

Report

Report to: **East Kilbride Area Committee**
Date of Meeting: **11 August 2021**
Report by: **Executive Director (Community and Enterprise Resources)**

Subject: **Participatory Budgeting
Additional £2m for Footpaths and Roads**

1. Purpose of Report

1.1. The purpose of the report is to:-

- ◆ Advise the Area Committee of the outcome and level of engagement for the Participatory Budgeting (PB) consultation exercise to identify £2m footway / footpath and road projects
- ◆ Advise of initial / potential learning points to develop future exercises.
- ◆ Set out next steps, locations, and forthcoming communications.

2. Recommendation(s)

2.1 The Committee is asked to approve the following recommendation(s):

- (1) the outcome and level of engagement for the PB consultation exercise to identify £2m footway / footpath and road projects as set out in Appendix 2 be noted; and
- (2) Initial / potential learning points to develop future consultation exercises and forthcoming communications be noted.

3. Background

- 3.1 Members will be aware that as part of agreeing the budget, an additional £2m was allocated to support footway / footpath and road improvements. This investment would continue the Council's commitment to prioritise investment in roads infrastructure and footway / footpath including those within parks.
- 3.2 The predominant focus of the investment was to target footpath improvement along with further investment to improve road conditions in South Lanarkshire. This additional sum was to be allocated across the 4 localities based on network length and be subject to an online PB exercise allowing communities to prioritise on a thematic basis where the further expenditure in their area should be targeted. The resulting programme of works will be informed by the road condition index and footway / footpath conditions information.
- 3.3 It was considered appropriate that the funding would be split 75% towards footway / footpath and 25% towards carriageways with work to be implemented in 2021/22.

3.4 Funding was allocated as per the table below:

| Funding Split | Footway Network Share (%) | Share of £1.5m (75%) (£m) | Carriageway Network Share (%) | Share of £0.5m (25%) (£m) | Total Funding Per Area (£m) |
|-------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Clydesdale | 20.50% | 0.307 | 42.80% | 0.214 | 0.521 |
| East Kilbride | 28.90% | 0.434 | 25.40% | 0.127 | 0.561 |
| Hamilton | 33.50% | 0.502 | 22.30% | 0.111 | 0.613 |
| Rutherglen & Cambuslang | 17.10% | 0.257 | 9.50% | 0.048 | 0.305 |
| Totals | 100.00% | 1.500 | 100.00% | 0.500 | 2.000 |

3.5 To address concerns that the vote could be dominated by larger population centres or organised communities, and using learning from national PB pilots, the process was organised using the following ‘thematic options’ rather than specific locations.

Footway Themes:

- Resurface footway / footpath in residential areas.
- Upgrade town centre pavements
- Resurface footway / footpath in cemeteries.
- Resurface footway / footpath in parks and sport/cultural recreational areas.
- Resurface footway / footpath in country parks.
- Resurface footway / footpath in general open spaces/ amenity areas.

Road Themes:

- Resurface main roads.
- Resurface minor roads.
- Resurface roads in residential areas.
- Resurface roads and car parks in cemeteries.
- Resurface roads and car parks in parks and sport/cultural recreational areas.
- Resurface roads and car parks in country parks.
- Resurface roads and car parks in general open spaces/ amenity areas.

4. Consultation Process and Results

4.1 The consultation ran between 27 April and 11 May 2021 and was promoted via the Council’s website, social media channels and third sector networks. Separate votes were held for each of the four areas with separate provision within each area vote for roads and footway / footpaths.

4.2 Each participant was allowed five votes for road themes in their area and a further five votes for footway / footpath themes. These votes could be apportioned in any way the participant wishes; for example, all five votes could be allocated to a single theme or, at the other extreme, a single vote could be allocated to each of five themes.

4.3 The top themes have been determined by totalling the votes cast in each area for footway / footpath and carriageways. Rather than having only a single winning theme the available funding has been allocated across the two most popular themes. 75% of funding in an area has been allocated to the top scoring theme and 25% to the second top theme.

