with a dimension and material compliance check – operational costs are recovered from the works promoter for all non-compliant cores. For any sample meeting the specified criteria for the dimension and material test, an air voids test is undertaken. Again, costs are recovered for any sample failing to meet the required standard.

For all cores identified as non-compliant, the responsible utility company is instructed to rework the reinstatement.

Quarterly performance meetings are held with the major utilities and the coring contractor with discussion points including: a review of the statistics and a presentation of results; the nature of typical non-compliant samples; and a presentation on innovations in new materials and/or reinstatement techniques. The authority operates a full disclosure of all testing information with the utility companies gathered through the programme in an effort to help them understand the reasons for their non-compliance and to support their improvement initiatives.

Evidence gathered over the previous two years has shown that the overall quality of the reinstatements has improved markedly and the programme seeks to respond to this by reducing the number of sites tested per utility based on individual performance.
Appendix C - Asset Management

Supporting information for Section C1
Section C1 – Question 1

Has your authority got an up to date asset management policy and strategy?

**Section C1 – Response to Question 1**

**ASSET MANAGEMENT POLICY AND STRATEGY RECOMMENDATION 3**

An asset management policy and a strategy should be developed and published. These should align with the corporate vision and demonstrate the contribution asset management makes towards achieving this vision.

In September 2013, we published a Highways Asset Management Policy and Strategy in draft form, based on the above recommendation (refer UKRLG Asset Management Strategy Guidance published in May 2013).

Our Policy and Strategy document aligns our Highways service objectives with the Council’s corporate vision and objectives, and provides a high level statement that describes how Unity/Oldham will manage their highways network in order to deliver and support these objectives. This document sets the context for the Asset Management Framework currently in place and demonstrates Unity/Oldham’s commitment to delivering best practice asset management.

The asset management policy and strategy can be found at the following link:

[http://www.oldham.gov.uk/info/200305/roads_pavements_and_highway](http://www.oldham.gov.uk/info/200305/roads_pavements_and_highway)

Section C1 – Question 2

Does your authority communicate relevant information associated with asset management through engagement with your relevant stakeholders when you set requirements, make decisions and report performance?

**Section C1 – Response to Question 2**

The HMEP process culminates in a proposed list of schemes which cover all maintenance aspects. Since February 2010 continuous improvement has been made in the capital planning process which the list of schemes is submitted to. The Capital Investment Programme Board (CIPB) has developed its role and provides a coordinated approach to the capital investment programme. The CIPB meets on a monthly basis, chaired by the Executive Director, EPS and attended by Assistant Executive Directors from each Directorate and appropriate Cabinet Members, including usually the Leader of the Council. The CIPB continues to use the two-stage business case process to consider potential capital projects. The CIPB has also taken account of the existing Capital Strategy and amended and revised this for Members consideration.

The relevance and benefits of the use of effective asset management and in particular HMEP techniques has been tabled on a number of occasions before the CIPB to ensure senior officer, member and financial support into the need for prudential borrowing / invest to save programmes of work, and indeed the way in which very targeted interventions and varied techniques are the optimum method for their delivery. This has ensured that asset management driven priorities have been able to support corporate and political objectives, and be supported in the public domain by the Leadership itself.
A presentation was also recently given to the Councils Scrutiny Committee who expressed support for our approach and the significant progress made. Copies of the HMEP Guidance for Elected Members was provided to Councillors as part of this process.

Progress on all highways programmes is reported back to a number of stakeholder forums on a regular basis including Cabinet, CIPB, monthly financial and KPI meetings, bi-weekly briefings with Executive Members (and Shadow Executive Members), specific highways strategy meetings with the Leadership including other council stakeholders such as Regeneration, and more detailed reviews right down to the individual project level including financial, progress and quality related aspects. Progress on all aspects of local highways delivery is also regularly discussed at local District Executive and Community Forum meetings around the various areas of Oldham attended by Ward members, Parish members, residents associations, businesses and the public as appropriate.

Section C1 – Question 3

Does your authority have an asset management register?

