

## WARDS AFFECTED All Wards

#### FORWARD TIMETABLE OF CONSULTATION AND MEETINGS

Cabinet Briefing
Overview and Scrutiny Management Board
Cabinet

26th November 2007 11<sup>th</sup> December 2007 7<sup>th</sup> January 2008

## LOCAL ENVIRONMENTAL WORKS PROGRAMME 2007/8 - PHASE 2

#### Report of the Corporate Director, Regeneration and Culture

## 1. Purpose of Report

1.1 To seek Cabinet approval to implement phase 2 of the 2007/8 Local Environmental Works (LEW) programme.

### 2. Summary

2.1 Cabinet recommended at their meeting on the 16<sup>th</sup> May 2005 that, before committing expenditure to the annual Local Environmental Works programmes, a further report be brought to Cabinet each year for approval. This report details phase 2 of the proposed 2007/8 Local Environmental Works programme in Appendix 1 estimated to cost £250,000. The report also details how it is proposed to allocate LEW funding in future years so as to give fair allocation across the City.

#### 3. Recommendations

- 3.1 Cabinet is asked:
  - i) To approve phase 2 of the 2007/8 Local Environmental Works programme estimated at £250,000.
  - ii) To approve the method of allocation of future LEW funding as being split 25 percent to each of the three Parliamentary Constituencies and Citywide.

#### 4. Report

4.1 The Local Environmental Works programme is designed to cover a wide range of environmental works around the City, addressing a number of problems, needs and opportunities. These have included previously the provision of a broad range of works such as:-

Laybys, Tidying up Untidy land, Local Environmental Improvements, Bus shelters, Improved Signing, Verge Hardening, Parking Areas, Unauthorised encampments, Minor Lighting improvements, City Centre Environmental improvements, Access and Conservation Grants.

The majority of the LEW funding has normally been spent on the construction of laybys and verge hardening with comparatively small amounts spent on other areas as detailed above. There is an assessment process for the provision of laybys based on the width of the road, the traffic flows and

1

whether the road is on a bus route. Other criteria taken into account for LEW schemes would be the number of requests received, improvement of the local environment, petitions, joint working, local members' views, value for money etc. It is proposed that the tidying up of untidy land now includes parks areas.

- 4.2 New Parks was the first Priority Area (2000/1/2), followed by Eyres Monsell and Mowmacre (2002/3/4), and then Saffron (2004/5). Subsequent Priority Areas have been Thurncourt (2005/6) and Humberstone and Hamilton (2006/7). Each Priority Area was originally allocated £250,000 for the works but this was reduced as the overall budget was reduced. In addition in 2005/6/7, match funding with the Braunstone Community Association enabled a significant programme of verge hardening to be carried out in the North Braunstone area.
- 4.3 It is proposed that Phase 2 of the 2007/8 LEW programme be allocated according to the three Parliamentary constituencies with approximately 25 percent of the programme being spent in each constituency and the remaining 25 percent being spent citywide generally. It is felt that this will give a fair allocation of the LEW works to all the wards around the City. In future years, it is further proposed that this split is continued with different wards within the constituencies being targeted each year. Future LEW programmes will be finalised after discussion with the Area/ward Committees for the relevant area.
- 4.4 Officers are proposing the phase 2 of the 2007/8 LEW programme, valued at £250,000, should be as detailed in Appendix 1 of this report.

#### 5. Financial and Legal Implications

5.1 Financial Implications

There is an approved total budget in the Corporate Capital Programme 2007/8 of £630,000 for Local Environmental Works.

Contact: Paresh Radia, Finance, Regeneration and Culture, Ext 6507.

5.2 Legal Implications

The City Council as Highway Authority has a legal duty to maintain highways and powers to improve highways. These scheduled works allow us to meet these responsibilities.