4.4 The results of the roads vote were:

| Area | 1st Place | 2nd Place |
|------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| Clydesdale | Resurface minor roads | Resurface main roads |
| East Kilbride | Resurface roads in residential areas | Resurface main roads |
| Hamilton | Resurface main roads | Resurface roads in residential areas |
| Rutherglen& Cambuslang | Resurface roads and car parks in country parks | Resurface main roads |

4.5 The results of the footway / footpath vote were:

| Area | 1st Place | 2nd Place |
|-------------------------|--|--|
| Clydesdale | Resurface footpaths in residential areas | Upgrade town centre pavements |
| East Kilbride | Resurface footpaths in residential areas | Resurface footpaths in country parks |
| Hamilton | Resurface footpaths in residential areas | Resurface footpaths in country parks |
| Rutherglen & Cambuslang | Resurface footpaths in parks & sport/cultural recreational areas | Resurface footpaths in residential areas |

4.6 1,245 respondents participated in the participatory budgeting process. This level of representation is an area that officers will look to grow and develop. With this being the first mainstream process and it not being a normalised practice, the level of response is considered to a positive indicator.

4.7 There were areas of participation that showed significant strength that should be noted. These were:

- 82% of respondents fell under the category of working age (25-64). This is a harder to reach group classically and should be regarded as a sign of success for the project.
- 17% of respondents classified themselves as having caring responsibilities out with parental responsibilities. This showed significant representation from this community.
- 12% of respondents identified as having a long-term disability or illness which showed good representation from this community.

- 4.8 A full breakdown of participant engagement in the process and the representation levels can be found at Appendix 1. Areas for improvement and initial / emerging lessons learned are indicated below in section 7.

5. Next Steps

- 5.1 In line with the results of the vote, the funding has been allocated as set out below to each of the areas and successful 1st and 2nd placed themes.

| | Footpaths / Footways | | Roads | | |
|-------------------------|----------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|
| Area | 1st Place (£m) | 2nd Place (£m) | 1st Place (£m) | 2nd Place (£m) | Funding Per Area (£m) |
| Clydesdale | 0.230 | 0.077 | 0.160 | 0.054 | 0.521 |
| East Kilbride | 0.325 | 0.109 | 0.095 | 0.032 | 0.561 |
| Hamilton | 0.376 | 0.126 | 0.083 | 0.028 | 0.613 |
| Rutherglen & Cambuslang | 0.193 | 0.064 | 0.036 | 0.012 | 0.305 |
| Totals | 1.124 | 0.376 | 0.374 | 0.126 | 2.000 |

- 5.2 Locations have subsequently been identified in line with the above funding and the results of the vote as outlined at paragraphs 4.4 and 4.5. Appendix 2 sets out the specific locations where works will be undertaken within the extents of the public road and footway network. These locations have been determined from the Service's prioritised list of locations requiring attention taking account of the condition and importance of road or footpaths / footways. Those schemes in East Kilbride are shaded grey.
- 5.3 It should be noted that the budget allocations do not align exactly with the estimated costs associated with the priority locations. Therefore, for some locations, it will be necessary to supplement a proportion of the works cost from other budgets.
- 5.4 It should also be noted that these are provisional project estimates and there may be some variance in terms of final outturn once more detailed design is undertaken and works are completed.
- 5.5 As a result, other projects may come forward should projects outturn under budget. Conversely, some projects may require to be deferred or supplemented from other budgets if costs increase from the provisional estimates. However, every effort will be made to deliver the projects identified at Appendix 2 during 2021/22.
- 5.6 Given an already full and challenging workload, to ensure delivery of both our core capital investment programme and the PB priority projects, it has been necessary to commence the projects prior to the August / September Area Committee cycle.

6. Communication

- 6.1 An essential element of any participatory budgeting process is advising participants of the outcome of the vote, 51% of respondents provided their email address to be advised of the outcome of this process. The Community Engagement Team will contact respondents initially via email to advise them of the successful themes in each area with a link to a tracking area for PB on South Lanarkshire's website.

- 6.2 A directory, which is an easy to update, online based spreadsheet, on the Council website will be updated on activities that are being carried out as a direct result of the PB process. The directory will identify 'winning' themes, identify which locations have been identified for works, provide updates around start date, completion date and provide photographic evidence of the works undertaken.
- 6.3 The Community Engagement Team, with support from relevant Services, will also work alongside the Corporate Communications / Digital Team to publicise the results through the SL View and social media posts to raise awareness of both the process and the results.
- 6.4 Committee Reports are being prepared for the four area committees to update elected members on the voting process and the outcomes from it. It should be noted that these reports are for noting only given the budget allocation has been agreed as part of budget setting process.