Section C1 – Response to Question 3

All assets are held within the Highways Management System – Exor hosted by Bentley.

Section C1 – Question 4

Does your authority follow lifecycle planning principles which are used to review the level of funding and which will help support investment decisions including long term investment in your assets?

Section C1 – Response to Question 4

This Council is already applying the DfT’s principles detailed within its Highways Maintenance Efficiency Programme (HMEP) guidance and toolkits, and as such ensures that maximum returns are obtained from its highways investment.

Our on-going plan involves using various agreed strategies and appropriate targeted and innovative interventions to:

1) Improve overall carriageway condition;
2) Increase residual life for carriageways not yet actually requiring full reconstruction;
3) Reduce the need for unplanned maintenance works enabling more targeted use of limited revenue funds

This will increase public confidence in highways condition outcomes due to the Council’s ability to determine a longer term plan for highways asset management.

The Council funded Highways Investment programme (HIP) carried out over a 4 year period invested £10m into the network and has helped commence our asset management. This particular initiative was implemented over a 4 year period up to and including the 2013/14 financial year and is now complete. This work was complementary to the highways works already planned within LTP budgets.

In addition part of our current targeted works has been the creation of a Gateways and Corridor Improvement Programme during the 2014/14 financial year. Nine key corridors into the borough have been identified within an on-going planned programme of targeted and specific
interventions over a period of years. This is to invest and maintain them at an enhanced level thus almost eliminating the need for unplanned maintenance, and hence revenue expenditure. In some cases these enhanced levels include an aesthetic measure to help create an environment conducive to growth and regeneration in accordance with the borough’s corporate plans.

There is also a nascent Secondary Corridor programme planned for commencement in this current financial year. This aims to deal with other classified routes in the borough in a similar planned way, achieving an appropriate agreed standard using an on-going planned regime.

The Council has approved £2m investment over the last year in the corridor approach, with a further £2m budgeted over the next two years continuing and implementing the joint corridor approach.

One of the main aspects of the new approach is to manage the combination of all highways budgets and various possible methods of highways repair / reconstruction to best target the areas actually needing intervention just before it is required, using a planned approach to maintain each highway or class of highway at an agreed condition standard. This agreed condition standard would be tempered according to the actual and likely available funding, whilst ensuring safety.

Unity Partnership working for Oldham Council initially is managing the Gateway Corridors using a 5 year Life Cycle Plan but intend to develop this into a 20 year Life Cycle Plan to ensure the longest possible residual life is achieved for all resurfaced roads carried out under HIP, and now also the Gateway Corridor proposals.

The 20 Year Life Cycle Plan for the Gateway Corridors will be part of Oldham Council / Unity Partnership’s plans for improved asset management. It is intended that this process will be implemented Borough wide as funds allow incorporating the on-going central government initiative Highways Maintenance Efficiency Programme (HMEP) life cycle costing exercise, which is sponsored by the Department for Transport.

This data led approach when combined with close collaboration with key Council priorities has led to the development of the Gateways and Corridors Programme designed to enhance the condition of all the major strategic routes into the Borough - thus potentially increasing the reputation and regeneration of Oldham, whilst actually helping to control on-going unplanned revenue expenditure.

The HMEP led approach is used to plan the future asset management of the Borough’s highways to best utilise the available government capital funds, any Council Prudentially borrowed funds and available revenue highways funds.
Appendix D – Efficiencies

Supporting information for Sections D1 to D3
Section D1

Is your authority actively engaged with securing efficiencies for highways maintenance?

Section D1 – Response

Here in Oldham we have been pro-active in seeking efficiencies in the delivery of our highways maintenance service. Significant effort has been put into this area over the last few years, leading to a step change in delivery to our communities.

In addition to a broad range of technical elements which are explained in detail below, we have focused on the importance of organisational structure and the creation of a strong team ethos. Our Service has been strengthened during this period by some key technical appointments as well as re-organisation.

Whilst this is the new norm in local government, our approach has resulted in us breaking down the traditional barriers across skill areas and the creation of multi-skilled and flexible staff. As a result, our service has reduced its overall resource cost by more than 35%. These savings are in addition to the construction related savings set out below.