Contact: Contact: Jamie Guazzaroni, Solicitor, Legal Services, RAD, Ext 6350

6. Other Implications

OTHER IMPLICATIONS	YES/NO	Paragraph References Within Supporting information
Equal Opportunities	No	
Policy	No	
Sustainable and Environmental	Yes	The proposal forms on improving the quality of life in both the outer areas and the City Centre.
Crime and Disorder	No	
Human Rights Act	No	
Elderly/People on Low Income	No	

#### 7. Risk Assessment Matrix

	Risk	Likelihood L/M/H	Severity Impact L/M/H	Control Actions (if necessary/or appropriate)	
1	Weather Conditions	L	L	Plan works at appropriate times	
2	Adverse results from consultation with Local Residents and Pressure Groups	М	М	Project planning	
3	Conflict with other works eg Statutory Undertakers	L	L	Attend Coordination Meeting	

L - Low L- Low
M - Medium M - Medium
H - High H - High

#### 8. Background Papers

- Report to Cabinet 16/5/05 entitled 'Corporate Capital Programme (2005/6 to 2007/8)'.
- Report to Highways and Transportation Scrutiny Committee 7/9/05 and Cabinet 26/9/05 entitled 'Corporate Capital Programme 2005/6 to 2007/8 – Local Environmental Works'.
- Report to Cabinet 13/3/06 entitled 'Corporate Capital programme 2006/7 to 2007/8'.
- Report to Cabinet 23/7/07 entitled 'Local Environmental Works Programme 2007/8 –Phase 1'.

#### 9. Consultations

- Legal Services
- Staff in Regeneration and Culture Dept
- Local residents
- Members: Councillor J Blackmore, Councillor Blower, Councillor Connelly, Councillor Corrall, Councillor Dawood, Councillor Draycott, Councillor Hall, Councillor Kitterick, Councillor Marriott, Councillor Shah, Councillor Shelton.

## 10. Report Author

Alan Adcock, Head of Highway Management Ext 6540.

Email: alan.adcock@leicester.gov.uk

#### **DECISION STATUS**

Key Decision	Yes
Reason	Significant effect on one or mol wards
Appeared in Forward Plan	Yes
<b>Executive or Council Decision</b>	Executive (Cabinet)

# Appendix 1 Proposed LEW Phase 2 schemes

SITE	WARD	DESCRIPTION	ESTIMATED BUDGET (£)
Leicester West Constituency			, ,
1.Piccaver Rise,	New Parks	Laybys/Parking Areas	36,000
2. Biddle/Blissett Road	New Parks	Laybys/Verge Hardening	30,000
Leicester East Consitituency.			
1. The Spinney, 404 to 424 Coleman Road	Evington	Untidy Land	6,000
2. Hedges on Troon Way	Rushy Mead	Untidy Land, possible damage to Houses	4,100
3.Cordery Road Overrunning	Evington	Verge hardening	9,500
4.Lily Marriot Gardens	Coleman	Environmental Improvement	35,900
5. Hamilton Park	Humberstone & Hamilton	Environmental Improvement & stopping unauthorised access	10,000
6. Columbine Road Verge	Humberstone & Hamilton	Verge Hardening	500
Leicester South Constituency			
Tamarton Road Parking Area	Eyres Monsell	Laybys/Parking Areas	36,000
2. Ford Rise/Ebchester Road	Eyres Monsell	Laybys/Parking Areas/Verge Hardening	20,000
3. Her Ladyship Covert	Eyres Monsell	New Pathway and signs	8,000
4. Saffron Lane Footway	Eyres Monsell	Replace Footway	2,000
Citywide			
Onslow Street Play Area	Spinney Hill	Clear Up site	12,000
2. Great Arler Street	Freemen	Verge hardening	15,000
3. 589 to 551 Saffron Lane	Aylestone	Vehicles parking on and	10,000
(Shops adjacent to Pork Pie	,	damaging footway plus	-,
island)		pedestrian safety issues	
4.Marwood Road Footpath	Abbey	New footpath for elderly	3,000
5. Babington Row	Freemen	Verge hardening	12,000
		Total	£250,000