7. Initial Lessons Learned

- 7.1 Operating the first mainstream PB process across the Council has identified several learning points to be considered as the process develops further.
- 7.2 A minimum voting period of six weeks should become standard to ensure all groups can align their meeting schedules with the process. This was identified by several groups and individuals and represents acknowledged good practice to maximise participation.
- 7.3 Through this process we used a 'cookie' which embedded itself into a voting device so that the device would only be allowed to vote once to maintain the integrity of the voting process. Issues were raised around some households only having one device and this possibly restricting potential participants. This point needs to be considered to ensure we find a balance between vote integrity and digital exclusion.
- 7.4 Consideration to enable paper voting has been given as some residents may not have access to the online survey. This would require preparation of and sending out of prepaid envelopes. This approach would add to costs and complications. The preference would be to only have an online survey and in doing so consideration is being given to locating entry terminals at community facilities for those with no internet access and / or encourage use of IT facilities in Council libraries. Any PB consultation should also be available in additional formats including BSL, Braille. This would assist in meeting SLC's equalities policy.
- 7.5 This PB process was marketed primarily through networks and social media. Marketing of PB processes could perhaps also be developed further through face-to-face approaches in schools / public areas to increase awareness and participation. Suitable resources would have to be identified should this be seen as a priority area.
- 7.6 Elected members will be notified of any PB processes going live to assist in their role of encouraging participation.
- 7.7 Costs are also anticipated in relation to future advertising of PB exercises and costs around administrative duties. Budgets will have to be identified for this.
- 7.8 Significant learning has been undertaken through this process, for the process to grow and develop it is crucial that this learning is shared between Resources and this will be taken forward by officers involved.

7.9 In terms of participation, specific areas that stand out that require improvement to ensure the process is representative are:

- SIMD 1 - 20% - Our most deprived communities were underrepresented in this process. We will look to raise engagement through the neighbourhood planning work that aims to empower deprived communities to have an active voice.
- Under 24's – This could be due to the nature of the process but there was also no specific targeted work done to engage this group. Moving forward where appropriate we plan to liaise with schools and further education establishments to increase representation.
- Ethnic Minorities – We will continue to engage with appropriate partners to ensure opportunities for participation are encouraged and accessible to all ethnic backgrounds.

8. Employee Implications

8.1 There are no employee implications at this time, however, in terms of some of the matters emerging from the lessons learned section additional resources in terms of budget may be required for future PB exercises.

9. Financial Implications

9.1 There are no financial implications currently. It is noted budget provision of £2m has been agreed, however, in terms of some of the matters emerging from the lessons learned section additional resources in terms of budget is likely to be required for future PB exercises.

10. Climate Change, Sustainability and Environmental Implications

10.1 There are no climate change, sustainability, and environmental implications associated with this paper.

11. Other Implications

11.1 There are no other implications associated with this paper.

12. Equality Impact Assessment and Consultation Arrangements

12.1 There is no need to conduct an EIA and the consultation arrangements and results are as set out in section 4.

Michael McGlynn

Executive Director (Community and Enterprise Resources)

20 July 2021

Link(s) to Council Values/Ambitions/Objectives

- ◆ Improve the quality of life of everyone in South Lanarkshire
- ◆ Improve the road network, influence improvements in public transport and encourage active travel
- ◆ Work with communities and partners to promote high quality, thriving and sustainable communities

Previous References

- ◆ None

List of Background Papers

◆ None

If you would like inspect any of the background papers or want any further information, please contact: -

Colin Park, Head of Roads and Transportation Services

Ext: 3653 (Tel: 01698 453653)

E-mail: colin.park@southlanarkshire.gov.uk

The following information around equalities was collected from participants to identify how representative the process was of the area profile of South Lanarkshire. Some participants opted not to leave their information so there is a discrepancy between total participants and the information available below.

