

Transport Asset Management Plan

Phase 2 April 2020 – March 2025

www.lancashire.gov.uk



Contents

Section	Description	Page
	Executive Summary	3
1	Introduction	4
2	Challenges and Changes in Phase 2	5
3	Changes in Demand	7
4	Customer Feedback	7
5	Performance Management	8
6	Funding Phase 2	8
7	What Will Phase 2 Look Like?	9
8	Service Standards	9
9	How Will We Deal with Additional Funds?	9
10	Reporting Progress	9
	Appendix 1 – Generic Service Standards	11
	Appendix 2 – Indicative Funding Levels 2020/21 and 2021/22	20
	Appendix 3 – Additional Funding	22
	Appendix 4 – Phase 2 Service Standards by Asset Type	24
	Appendix 5 – Methodology to Workout Overall Asset Condition	26

Transport Asset Management Plan – Phase Two Review

Executive Summary

The Transport Asset Management Plan (TAMP) was approved by the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport on 10 June 2014 and identified the key strategic priorities of the county council, as the highway authority for Lancashire, during the period 2015/16 to 2029/30.

The TAMP recognised that due to ongoing financial constraints the county council could no longer simultaneously maintain all its transport assets to the same standard as previously.

In order to address this, we needed to change how we maintained our transport assets. We moved away from the philosophy of tackling 'worst first' in favour of an approach whereby the underlying condition of the network was addressed via the use of early intervention preventative maintenance strategies, as we believed this would enable us to make more efficient use of our resources

This approach has seen improvements in the condition of both the assets (A, B & C roads and footway) that were the focus of our attention during Phase 1. Our A, B & C roads are now in a better condition than they were in 2009. At the same time, we have been able to maintain most other assets in a similar condition to what they were in 2015.

We undertook a review of Phase 1 and used this to update our approach to Phase 2, which Cabinet approved at their December 2020 meeting. The main focus of Phase 2 will be to maintain the A, B, C road condition, and also improve the urban and rural unclassified road networks and footways, whilst managing the other asset types within a level of acceptable risk.

This document:

1. outlines the current challenge and changes that have shaped the review of the original TAMP proposals and led to the proposals for TAMP phase 2
2. defines our approach to assessing funding need through Lifecycle Planning, informed by monitoring performance
3. indicates our commitment to maintaining performance through benchmarking with other authorities and considering customer feedback
4. gives a commitment to incorporate more performance management reporting as part of the annual review process
5. outlines the approach to the management of risk
6. outlines the service standards by which we will monitor our performance
7. gives an undertaking to continue to be transparent in everything we do so we can be held responsible for our stewardship of the highway and transport assets covered by the TAMP.

1. Introduction

The information below provides a brief resume of the key points of the Transport Asset Management Plan (TAMP) 2015-2030.

The TAMP was approved by the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport on 10 June 2014 and identified the key strategic priorities of the county council, as the highway authority for Lancashire, during the period 2015/16 to 2029/30.

The TAMP recognised that due to ongoing financial constraints the county council could no longer simultaneously maintain all its transport assets to the same standard as previously.

A fundamental principle of the TAMP was to move away from the philosophy of tackling 'worst first' in favour of an approach whereby the underlying condition of the network was addressed via the use of early intervention preventative maintenance strategies as we believed this would enable us to make more efficient use of our resources.

The TAMP adopted a flexible approach to addressing maintenance backlogs and three separate five-year delivery programmes were identified to address the following priorities,

Phase 1, to run from April 2015 until March 2020. Works to be targeted at improving our A, B and C roads and our footway networks. Phase 2, to run from April 2020 until March 2025. Works to be targeted at improving the Unclassified Rural and the

Unclassified Urban networks. Phase 3, to run from April 2025 until March 2030. Works to be targeted at improving our structures and street lighting assets.

Service Standards

In order that we could review and report our progress we devised a set of service standards which are specific to us. Setting service standards has enabled us to -

- support planned maintenance of the network
- achieve a reduction in maintenance backlogs
- reduce the year on year investment required to deal with natural annual deterioration of the asset
- make best use of available resources
- ensure transparency and accountability
- ensure that similar assets are maintained to the same standard across each district area

Challenging targets were set for each asset group and the initial TAMP set targets for the end of each phase and at the end of the 15 year TAMP investment period. These targets are reviewed on an annual basis.

At the end of each year we publish a refresh document which details how we have performed together with details of the changes we have faced. This information can be viewed [here](#).