In 2009/10, the Council made a decision to invest £10m into its Highway network. The aims of this investment were to improve network condition both footway and carriageway. The investment was provided over a four year period ending March 2014.

During the early stages of the investment period we took the opportunity to re-align our service delivery to more closely match the Councils strategic outcomes. In essence, our asset management approach has been developed and enhanced to focus investment in areas that support the creation of Confident Communities, A Co-operative Council and an Attractive Place to Invest.

We recognised some time ago that our highway assets provide a social function beyond the simple movement of traffic and our strategies recognise that priority should be given to this function and the contribution it makes to our economic performance. This is a critical element of delivering improved value for money and driving efficiency throughout the investment period and beyond.

The prioritisation of investment onto key strategic corridors in Oldham has resulted in significant improvement in network quality in these key areas but has also helped to enhance the reputation of the authority in the eyes of road users and businesses.

Our local business community was represented and expressed positive support for our approach during the visit of the Transport Minister, Robert Goodwill, to Oldham in December 2013. This support is extremely important to us since it is a direct expression of the contribution our asset management investment makes to our local economy.

Technical Partnerships and collaboration

We have partnered with a number of organisations in order to drive improvements in outcomes for our communities, including efficiencies. A key example of such partnerships is the development of our Utility re-instatement coring programme. Through the delivery of this extremely successful initiative (commenced trials autumn 2011), we have achieved more than 6,000 network improvements and are driving an increase in the overall quality of re-instatements.
Of critical importance to us has been our strong working relationship with the Utilities themselves. Our programme is recognised by NJUG as being an excellent example of working in partnership. In 2013, the Chair of NJUG said of our work “NJUG and its members are pleased to work with Oldham and any other authorities who follow the same approach as it is recognised as a fair, robust and consistent policy promoting collaboration and delivering real improvements and we would encourage other authorities to follow this approach.” We also presented on the subject ‘Working in Collaboration for the benefit of customers’ at the NHAUC conference in October 2013, this was by invitation from the CEO of NJUG.

In addition, we have partnered with TRL on a number of initiatives including the Utility coring programme itself. Oldham has hosted a number of innovation forum meetings with NJUG, the Utilities and neighbouring authorities and we are keen to develop such initiatives further over the next few years.

**Multi Hog**

An area targeted to identify increased efficiency in both time and cost was the traditional patching team with road breakers. Oldham Council carried out a series of trials to identify the correct process/plant to complement our existing patching techniques. Following a successful 6 month trial, we procured plant through the company Multi Hog. The effect was instant reducing the amount of material used daily and still maintaining the productivity with an option to recycle the waste product.

The Multi Hog is a versatile machine and is primarily used as part of a wider plane and patch program for both Bitmac and HRA patching between February and October but is used during the winter period to treat the network of rural lanes with the additional gritting attachments. Other uses for the machine such as stump grinding attachments and crushing buckets are currently being explored.

**Recycling**

Oldham Council are currently carrying out in-situ and ex-situ trials for recycling both footway and carriageway materials. Early indications suggest that the trials will be successful in providing a cost saving and Oldham Council intend to roll these techniques out throughout the 2014-15 financial year and we have ambitious plans to expand this.

**Tendering the contract documents**

Oldham Council, continually review its contractor frameworks for areas of efficiency. Several sections of the frameworks have been re-tendered to allow for innovation and to keep up with current Highway trends and initiatives.

**Iron work**

We are seeing additional benefits resulting from our improved asset management and ability to programme more effectively. One example of this is that we know arrange for the delivery of a supply of United Utilities Iron Work in advance of planned works. This allows iron work to be replaced efficiently for all schemes included the large areas of coverage provided by surface treatment programme. We developed this improvement in conjunction with United Utilities and whilst this is a single example it is a good illustration of our flexible approach and use of collaborative working.
Our Achievement

We estimate that we have achieved year on year savings as shown in the table below (assuming a simplistic average);

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Estimated Year on Year Efficiency Savings (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since 2011, we can demonstrate significant success in terms of outcomes delivered through our highway maintenance programmes and asset management strategies. The following network condition maps show the improvement we have achieved in the condition of our asset over the last few years. This illustrates that whilst we have focused aggressively on driving down cost, we have done this whilst delivering improved outcomes. This is a trend we are confident we will maintain through a continued investment in innovation and improvement.
Section D2

Is your authority exploring or has it already joined with neighbouring local highway authorities or a Highways Maintenance Alliance to achieve economies of scale?