Locality

| Locality | No of Participants | Percentage of Participants | South Lanarkshire Area Profile |
|---------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| East Kilbride | 524 | 42% | 30.00% |
| Hamilton | 368 | 30% | 32.00% |
| Cyldesdale | 213 | 17% | 19% |
| Rutherglen and Cambuslang | 140 | 11% | 19% |

SIMD 2020

| Decile | Survey Engagement | Percentage of Participants | South Lanarkshire Area Profile |
|-----------|-------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1-20% | 143 | 12% | 20% |
| 21- 40% | 250 | 22% | 23% |
| 41- 60% | 248 | 22% | 20% |
| 61- 80% | 268 | 24% | 20% |
| 81 - 100% | 223 | 20% | 17% |

Age

| Age | Survey Engagement | Percentage of Participants | South Lanarkshire Area Profile |
|----------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Under 16 | 2 | 0% | 18% |
| 16-24 | 31 | 3% | 10% |
| 25 - 64 | 1026 | 82% | 82% |
| Over 65 | 165 | 13% | 21% |
| Prefer not to answer | 21 | 2% | N/A |

Gender

| Gender | Survey Engagement | Percentage of Participants | South Lanarkshire Area Profile |
|----------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Female | 750 | 60% | 52% |
| Male | 434 | 35% | 48% |
| Prefer not to answer | 59 | 5% | N/A |
| Other | 2 | 0% | N/A |

Ethnic Background

| Ethnic Background | Survey Engagement | Percentage of Participants | South Lanarkshire Area Profile |
|--|-------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| White | 1140 | 92% | 97.30% |
| Prefer not to answer | 98 | 8% | N/A |
| Asian, Asian Scottish or Asian British | 3 | 0% | 2.10% |
| Mixed/multiple ethnic groups | 2 | 0% | 0% |
| Arab | 2 | 0% | 0% |
| African, Carribean or black | 0 | 0% | 0.60% |
| Other ethnic group | 0 | 0% | 0% |

Sexual Orientation

| Sexual Orientation | Survey Engagement | Percentage of Participants | South Lanarkshire Area Profile |
|-----------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Heterosexual/Straight | 993 | 80% | 97% |
| Prefer not to answer | 193 | 16% | N/A |
| Gay/Lesbian | 23 | 2.20% | 2.20% |
| Bisexual | 18 | 1% | 0.80% |

Caring Responsibilities

| Caring Responsibility | Survey Engagement | Percentage of Participants | South Lanarkshire Area Profile |
|-----------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Childcare | 478 | 38% | N/A |
| No | 467 | 38% | N/A |
| Yes, other | 215 | 17% | 11% |
| Prefer not to answer | 121 | 10% | N/A |

Disabilities

| Disabilities | Survey Engagement | Percentage of Participants | South Lanarkshire Area Profile |
|----------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| No | 988 | 79% | N/A |
| Yes | 146 | 12% | 11% |
| Prefer not to answer | 111 | 9% | N/A |

Appendix 2

| Funding Theme Split / Value | Footpaths / Footways 1st Place | Footpaths / Footways 2nd Place | Carriageways 1st Place | Carriageways 2nd Place | Total Funding Per Area (£m) |
|--|--|--------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Clydesdale | Resurface footpaths in residential areas | Upgrade town centre pavements | Resurface minor roads | Resurface main roads | Total |
| A706 Cleghorn Road, Lanark | 0.037 | | | | 0.037 |
| A72 Lanark Road, Crossford | 0.080 | | | | 0.080 |
| Station Road, law | 0.113 | | | | 0.113 |
| Whitelees Road, Lanark | | 0.077 | | | 0.077 |
| B7011 Brownlee Road, Law | | | | 0.054 | 0.054 |
| Abbeygreen Road, Lesmahagow | | | 0.093 | | 0.093 |
| School Road, Lamington | | | 0.034 | | 0.034 |
| Camps Road, Crawford - Carlisle Road Jct to Clyde Bridge | | | 0.017 | | 0.017 |
| School Road, Carmichael | | | 0.016 | | 0.016 |
| | 0.230 | 0.077 | 0.160 | 0.054 | 0.521 |