2. Challenges and Changes in Phase 2

As a result of reviewing progress over the past 5 years together with using our improved asset management knowledge and better condition data we have been able to challenge some of the original assumptions made in TAMP Phase 1 as outlined below: -

- At the start of Phase 1 we set a demanding end of phase target and an initial interim target for our A, B & C roads. The interim target was used to address condition disparities across this asset group in Lancashire. Once the condition of these roads had been 'evened up', further interim targets were set with the aim of 'incrementally' reaching the demanding end of phase targets. Lifecycle modelling now suggests that the end of phase standards for the A, B & C roads were too stringent particularly as SCANNER can define naturally undulating roads as requiring unnecessary attention and this was a significant factor in this asset grouping not meeting the service standards set for the end of phase 1.
- Since 2014, more performance data is available through the Association for Public Service Excellence (APSE) network. This has shown that had we achieved some of these targets we would have exceeded the performance of some top quartile authorities. The use of the APSE performance data has enabled us to set more realistic and achievable service standards for Phase 2.
- Lifecycle modelling also suggests the investment in Phase 2 should be higher than initially expected for the A, B & C road networks in order that their condition can be improved and maintained to a condition whereby going forward it will be easier to maintain them in a better condition than otherwise would be the case.
- Lifecycle modelling based on the video survey data suggests that the rural unclassified network requires less investment than the 2014 TAMP suggested. This survey work also suggests that the urban unclassified (i.e. residential estates etc) network requires an investment similar to that anticipated in the 2014 TAMP for the first two years, but requires substantial investment in years 3 to 5 in order that they can be brought up to a standard where, going forward, it will be easier to maintain them in a better condition than otherwise would be the case.
- The rural and urban unclassified road networks have been video surveyed and the results analysed. We are currently working with benchmarking partners and the Department for Transport with regards which attributes that ought to be included in the road condition calculation. Once there is a consensus, we will be able to determine a service standard that is directly comparable with other highway authorities who use this survey methodology.
- Moss Roads require a consistent investment in Phase 2 (and part of Phase 3) in order that they can be brought up to a standard where, going forward, it will be easier to maintain them in a better condition than otherwise would be the case. The approved Moss Road Strategy will be used to guide future investment decisions.

- Expenditure on structural defects over the last few years has been in the region of £8m with an additional £1m spent on spray injection patching. Increased investment in the highway network as outlined above should reduce need for this activity by the end of Phase 2.
- The average condition of our bridge stock has remained steady over Phase 1. Work has been undertaken to establish a mechanism whereby the bridge stock condition we report in future better reflects our priorities as set out in the Structures Lifecycle Plan.
- The current TAMP allocation for bridges and similar structures did not provide sufficient funding for Principle Bridge Inspections or other risk-based assessments such as scour assessments etc. The Authority is substantially at risk if these condition inspections are not undertaken and a bridge failure occurs. TAMP Phase 2 allocations now allows for more comprehensive inspections and assessments.
- As the rate of street lighting renewal has not kept up the rate of decay, many columns have remained in use long after their recommended service life has passed, resulting in a backlog of aging columns. The street lighting service standard has been changed in Phase 2 so that it better reflects this increasing backlog.
- As our increasing lighting column stock continues to age, it is essential that the county council continues to proactively test our columns so we can safely extend their recommended service life. TAMP Phase 2 allocations now allow for more structural inspections.

- It has become evident that the TAMP provision for our traffic signal assets was inadequate in Phase 1 as 62% of signals and 68% of pedestrian crossings have exceeded national guidelines with regards replacement ages. Steps have now been taken to address this in Phase 2. Funding has been increased and a new service standard has been devised so that we are better able to identify our signal priorities over the next 5 years.

It has also become apparent over the last couple of years that some assets have had no capital allocation through the TAMP funding mechanism and there is no provision for other maintenance requirements, such as renewal for weather stations. In order to address these concerns, it is proposed to provide capital funding for: -

- Vehicle Restraint Barriers – expenditure to be in accordance with the risk-based approach included in the approved Vehicle Restraint System Code of Practice. [Codes of practice - Lancashire County Council](#)
- Safety Cameras - previously no capital budget in the TAMP
- Unpredicted asset failures or issues - experience has shown there is a need to for funding to deal with unpredicted asset failures such as road slips, slope movement, cattle grid replacement and 'fatting' of roads due to high summer temperatures etc.
- Planned additional maintenance of ad-hoc or other highway assets that has not had budget provision but recent experience

shows a need for example replacement of weather station equipment and trash screens.

We have adopted a risk-based approach to our decision making in line with the 'Well Management Highways Code of Practice'. In future, decisions will be based on risk, supported by comprehensive condition data, performance management information and appropriate lifecycle planning information. In 2021/22 we intend to carry out a risk review to inform the funding strategies going forwards. A summary of which will be reported in the 2021/22 TAMP Refresh.