Section D2 – Response

Greater Manchester has consistently placed connectivity and transport at the heart of our economic strategy, with a clear understanding of the role of effective and reliable transport networks in connecting businesses with their supply chains, their customers and their labour markets. Our network of 9,000km local highways and 200km Highways Agency routes faces a particularly complex array of challenges in managing the local, commuter and strategic demands in supporting growth, and we believe that effective management and maintenance is critical to the achievement of that growth. This is reflected in the initial highways coordination functions that were granted to TfGM in 2011, through the establishment of GMCA, and the encouragement of initial collaborative models, which have been established since then, to deliver both service improvement and efficiency savings.

A review has been underway since late 2013 to build on these transport governance and delivery arrangements and establish optimal models of devolution that secure the efficiency benefits of service delivery at scale, whilst retaining a local highways provision that is responsive and accountable to local communities. The review, overseen by a panel of GM Leaders and Chief Executives, will provide a new level of integration across the ten local highways authorities and Highways Agency to secure economies of scale where possible and ensure that priorities are addressed at a strategic economy-wide level. In terms of highway maintenance, the key outcomes will be to develop a delivery model that will:

- meet the challenges of maintenance funding limitations and a growing highways asset maintenance backlog, which threatens to undermine the long-term reliability of the GM network; and
- consistently target maintenance investment on strong asset management to support the long-term economic viability of the city-region.

While we are still in the process of establishing an optimal delivery model, our existing co-operative arrangements ensure that each of the ten Highway Authorities have access to the broader expertise pool and a number of collaborative initiatives are in place within GM.

Oldham is represented on each of the sub-group Partnerships reporting into the Greater Manchester Transport Strategy Group and we actively participate in joint initiatives. The GM Authorities undertake numerous joint procurements for materials and services, examples of which are winter salt, forecasting, surveying, professional service frameworks and construction frameworks. Currently across GM we jointly procure:

- The Supply of Dense Bituminous Macadam (DBM) & Associated Works
- Civil Materials
- Procurement of work wear
- Highway Vehicles
- Salt Procurement is via ESPO
- Metoffice Weather forecasting
- Vaisala Bureau services
- Gritting Vehicles
In addition Oldham Council entered into Partnership with Rochdale Council to procure and Project Manage a Street Lighting Private Finance Initiative due to the age profile and poor condition of the street lighting assets. The Contract was awarded to The Community Lighting Partnership and its Operating subcontractor Eon on the 20th April and the Service Commenced on 4th July 2011.

This project will see 100% of the street lighting infrastructure replaced within the 25 year term and will provide a minimum residual life of the apparatus in excess of 5 years at the end of the Contract. The Service Provider is designing, installing and maintaining the assets including the management information system and inventory. Such a contract is specifically designed to provide investment and a scale of contract sufficient to drive high levels of efficiency.

Further examples are being sought and Oldham is leading on a number of initiatives such as the review of options for collaborative Structures and Bridges delivery and the joint procurement of a bridge management system. The Districts across Manchester all play their part in contributing to or leading the variety of collaborative work arrangements in place.

We are also actively assessing options for collaborative procurement of a wide range of services particularly through the HAMP Sub-groups, looking for efficiencies which will benefit wither all authorities or a cluster of authorities. At present Unity staff are seconded to Rochdale Borough Council providing engineering services to enhance their HMEP capabilities.
Section D3

Is your authority sharing its efficiency experience and/or case studies with other local highway authorities via the Highways Maintenance Efficiency Programme or other good practice networks?

