

# Report

Report to:	<b>Hamilton Area Committee</b>
Date of Meeting:	<b>31 August 2022</b>
Report by:	<b>Executive Director (Community and Enterprise Resources)</b>

Subject:	<b>Participatory Budgeting: Footways</b>
----------	--

## 1. Purpose of this 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 £2.500 million of footway projects and next steps

## 2. Recommendation(s)

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

- (1) that the outcome and level of engagement for the PB consultation exercise to identify £2.500 million of footway projects, as set out in this report, be noted.

## 3. Background

- 3.1. Following the participatory budgeting investment in carriageway and footways completed in 2021/2022, a second phase of investment has now been agreed that will focus on the improvement of footways, making our towns and villages safer for pedestrians, supporting healthy lifestyles through physical activity, and improving the look and feel of our environment.
- 3.2. £2.500 million ring-fenced investment in the Roads Capital Programme will support footway improvements which are part of the adopted footway network. This investment will continue the Council's commitment to prioritise investment in roads and related infrastructure by directing additional funds to help improve the condition of our footways.
- 3.3. As was the case in 2021/2022 the split between geographical and operational areas is largely based on the estimated footway network length.

Operational Area	Footway length (Km)	Footway network share (%)	Allocation
Clydesdale	498.70	20.5%	£512,500
Hamilton	812.07	33.5%	£837,500
East Kilbride	701.09	28.9%	£722,500
Rutherglen and Cambuslang	413.91	17.1%	£427,500
<b>Totals</b>	<b>2425.77</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>£2,500,000</b>

- 3.4. Furthermore, to address concerns that the vote could be dominated by larger population centres or more affluent/organised communities and using learning from national and 2021/2022 PB exercise pilots, the process was again organised in 'thematic options' rather than specific streets/roadways.
- 3.5. The public were asked to vote on the following themes they wished to see delivered through this fund:-
- (1) minor and residential footways
  - (2) main and distributor footways
  - (3) footways in business areas
- 3.6. Last year there were both carriageway and footway themes put forward including those unrelated to the public adopted road network (e.g. cemeteries, country parks). However, this year a more focused investment on footways that are part of/adjacent to the public adopted road and footway network has been progressed.

#### **4. Consultation Outcomes**

- 4.1. The consultation ran between 22 April and 5 June 2022 and was promoted via the Council's website, social media channels and third sector networks.
- 4.2. Separate votes were held for each of the 4 Areas and each participant was allowed multiple votes for the chosen themes. Participants were able to apportion the votes in any way they chose; for example, all 3 votes could be allocated to a single theme or, at the other extreme, a single vote could be allocated to each of 3 themes.
- 4.3. As was the case last financial year, rather than having only a single winning theme the available funding was allocated across all themes. 60% of funding in an area was allocated to the top scoring theme, 25% to the second top theme and 15% to the third-place theme.
- 4.4. The proposed allocation of funding allows a proportion of the funding to be distributed to all themes (and in turn priorities). This provides the flexibility to continue to target key priorities within each theme based on engineering merit rather than to solely target all funds into one theme, while providing our communities with the opportunity to influence spend across specific themes.
- 4.5. This also represents best practice in terms of risk management as it gives the service the ability to continue to target funds to those areas in greatest need with the aim of improving those footways that are in the worst condition in the first instance.
- 4.6. The results of the vote, are shown in Appendix 1 with numbers of votes cast in brackets. In each of the areas the first-place theme was minor and residential footways, followed by main and distributor footways, and then footways in business areas.
- 4.7. The equalities information attached in Appendix 2 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.
- 4.8. In terms of participation several areas showed significant strength that should be noted, namely:-

- ◆ 83% of respondents fell under the category of working age (25 to 64). This is a harder to reach group and should be regarded as a sign of success for the project
- ◆ 16% of respondents classified themselves as having caring responsibilities out with parental responsibilities. This showed significant representation from this community
- ◆ 15% of respondents identified as having a long-term disability or illness which showed good representation from this community
- ◆ representation from SIMD 1 (bottom 20%) considerably increased this year rising from only 12% representation last year to 19% this year.

4.9. In terms of participation, specific areas that stand out that require improvement in the future to try and ensure the process is representative are:-

- ◆ 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. Joint work to promote was undertaken with the Education department, this requires further development.
- ◆ Ethnic Minorities – Improvement from last year was demonstrated in this area with an increase to 1.5% representation. This area still requires further development.
- ◆ East Kilbride and Cambuslang and Rutherglen were both underrepresented in this process. More targeted work to engage residents in these areas may be required.

## 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 prioritised themes and specific named schemes have subsequently been identified.