3. Changes in Demand

There continues to be an increase in demand from customers and stakeholders for service improvements. Due to reductions in DfT funding, a real challenge for the authority is to be innovative with regards how assets are maintained and to drive efficiencies through all parts of the service, so that we are able to do more with less.

This is becoming more important particularly as the asset base continues to grow as new roads and bridges are constructed and new traffic signals and lighting columns are erected.

It is unlikely that future maintenance resources will be sufficient to manage the increased demands from an ever-expanding asset stock. Therefore, our objective should be to attempt to maintain our overall asset levels as close as is practical to 2019 levels by

identifying opportunities to remove or rationalise existing assets as and when new assets are added to the network. When we install new assets we should be looking at options that require less maintenance and have reduced 'whole life costs' through incorporating new material and treatment technologies into our design specifications so that these new assets have the lowest possible lifecycle costs

4. Customer Feedback

Since 2015 the county council has taken part in the annual National Highways & Transport Network (NHT) survey which collects the public's views on different aspects of highway and transport assets / services.

Responses to the survey are compiled into Key Benchmark Indicators (KBIs) and Benchmark Indicators (BIs) for each Authority, most of which measure satisfaction. There are also a range of Key Quality Indicators (KQIs) and Quality Indicators (QIs) which cover the non-satisfaction related questions in the survey, measuring ease of access to services, levels of provision and how well informed the public feel

Subscription to this allows us to find out about people's priorities and so we can consider any changes we could make to where investment is prioritised, and the way we work, to provide a service which better meets people's needs and expectations.

We also compare our results with those of other councils of similar size and geography to Lancashire in order to identify any areas of work where we could learn from others in order to improve our service.

We will include details of annual NHT feedback, or links to relevant information in future TAMP Refresh documents. We will look at the survey results and incorporate any changes we consider appropriate into service delivery/service standards.

5. Performance Management

Whilst the TAMP contains information about service standards and there is an annual reporting framework in place, to monitor progress, we intend to incorporate more performance management reporting into this process as this enables us to monitor more closely how our assets are performing and enable us to intervene quickly.

We have for many years been monitoring performance of the 'pothole repairs' and 'street lighting defects' KPI's which has brought about a real understanding of our systems and procedures and has led to greater efficiencies and improvements in the way we do things. This has not only benefited the county council but also service users through improved performance.

It's important that we build on this and carry this forward into TAMP phase 2 by expanding the number of indicators we monitor and report on. This will encourage us to be innovative with regards

how assets are maintained and drive efficiencies through all parts of the service.

Key performance indicators are reported to the Cabinet Committee on Performance Improvement and a separate Performance Management Framework has been developed for regular monitoring.

6. Funding Phase 2

The original TAMP capital allocations were designed to meet the expected DfT grant settlement of £25m per annum. Actual Maintenance Block and Incentive Fund allocations fell short of this in Phase 1 and are expected to continue to do so in Phase 2. We will endeavour to protect the funding requirements for those assets that are our priority in Phase 2 but depending on the extent of future shortfall this cannot be guaranteed.

Using lifecycle planning, our current estimate of the capital required in Phase 2 to improve our assets in line with the TAMP approach and then maintain them at a good standard is between £75.5m and £65.5m per annum, which is substantially more than is currently or ever likely to be available.

In order that we can do more with less, two funding levels are proposed which take risk into account in line with the 'Well-Managed highway Infrastructure: A Code of Practice'.

Two levels of funding for 'acceptable risk' have been defined that require additional borrowing of between £9.8m and £17.5m. In addition to these, funds will be required for Structural Defects (£6m extra).

We had hoped to be able to provide Indicative funding levels for the next 5-years. Due to funding uncertainty we are only able to provide indicative funding levels for 2021/22 and 2022/23 currently. This information is provided in Appendix 2 and future years funding levels will be refreshed annually.

7. What will Phase 2 look like?

Whilst our main focus of Phase 2 will be rural and urban unclassified road network, greater emphasis will be given in the early years of this phase to the A.B & C road networks.

Funding will also be made available each year for the following: -

- Traffic signal assets
- Moss roads
- Drainage
- Vehicle restraint systems
- Safety cameras
- Unpredicted asset failures or issues
- Planned additional ad-hoc maintenance issues

Details of our proposed allocations are set out in Appendix 2. There is currently no indication of funding levels from the

Department for Transport beyond 2021/22. If the overall funding received plus additional fund made available from Cabinet is less than the minimum 'Balanced Budget TAMP' (Appendix 2) a further paper will be provided to Cabinet setting out the proposed revised priorities and apportionments for that year. Overall funding levels between 'Balanced Budget TAMP' and the 'Capital Strategy: Acceptable Risk Managed' will be apportioned in line with Appendix 3.