Section 3 – Response

This is an area where Oldham has been particularly active over a number of years. We are keen to share our experience with other Local Authorities, both within the Greater Manchester area and beyond. We are also keen to promote best practice and to drive a collaborative working agenda.

Since entering into a Public/Private Joint venture with Mouchel in 2006, we are very much pro-active in seeking ways to improve services, leverage value and share experience across professional networks.

Oldham provides the nominated lead linkage between HMEP and the GM Authorities via the Greater Manchester Highway Asset Management Partnership and we have worked closely with Steve Kent and Matthew Lugg on a number of initiatives. We receive a great deal of assistance and support from the HMEP team and are an enthusiastic adopter of the toolkits and guidance documents.

Oldham is also the nominated lead authority for a pilot business case examining options for delivering bridges and structures services through collaborative working. A number of new delivery options are being considered and evaluated and all ten districts are currently involved.

We are also active within both the reform and growth groups formed to develop options and business cases in connection with the highways review referred to elsewhere.

We felt it would be useful to provide some highlights regarding our involvement in sharing knowledge and best practice to evidence how passionately we feel about the importance of this. We work extensively with our neighbours in Greater Manchester (GM), however we are also actively sharing knowledge and experience with Leeds City Council and Cheshire East and Chester County Council amongst others.

In May 2012 Oldham was proposing a consistent Asset management approach across GM, we lead on a short review of options alongside Tameside Council, presenting to the Transport Strategy Group on the findings. This early work, undertaken on behalf of the GM HAMP group lead on to further work on collaborative opportunities and provided learning and information to support the next steps in this area.

---

**GM Highways Asset Management Partnership**

**Strategic Asset Management across Greater Manchester**

**Our Challenge...**

Friday 11th May 2012

---

**Applying VM principles across Greater Manchester**

What will it look like?

- All Districts applying ‘GMVM’ process – consistency and transparency of data
- Underpins GM Asset Management Strategy – investment in Strategic Road Network in GM
- Allows targeting of areas of greatest need & greatest benefit
- Recognises all Districts have different baseline
In June 2012, Oldham hosted the ‘Future of Transport’ Conference and we presented a paper setting out our thoughts on the potential for collaborative working. In particular we were promoting the benefits of collaborative programme and project management.

We provided an update on our asset management approach at the IET Asset management Conference in November 2013. Our paper sets out our continued commitment to collaborative working, technical and non-technical partnership working and successful outcomes around network condition and improved efficiency.
Oldham hosted the first of the DfT Roadshows on 24th January and we presented a paper setting out the opportunities in GM together with some of the successes we have had locally.

In early March 2014, Oldham hosted a collaborative workshop for Greater Manchester Districts and TFGM. The day was facilitated by Towey Duffy and attended by Matthew Lugg on behalf of HMEP. During the meeting we discussed the future development of collaborative working across GM to help inform the successful delivery of new working models and move the agenda forward. Outputs from the day helped to form next steps on the Highway Review itself.
On 6th March Oldham presented at the APSE National Roads, St Lighting and Winter Maintenance Seminar, providing a case study of our asset management journey. In particular the paper focused on the importance of valuation and strong underlying asset data.

The above papers represent snap shots of our journey in improving the way we work, how we plan and prioritise our asset management. Presence at these industry events has provided significant opportunity for us to network and knowledge share. They have been developed alongside our on-going asset management strategy development and have been shared with HMEP at a senior level. We are keen to take part in and contribute to knowledge sharing events and to both take and receive learning from situations.

We are also very pleased to have been chosen to take part in a project being undertaken by the HTMA titled ’Invest to save’. The project will examine the impact of early intervention in highway maintenance, the findings of which will help inform future strategies around ways to fund transport and the benefits of investment. We are very keen to be involved in this type of initiative, adding to the general debate and development of the industry and look forward to the findings.

In addition to the above, we work extensively with other authorities across the UK, our engineers and managers have held discussions and/or provided support to a number of UK Local Authorities including Leeds City Council, Knowsley Metropolitan Borough Council, Kirklees Council, Tameside Borough Council and Rochdale Borough Council. This has by no means been a one way arrangement and we are happy to be able to report learning and knowledge sharing for both respective organisations.
Appendix E – Other

Supporting information for Sections E1 and E2
Section E1

Please provide details on which of the following good practice activities your authority is undertaking for its highways management activities.