Area	1st (60%)	2nd (25%)	3rd (15%)	Totals
Clydesdale	£307,500	£128,125	£76,875	£512,500
Hamilton	£502,500	£209,375	£125,625	£837,500
East Kilbride	£433,500	£180,625	£108,375	£722,500
Rutherglen & Cambuslang	£256,500	£106,875	£64,125	£427,500
Totals	£1,500,000	£625,000	£375,000	£2,500,000

5.2. Appendices 3 to 6 sets out the specific schemes and indicative sums allocated to each scheme. These schemes have been identified using our scheme assessment criteria which allows us to score potential footway schemes based on several factors, which collectively contribute towards an overall score enabling us to prioritise our resources. This ensures that funds are targeted at those footways that are in greatest need of repair based on engineering judgement.

5.3. Schemes in Hamilton are indicated at Appendix 4.

5.4. It should 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.
- 5.6. Given an already full and challenging workload, and as already intimated to elected members, to ensure delivery of both our core capital investment programme and the participatory budget priority projects, it has been necessary to commence the schemes prior to the August Area Committee cycle.
- 5.7. An essential element of any participatory budgeting process is advising participants of the outcome of the vote. The Community Engagement Team will contact those respondents who provided their email address to advise them of the successful themes in each area with a link to a tracking area for PB on South Lanarkshire's website.
- 5.8. The Community Engagement Team, with support from the Service, 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.
- 5.9. Reports have been prepared for the 4 Area Committees to update elected members on the voting process and the outcomes from it. These reports are for noting only given the budget allocation has been agreed as part of budget setting process.

## **6. Employee Implications**

- 6.1. There are no employee implications at this time.

## **7. Financial Implications**

- 7.1. The intention is to spend the full £2.500 million during 2022/2023, however, market conditions (for example contractor/material availability) are likely to result in some spend moving into 2023/2024.
- 7.2. Specific issues have emerged and are ongoing in relation to bituminous materials due to the Ukraine/Russia conflict and a saturated market is also impacting on contractor availability. However, every effort will be made to deliver the projects identified in appendices 3 through 6 during 2022/2023.
- 7.3. In terms of an update on the 2021/2022 participatory budgeting programme for footways, 29 projects within residential areas, town centres, country parks and parks were identified and 26 were completed.
- 7.4. The footway project in Chatelherault Country Park is expected to be undertaken during 2022/2023 and is linked to the replacement of White Bridge and a feasibility study is underway. Work was also not fully completed and is continuing at Calderglen Country Park. These works are being progressed by colleagues in Facilities, Grounds and Waste.
- 7.5. An adopted footway project in Clydesdale was only partially completed due to weather related issues and works are now programmed for 2022/2023. Funding of circa £0.120 million from 2021/2022 has, in addition to the share identified for 2022/2023, been made available to the Clydesdale Area. A further £0.040 million is also available from 2021/2022 for Hamilton schemes and this will be used to manage inevitable cost variances.

7.6. For completeness, in addition to the PB funding discussed in this report, circa £1.000m funding, has been allocated from the Roads Investment Programme for prioritised footway improvements. Specific schemes are shown at the bottom of appendices 3 through to 6 and it should be noted that the projects are similar in terms of their alignment to the top 2 PB themes emerging from the PB exercises.

## **8. Climate Change, Sustainability and Environmental Implications**

8.1. There are no significant implications in terms of climate change, sustainability and environmental implications associated with this report.

## **9. Other Implications**

9.1. There are no other significant implications as result of the contents of this report.

## **10. Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) and Consultation Arrangements**

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

**David Booth**

**Executive Director (Community and Enterprise Resources)**

21 July 2022

## **Link(s) to Council Values/Priorities/Outcomes**

### **Values**

- ◆ Focused on people and their needs
- ◆ Working with and respecting others
- ◆ Accountable, effective, efficient, and transparent
- ◆ Ambitious, self-aware, and improving
- ◆ Fair, open and sustainable
- ◆ We will work to put people first and reduce inequality
- ◆ We will work towards a sustainable future in sustainable places
- ◆ We will work to recover, progress, and improve
- ◆ Good quality, suitable and sustainable places to live
- ◆ Thriving business, fair jobs and vibrant town centres
- ◆ Caring, connected, sustainable communities
- ◆ People live the healthiest lives possible

### **Previous References**

- ◆ Hamilton Area Committee – 8 September 2021

### **Contact for Further Information**

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

Colin Park, Head of Roads, Transportation and Fleet Services

Ext: 3653 (Tel: 01698 453653)

E-mail: [colin.park@southlanarkshire.gov.uk](mailto:colin.park@southlanarkshire.gov.uk)

Clydesdale (Overall 807 votes)

1<sup>st</sup> Place: Minor / Residential – 475 (59%)  
2<sup>nd</sup> Place: Main and distributor – 229 (28%)  
3<sup>rd</sup> Place: Business areas – 103 (13%)

Hamilton (Overall 1,023 votes)