8. What about our Phase 3 assets?

Phase 3 assets (structures and street lighting) will continue to be funded in Phase 2 at the same level as set out in Phase 1. However in order to support this funding, we intended to carry out a range of risk based inspections principle bridge inspection, scour assessments, column testing etc., in order that we can detect and act upon problems at an early stage so as to avoid catastrophic failures across these asset groups.

9. Service Standards

The Service Standards for Phase 2 are set out at Appendix 4 and includes the condition at the start of phase 2 and our targets for the end of phase 2 in March 2025.

10. Reporting progress

We propose to continue calculating an overall asset score and providing annual TAMP refresh documents showing all the same information as previous years.

Whilst we are no longer required to calculate Whole of Government Account (WGA) information we use the last official WGA values of our assets in 2018-19 during Phase 2 in order that we can maintain a consistent approach to calculating our overall progress. The methodology we use is set out in Appendix 5.

In line with Phase 1 reporting, we will continue in Phase 2 to report our end of year progress on an asset by asset basis also. Such information and will contain a summary of the condition of each of the asset groups covered by the TAMP together with key bullet points which seek to outline briefly the key facts relating to the category of the asset.

Generic Service Standards

Service Standard	Description of Level of Service
EXCELLENT	Definition A level of service that is well above statutory needs and the requirements detailed in national codes of practice. Service delivery aimed at maintaining the asset to a high standard. The risks and consequences associated with providing this service level are summarised below: a) Legal • The authority complies with the requirements of the relevant codes of practice in all respects; any minor local derogations are documented and supported by a robust risk assessment; • We know what is required and how we deliver the requirements; • We further understand future needs and pressures and have a well-developed strategic plan for the next five years. b) Safety • Significant reduction in claims against LCC for personal injury and third party damage. • Safety defects are well defined with performance standards for rectification of those defects. • Systems are in place to ensure proper assessment prioritisation and rectification of defects or temporary arrangements to mitigate risk until a permanent repair is possible. • We have relevant information to support our delivery to required performance standards. • Performance standards are challenging and reviewed regularly. c) Availability • The asset is available for normal reasonable use. d) Condition • The condition of the asset is improving strongly with asset value increasing.

	• It is increasingly possible to flexibly assign resources to selected programmes each year as the relative deterioration is marginal year on year. e) Asset Value • The investment required to bring the asset to an as new condition is reducing. • High costs in the short term as intervention measures are used to improve asset condition – results in lowest whole life costs. f) Public Perception • Generally public perception of the condition of the strategic and residential road network would be expected to be positive however the response to the few defects remaining will be disproportionate as expectations will steadily increase. • The majority of the asset improvements will be less visible and the general public and members would not be expected to notice improved drainage, improving lighting column condition or improving bridge condition. g) Service Delivery • The principle service delivery is focused on preventative maintenance at the optimal time in an assets lifecycle which will effectively reduce the average cost per scheme, particularly in respect of roads, and in turn fuel more rapidly improving condition. • Operating at a sustainable level using sustainable methods.
GOOD	Definition A level of service that is above statutory needs and the requirements detailed in national codes of practice. The risks and consequences associated with providing this service level are summarised below: a) Legal • The authority generally exceeds the requirements of the relevant codes of practice in key respects; any derogation is minor and defensible, documented, and supported by a robust risk assessment.

- We know what is required and how we deliver the requirements;
 - We are able to defend legal claims robustly and develop a strong due diligence defence.
- b) Safety**
- Safety defects are well defined with performance standards for rectification of those defects.
 - Systems are in place to ensure proper assessment prioritisation and rectification of defects or temporary arrangements to mitigate risk until a permanent repair is possible.
 - We have supporting information to ensure our delivery to required performance standards.
 - Should see a reduction in numbers of third party claims against LCC for personal injury and third party damage.
- c) Availability**
- The vast majority of the asset is available for normal reasonable use.
- d) Condition**
- The condition of the asset has been stabilised, but significant improvements will take time It is assumed that the rate of deterioration is minimal.
- e) Asset Value**
- The asset value is maintained as far as is reasonably practical.
 - Relatively high costs in the short term as intervention measures are used to improve asset condition – results in lower whole life costs.
- f) Public Perception**
- It is likely that public perception is still focused on the defects present and that it will take significant time before any improvement in perception of the asset is noted.
- g) Service Delivery**
- A mixture of preventative and reactive service delivery models will be used as the backlog of maintenance issues will only be reduced slowly if at all.