Section E1 – Response

As explained elsewhere in this document, Oldham Council has and continues to invest directly in its highways network through invest to save initiatives by virtue of prudential borrowing.

In summary this includes a £10m Highways Investment Programme, completed over a 4 year period; an on-going £2m Gateways & Corridors Programme; the commencement of a Secondary Corridor Plan which will provide up to £2m of additional investment over the next two years; and a Town Centre Regeneration programme of £2.2m.

The efficiency and effectiveness of initiatives has been optimised over the last two or three years using a wide variety of techniques such as the adoption of HMEP toolkits. The works themselves are being implemented utilising more efficient office and site based workforces achieved through strategic reorganisations and flexible collaboration. We are pro-actively seeking innovative materials and/or techniques, many including the use of more efficient methods e.g. the jet patcher as an appropriate solution or part solution prior to Microasphalt.

It is considered that the current highly effective delivery of these completely integrated programmes, defined and managed using the asset management HMEP based principles of “prevention is better than cure”, also satisfying local corporate, political and regenerative objectives, are contributing very positively to the infrastructure of Oldham and helping contribute to the regeneration of the borough of Oldham.

Oldham Council collaborates on many fronts and in many ways across its local boundaries within Greater Manchester and beyond across the country, both through its local authority contacts and via the judicious use of appropriate specialist effective expertise including through Unity Partnership and Mouchel, as is beneficial to its efficient highways delivery. This is discussed in significant detail within this submission and includes Oldham being a key member of many collaborative groups across GM, and being at the forefront of current collaborative GM pilot initiatives.

Oldham also is involved throughout the country including being the nominated key linkage between HMEP and the GM authorities, and involved directly with collaboration directly with other authorities beyond GM for example Leeds City Council.

As we hope this paper demonstrates, we are pro-actively seeking new ways of working and continue to invest in our network, particularly where this can be seen to directly contribute to our local economy and the well-being of our communities. We look forward to further refining our approach in collaboration with members of the local government community across the UK.
Section E2 – Part 1

Do you consider your authority to be an exemplar authority in tackling potholes and undertaking highway maintenance?

Section E2 – Part 1 – Response

We consider ourselves to be extremely pro-active in our approach to the management and improvement of services, including Highway Maintenance. The Council leadership are extremely supportive and are open in their positive view of the Highways Service.

We have set our strategy and Policy firmly in line with the Council's strategic aims connected with regeneration and strong communities. By doing so we have a focus that has helped drive improvement in value for money and a culture of innovation and change.

We are very keen to partner with other technical organisations and our neighbouring authorities as well as other Local Authorities across the UK and can evidence this as set out elsewhere in this document. We see this level of collaboration being critical in future success.

We consciously chose an approach that sets at its heart the strategic Council outcomes and have aligned our asset management strategies against this.

Our approach to delivering efficiency has fully embraced the HMEP principles and we were an enthusiastic early adopter of the toolkits and other guidance advice, building close relationships with the advocates and their networks. We see the value in this process and wish it to continue.

Our active participation in industry events and presentation of numerous papers setting out our case study is another clear indication of the confidence in our approach and ability and, of course, our willingness to share learning and knowledge. This has paid significant dividends by increasing our professional networks.

In addition, we actively participate in the Greater Manchester community and are supporters and contributors to the groups driving the strategic Highways review. We are keen to see new operating models being implemented and feel that Oldham can play a significant part in that going forward.

For the above reasons and as set out throughout this paper, we do consider ourselves as an exemplar authority in this area but we remain open to learning and knowledge from elsewhere.

Section E2 – Part 2

If yes, would your authority be willing to share its experiences more widely with other authorities / organisations?

Section E2 – Part 2 – Response

In our view, there are significant benefits which we see the value of sharing to the widest community possible. We have already shared our experiences locally, nationally and internationally and would welcome any opportunity to enable us to share our experiences further.