| Funding Theme Split / Value | Footpaths / Footways 1st Place | Footpaths / Footways 2nd Place | Carriageways 1st Place | Carriageways 2nd Place | Total Funding Per Area (£m) |
|---|--|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| East Kilbride | Resurface footpaths in residential areas | Resurface footpaths in country parks | Resurface roads in residential areas | Resurface main roads | |
| Muirside Road, Strathaven | 0.035 | | | | 0.035 |
| Woodhill Road, Strathaven | 0.036 | | | | 0.036 |
| Kirktonholme Road, East Kilbride | 0.032 | | | | 0.032 |
| Cleland Place, East Kilbride | 0.038 | | | | 0.038 |
| Maxwellton Road, East Kilbride | 0.038 | | | | 0.038 |
| Owen Avenue /Dale Avenue, East Kilbride | 0.085 | | | | 0.085 |

| | | | | | |
|---|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Galt/Reith / Owen Avenue /Dale Avenue, East Kilbride | 0.062 | | | | 0.062 |
| Tannahill Drive, East Kilbride | | | 0.050 | | 0.050 |
| Ontario Park and Sudbury Crescent (part), East Kilbride | | | 0.045 | | 0.045 |
| Blacklaw Drive (at Glen Urquhart), East Kilbride | | | | 0.032 | 0.032 |
| Footpaths in country parks | | 0.109 | | | 0.109 |
| | 0.325 | 0.109 | 0.095 | 0.032 | 0.561 |

| Funding Theme Split / Value | Footpaths / Footways 1st Place | Footpaths / Footways 2nd Place | Carriageways 1st Place | Carriageways 2nd Place | Total Funding Per Area (£m) |
|---|--|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Hamilton | Resurface footpaths in residential areas | Resurface footpaths in country parks | Resurface main roads | Resurface roads in residential areas | |
| Almada Street / Clydesdale Street / Burnbank Road, Hamilton | 0.100 | | | | 0.100 |
| Hunthill Road, Blantyre | 0.050 | | | | 0.050 |
| B7071, Bothwell Road, Uddingston | 0.096 | | | | 0.096 |
| B7071, Uddingston Road, Bothwell | 0.015 | | | | 0.015 |
| Mill Road, Hamilton | 0.020 | | | | 0.020 |
| Argyle Street, Stonehouse | 0.030 | | | | 0.030 |
| The Neuk, Stonehouse | 0.010 | | | | 0.010 |
| Craig Street, Blantyre | 0.010 | | | | 0.010 |
| Alness Street, Hamilton | 0.045 | | | | 0.045 |
| High Patrick Street, Hamilton | | | 0.024 | | 0.024 |
| Woodfoot Road (Phase 3), Hamilton | | | 0.059 | | 0.059 |
| Lime Grove, Blantyre | | | | 0.028 | 0.028 |
| Footpaths in country parks | | 0.126 | | | 0.126 |
| | 0.376 | 0.126 | 0.083 | 0.028 | 0.613 |

| Funding Theme Split / Value | Footpaths / Footways 1st Place | Footpaths / Footways 2nd Place | Carriageways 1st Place | Carriageways 2nd Place | Total Funding Per Area (£m) |
|--|--|--|--|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Rutherglen & Cambuslang | Resurface footpaths in parks & sport/cultural recreational areas | Resurface footpaths in residential areas | Resurface roads and car parks in country parks | Resurface main roads | |
| Blairbeth Road, Rutherglen | | 0.064 | | | 0.064 |
| Caledonia Avenue, Rutherglen | | | | 0.012 | 0.012 |
| Halfway Park footpath repairs | 0.046 | | | | 0.046 |
| Mill Road Recreation area access road repair | 0.022 | | | | 0.022 |
| Cambuslang park footpath repairs | 0.102 | | | | 0.102 |
| Overtoun Park footpath repairs | 0.010 | | | | 0.010 |
| Stonelaw park entrance path repairs | 0.007 | | | | 0.007 |
| Woodburn Park entrance path repairs | 0.003 | | | | 0.003 |
| Fernhill Community Centre monoblock repairs | | | 0.004 | | 0.004 |
| Cambuslang Institute car park patch repairs | | | 0.003 | | 0.003 |
| Eastfield Lifestyles Access Road repairs | | | 0.032 | | 0.0032 |
| | 0.190 | 0.064 | 0.039 | 0.012 | 0.304 |

| | | | | | |
|---------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Totals | 1.124 | 0.376 | 0.374 | 0.126 | 2.000 |
|---------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|