	Increased capital budget enables preventative maintenance to be carried out. Such works are directed at intervening at the right point to restore the asset to an appropriate condition at minimum cost.
FAIR	Definition A level of service that generally meets statutory needs and the requirements detailed in national codes of practice. The risks and consequences associated with providing this service level are summarised below: a) Legal - The authority complies with the requirements of the relevant codes of practice in all respects and a robust risk assessment exists, except where it chooses not to carry one out. In all such instances any derogation is documented and supported by a robust risk assessment. - We know what is required and how we deliver the requirements. - The legal exposure of the authority is reasonably controlled and robust systems are in place to provide supporting evidence of compliance with the code of practice. b) Safety - Safety defects are well defined with performance standards for rectification of those defects. - Systems are in place to ensure proper assessment prioritisation and rectification of defects or temporary arrangements to mitigate risk until a permanent repair is possible. - We have relevant information to support our delivery to required performance standards. We are proactive in the identification and rectification of those defects. - In all cases except where the asset condition was formerly GOOD or EXCELLENT it is unlikely to result in an increase in the risks associated with safety or legal deficits. c) Availability - The majority of the asset is available for normal reasonable use. - Restrictions of the asset are largely planned maintenance activities rather than emergency repairs with the exception of emergency utility repairs.

	d) Condition • The condition of the asset is stabilised or with minor deterioration. • It is assumed that the rate of deterioration is under 10%. e) Asset Value • The asset value is likely to be depreciating as a result of other external factors rather than under investment. f) Public Perception • It is likely that public opinion does not reflect the condition of the asset and the presence of any defects at all would be considered by members of the public to indicate that the asset was in poor condition. g) Service Delivery • A mixture of preventative maintenance undertaken at the optimal time and reactive maintenance will be delivered although it is possible that outside pressure focuses some investment in areas which do not serve to improve the condition of the asset. • The backlog of maintenance needs will probably be growing but at a reduced rate, due to any severe weather events and the reduction of our ability to focus on technically driven programmes.
ACCEPTABLE	Definition The minimum level of service to meet most statutory requirements and compliance with minimum requirements detailed in national codes of practice. The risks and consequences associated with providing this service level are summarised below: a) Legal • The authority complies with the requirements of the relevant codes of practice in all key respects; any derogation is documented and supported by a robust risk assessment. • We know what is required and how we deliver the requirements.

b) Safety

- High reliance on Safety Inspection regime to identify defects.
- In all cases **except** where the asset condition was formerly GOOD or EXCELLENT it is likely to result in an increase in the risks associated with safety or legal deficits.
- Safety defects are well defined with performance standards for rectification of those defects. Systems are in place to ensure proper assessment prioritisation and rectification of defects or temporary arrangements to mitigate risk until a permanent repair is possible.
- We have relevant information to support our delivery to required performance standards.

c) Availability

- The majority of the asset is available for normal reasonable use.

d) Condition

- The condition of the asset is deteriorating but at a reduced rate compared to POOR standard.
- It is assumed that the rate of deterioration over under investment is of the order of 30% i.e. £10m underinvestment results in £13m of deterioration.

e) Asset Value

- The asset value is likely to be depreciating as a result of minimum investment.

f) Public Perception

- Likely to be well aware that the asset is deteriorating and is becoming less available, safe or fit for purpose.
- Members in particular will be facing pressure for improvement and will seek to react to local pressures potentially diluting the impact on overall asset condition.
- Complaints and claims would be expected to be high. It is highly likely that members or the public would easily distinguish between POOR and ACCEPTABLE standards in their localities.

	g) Service Delivery • The principle focus is likely to be reactive maintenance rather than preventative works undertaken at the optimal time. • It will not be possible to address all issues rapidly and a prioritisation of service demands will be required. • An increasing backlog of maintenance needs will exacerbate the service problems and lead to a further chain reaction of deterioration. • Depreciation in the asset value would be expected to exceed the under investment required to achieve a FAIR standard. • It would be expected that initially deterioration would outstrip underinvestment by 30% with that proportion tending to increase year on year.
POOR	Definition Service delivery that is considered to fall below the minimum standard deemed necessary to maintain the asset in a safe manner. As a result, only those essential and critical repairs that are affordable are undertaken. The risks and consequences associated with providing this service level are summarised below: a) Legal • Unable to ensure that we carry out all those duties that are incumbent on the authority through law, statutory duties or mandatory requirements. • Insufficient allocation to carry out works to recommendations contained in relevant codes of practice for which there is no approved derogation. • Authority is more exposed to legal action up to and including corporate manslaughter. • Degree of risk may be mitigated by a robust risk assessment which describes the reasons for deviation from the code of practice. b) Safety • In all cases except where the asset condition was formerly GOOD or EXCELLENT it is likely to result in a significant increase in the risks associated with safety or legal deficits.

- Risks associated with the asset may be increased with attendant risks of legal exposure.
 - Likely to result in a significant increase in third party claims against LCC for personal injury and third-party damage.
 - Heavy reliance on Safety Inspection regime to identify defects.
- c) Availability**
- Availability of entire network cannot be guaranteed.
 - Poor asset condition means parts of the asset may be withdrawn on a temporary or permanent basis to reduce the safety and legal exposure of the authority.
 - As no programmed maintenance work is undertaken assets may be withdrawn from service for some time.
- d) Condition**
- Condition of the asset will quickly deteriorate as investment is not keeping pace with the maintenance requirements. This standard is not sustainable over the long term.
 - It is assumed that the rate of deterioration exceeds the under investment required to maintain condition by a factor of at least 50% i.e. investment £10m less than required means a depreciation of £15m in asset value.
- e) Asset Value**
- Asset value is likely to be depreciating more rapidly as a result of minimal investment.
 - Maintenance heavily reliant on reactive activities which result in unpredictable financial management and highest whole life costs.
 - The cost of investment needed to return the stock to the minimum standard is growing rapidly and exceeds the resources available.
- f) Public Perception**
- Likely to be well aware that the asset is deteriorating and is becoming less available, safe or fit for purpose.
 - Members in particular will be facing pressure for improvement and will seek to react to local pressures potentially diluting the impact on overall asset condition.
 - Complaints and claims would be expected to be high.

g) Service Delivery

- The principle focus is likely to be reactive maintenance with minimum or no preventative maintenance intervention to prevent asset deterioration.
- It will not be possible to address all issues rapidly and a prioritisation of service demands will be required.
- It is likely that increasing portions of the asset are removed from service and that the trend accelerates with time as the asset ages.
- An increasing backlog of maintenance issues will exacerbate the service problems and lead to a further chain reaction of deterioration.
- Depreciation in the asset value would be expected to exceed the under investment required to achieve a FAIR standard. It would be expected that initially deterioration would outstrip underinvestment by 50% with that proportion tending to increase year on year.

Indicative Funding Levels 2020/21 and 2021/22

**Apportionment of Department for Transport (DfT)
Highway Maintenance Funding – Year 1 (2020/21)**

Programme	DfT Maintenance Needs Grant	DfT Incentive Fund Band 2*	DfT Incentive Fund Band 3*	Total (Assuming Band 3)
A, B & C Roads	£4,500,062		£400,148	£4,900,210
Urban Unclassified	£3,734,000		£307,585	£4,041,585
Rural Unclassified	£989,938			£989,938
Footways	£720,000		£62,970	£782,970
Moss Roads	£750,000			£750,000
Drainage	£440,000	£60,000	£60,000	£500,000
Street Lighting	£1,000,000			£1,000,000
Traffic Signals	£100,000		£200,000	£300,000
Bridges & Structures	£2,400,000	£600,000	£600,000	£3,000,000
Structural Defects	£2,000,000			£2,000,000
Safety Camera Maintenance	£30,000		£20,000	£50,000
Geotech / Surveys	£80,000	£9,400	£20,000	£100,00
Surveys & Coring for Capital Programme	£600,000	£75,000	£150,000	£750,000
Future Design/Site Investigations	£0		£299,297	£299,297
Planned Additional Maintenance	£283,000	£115,600	£400,000	£683,000
Structures: Principal Bridge Inspections	£300,000		£300,000	£600,000
Structures: Risk Based Assessments	£215,000		£100,00	£315,000
Street Lighting: Risk Based Assessments and Column Replacements	£250,000		£250,000	£500,000
Vehicle Restraint Barriers: Risk Based Assessments	£175,000		£144,000	£319,000
Derby Street Bridge	£0	£300,000	£553,000	£553,000
Total	£18,567,000	£1,160,000	£3,867,000	£22,434,000

*we will receive the Maintenance Needs Grant plus EITHER Band 2 OR Band 3 Funding – not the Maintenance Needs Grant and Band 2 and Band 3.

**Proposed Apportionment of Indicative Department for Transport (DfT)
Highway Maintenance Funding for Year 2 (2021/22) – Year 5 (2024/25)**

Programme	2014 Outline Capital Allocations- TAMP Phase 1	2021/22 – 2024/25 Basic TAMP Requirement	2021/22 – 2024/25 Capital Strategy: Acceptable Risk Managed	2021/22 – 2024/25 Balanced Budget TAMP
Non-Core TAMP				
Risk Based Condition Assessments				
Structures: Principle Bridge Inspections		£600,000	£900,000	£579,420
Structures: Risk Based Assessments		£315,000	£350,000	£304,196
Street Lighting: Risk Based Inspections & Column Replacements		£500,000	£750,000	£482,850
Vehicle Restraint Barriers		£350,000	£400,000	£337,995
Planned Maintenance:				
Preventative (Jet patching)			£500,000	£500,000
Moss Roads	£700,000	£750,000	£750,000	£724,275
Safety Camera Maintenance		£50,000	£50,000	£48,285
Planned additional maintenance of ad-hoc or other highway assets		£990,000	£990,000	£640,000
Commitments				
Safer Roads Resurfacing Contribution 2021/22		£230,000	£230,000	£230,000
Non-Core Sub Total	£700,000	£3,785,000	£4,570,000	£3,847,021
Core TAMP				
A, B & C Roads	£3,000,000	£4,500,000	£9,700,000	£4,145,475
Rural Unclassified	£5,500,000	£1,750,000	£2,591,000	£1,602,475
Urban Unclassified	£5,500,000	£3,750,000	£6,400,000	£3,433,875
Footways	£1,000,000	£1,000,000	£2,000,000	£965,700
Surveys & Coring for Capital Programme	£0	£750,000	£750,000	£724,275
Street Lighting	£2,000,000	£1,000,000	£1,000,000	£965,700
Bridges & Structures	£3,000,000	£3,500,000	£3,500,000	£3,379,950
Drainage	£2,000,000	£500,000	£1,000,000	£482,850
Retaining Walls	£500,000	£0	£0	£0
Future Design / Site Investigations	£0	£300,000	£300,000	£289,710
Structural Defects	£1,500,000	£2,000,000	£2,000,000	£1,931,400
Traffic Signals	£300,000	£1,225,000	£2,400,000	£600,000
Geotech / Surveys		£100,000	£100,000	£96,570
Core TAMP Sub Total	£25,000,000	£20,375,000	£31,741,000	£18,617,980
Summary Totals by Programme				
Non – Core TAMP		£3,785,000	£4,570,000	£3,847,021
Core TAMP		£20,375,000	£31,741,000	£18,617,980
Total		£24,160,000	£36,311,000	£22,465,000
Anticipated Total Grant		£22,465,000	£22,465,000	£22,465,000
Funding Gap		£1,695,500	£13,846,600	£0

Additional Funding

Should additional funds be made available during the life of Phase 2 this appendix sets out how this additional money should be allocated.

Priority 1

Additional funding should be directed towards the rural and urban unclassified road network in order that we can complete all necessary works relating to this asset grouping at the earliest opportunity and to the A, B C road network in order that we can help maintain its condition and prevent future deterioration.

Priority 2

Any additional funding should also be directed towards the street lighting and traffic signal assets. Both assets have experienced significant underfunding for many years which is reflected in the growing maintenance backlogs. Where funding is provided this should be directed towards asset replacement works.

Priority 3

Should any monies remain unallocated as a result of satisfying priorities 1 and 2, this should be directed towards the bridges and similar structures asset group to either carry out additional preventative risk-based surveys or other works as required.

Should any monies remain unallocated as a result of satisfying priorities 1, 2 & 3, any remaining funds to be allocated by the Director of Strategy and Performance (or their successor) in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport for TAMP related activities.

Phase Two – Service Standards by Asset Type

The tables below set out the end of TAMP Phase 2 Service Standards covering the period 2020/21 to 2024/25 together with the March 2020 baseline condition data, for all assets covered by the TAMP.

A, B, C Road Standards 2020/21 – 2024/25

Asset Category	Condition Measure (SCANNER)	LCC Service Standards: Based on APSE\DMG 19/20 Shire Council Benchmarking data					Asset Condition		
		POOR (Quartile 4)	ACCEPTABLE (Quartile 3)	FAIR (Quartile 2)	GOOD (Quartile 1)	EXCELLEN T (top 10 Percentile)	2019/20	2024/25 End Year 5 - Target	
							Base	Current Funding Levels	Capital Strategy: Acceptable Risk Managed Funding
A Roads	% RED	>4.32%	4.32% - 2.88%	2.88% -2.01%	2.01%– 1.53%	≤1.53%	2.1%	2.88% -2.01%	2.01%– 1.53%
	% AMBER	>35.72%	35.72% - 25.06%	25.06%- 20.47%	20.47% - 18.86%	≤18.86%	20.47%	25.06%- 20.47%	20.47% - 18.86%
B Roads	% RED	>6.04%	6.04% - 3.73%	3.73% - 2.19%	2.19% - 1.95%	≤1.95%	3.09%	3.73% - 2.19%	2.19% - 1.95%
	% AMBER	>31.90%	31.90% - 29.13%	29.13%- 22.73%	22.73% - 19.63%	≤19.63%	22.73%*	29.13%- 22.73%	22.73% -19.63%
C Roads	% RED	>6.02%	6.02% - 5.1%	5.1% - 3.54%	3.54% - 3.24%	≤3.24%	5.23%	6.02% - 5.1%	5.1% - 3.54%
	% AMBER	>32.78%	32.78% - 28.87%	28.87% - 24.92%	24.92% - 22.38%	≤22.38%	28.87%*	31.40% - 27.77%	28.87% - 24.92%

* The condition scores of these two assets are on the exact grade boundary between two service standards – hence why they have two colours associated with them

Structures Service Standards 2020/21 – 2024/25

Bridges Asset Category	Condition Measure	LCC Service Standard					Asset Condition	
		POOR	ACCEPTABLE	FAIR	GOOD	EXCELLENT	2019/20	2024/25 - End of TAMP Phase 2
		Structures National Guidance Service Standard					Base Condition (Score at end of TAMP Phase 1)	Current Funding
Planned Targeted	Bridge Condition Index (Critical)	VERY POOR	POOR	FAIR	GOOD	VERY GOOD	78.89	GOOD (80 ≤ – < 90)
Planned Preventative							80.59	FAIR (72 – 79)
Planned Do Minimum							83.01	FAIR (65 – 72)

Street Lighting Service Standard 2020/21 – 2024/25

Asset Category	Condition Measure	LCC Service Standards					Asset Condition			
		POOR	ACCEPTABLE	FAIR	GOOD	EXCELLENT	2019/20	2024/25 End Year 5 - Target		2029/30 End Phase 3 Target
							Base	Current Funding Levels	Capital Strategy: Acceptable Risk Managed Funding	Capital Strategy: Acceptable Risk Managed Funding
Street Lighting	No. of columns aged over 40 years old	>16,000	16,000 – 12,001	12,000 - 8,001	8,000 – 4,001	<4,000	13,639	>16,000	>16,000	12,000 -8,001

Traffic Signals Service Standards 2020/21 – 2024/25

Asset Category	Condition Measure	LCC Service Standards					Asset Condition			
		POOR	ACCEPTABLE	FAIR	GOOD	EXCELLENT	2019/20	2024/25 End Year 5 - Target		
							Base	Current Funding Levels (£600k)	Basic TAMP (£1.225m)	Capital Strategy: Risk Managed Funding (£2.4m)
Traffic Signals	No. of obsolete and vulnerable traffic signal sites*	>270	270 - 201	200 - 135	134 - 70	<70	337	313	289	241

Methodology to Workout Overall Asset Condition

The overall condition of the transport infrastructure asset has been determined by assigning scores to each service standards shown below: -

Scores per Service Standard				
POOR	ACCEPTABLE	FAIR	GOOD	EXCELLENT
1	2	3	4	5

A weighted score is produced by multiplying each service standard score from the table above by the asset valuation (as determined from the latest Whole of Government Accounts asset valuation from 2018-19), as show below:

Asset Group	2018-19 Valuation £ Million	Service Standard	Score	Weighted Score
A Roads	855	ACCEPTABLE	2	1,710
B Roads	504	ACCEPTABLE	2	1,008
C Roads	1,445	FAIR	3	4,335
Residential Unclassified Rods	3,703	POOR	1	3,703
Rural Unclassified Roads	1,161	POOR	1	1,161
Footway & Cycle ways	727	EXCELLENT	5	3,635
Bridges & Similar Structures	1,406	GOOD	4	5,624
Street Lighting	155	GOOD	4	620
Traffic Signals	19	POOR	1	19
Total	9,975			21,815
Weighted Average Score			=	2.17

Overall grade boundaries have been determined as follows: -

Overall Service Standard – Grade Boundaries				
POOR	ACCEPTABLE	FAIR	GOOD	EXCELLENT
1 to 1.9	2 to 2.9	3 to 3.9	4 to 4.9	5