1<sup>st</sup> Place: Minor / Residential – 555 (54%)  
2<sup>nd</sup> Place: Main and distributor – 289 (28%)  
3<sup>rd</sup> Place: Business areas – 179 (18%)

Rutherglen and Cambuslang (Overall 456 votes)

1<sup>st</sup> Place: Minor / Residential – 294 (65%)  
2<sup>nd</sup> Place: Main and distributor – 105 (23%)  
3<sup>rd</sup> Place: Business areas – 57 (12%)

East Kilbride (Overall 705 votes)

1<sup>st</sup> Place: Minor / Residential – 433 (61%)  
2<sup>nd</sup> Place: Main and distributor – 175 (25%)  
3<sup>rd</sup> Place: Business areas – 97 (14%)

**Locality - 997**

Locality	No of Participants	Percentage of Participants	South Lanarkshire Area Profile
East Kilbride	235	24%	30.00%
Hamilton	341	34%	32.00%
Clydesdale	269	27%	19%
Rutherglen and Cambuslang	152	15%	19%

**SIMD 2020 – 951 Postcodes provided**

Decile	Survey Engagement	Percentage of Participants	SL Area Profile
1-20%	180	19%	20%
21-40%	214	22.5%	23%
41-60%	224	23.5%	20%
61-80%	173	18%	20%
81-100%	158	17%	17%

**Age**

Age	Survey Engagement	Percentage of Participants	SL Area Profile
Under 16	3	0%	18%
16-24	23	2%	10%
25-64	815	83%	82%
Over 65	136	14%	21%
Prefer not to answer	20	2%	N/A

**Gender**

Gender	Survey Engagement	Percentage of Participants	SL Area Profile
Female	686	69%	52%
Male	266	27%	48%
Prefer not to Answer	4	0%	N/A
Other	41	4%	N/A

## Ethnic Background

Ethnic Background	Survey Engagement	Percentage of Participants	South Lanarkshire Area Profile
White	932	94%	97.30%
Prefer not to answer	51	5%	N/A
Asian, Asian Scottish, or Asian British	3	0%	2.10%
Mixed/multiple ethnic groups	7	1%	0%
Arab	0	0%	0%
African, Carribean or black	1	0%	0.60%
Other ethnic group	3	0%	0%

## Sexual Orientation

Sexual Orientation	Survey Engagement	Percentage of Participants	South Lanarkshire Area Profile
Heterosexual/Straight	795	80%	97%
Prefer not to answer	138	14%	N/A
Gay/Lesbian	30	3%	2.20%
Bisexual	16	2%	0.80%

## Caring Responsibilities

Caring Responsibility	Survey Engagement	Percentage of Participants	South Lanarkshire Area Profile
Children Under 18	435	44%	97%
Yes, other	158	16%	N/A
No caring responsibilities	336	34%	2.20%
Prefer not to answer	100	10%	0.80%

## Disabilities

Disability	Survey Engagement	Percentage of Participants	South Lanarkshire Area Profile
Yes	152	15%	11%
No	755	76%	89%
Prefer not to answer	90	9%	N/A



### Appendix 3: Clydesdale

<b>Footways Participatory Budgeting</b>	<b>Allocation (£)</b>	<b>Theme</b>
<b>Theme 1, Minor / Residential (PB Budget £307,500) PB Underspend 21/22 £120,738</b>		
Station Road, Law (funded from 2021-22 PB)	52,000	Minor / Residential
Wilton Road, Carluke Ph1 (part funded from 2021-22 PB)	184,211	Minor / Residential
Silverdale Crescent, Lanark	79516	Minor / Residential
Dale Street, Douglas	58000	Minor / Residential
Brownhill Avenue, Douglas	54511	Minor / Residential
<b>Total</b>	<b>428,238</b>	
<b>Theme 2, Main / Distributor (PB Budget £128,125)</b>		
Main Street, Forth (Kirk Green – Hawkwood)	72,195	Main and Distributor
Heathfield Drive, Blackwood	55,930	Main and Distributor
<b>Total</b>	<b>128,125</b>	
<b>Theme 3, Business Areas (PB Budget £76,875)</b>		
Bloomgate, Lanark	29,000	Business Areas
A721 Chapel Street, Carluke	30,000	Business Areas
St Leonard Street, Lanark	17,875	Business Areas
<b>Total</b>	<b>76,875</b>	

<b>Other Footway, Service Capital (PB Budget £205,600)</b>	<b>Allocation (£)</b>	<b>Theme</b>
A70 Mainhill	100,987	Main and Distributor
Low Village Rd, Lamington	20,000	Minor / Residential
A706 Main Street, Forth	25,000	Main and Distributor
Whitehill Crescent, Lanark	59,613	Minor / Residential
<b>Total</b>	<b>205,600</b>	

## Appendix 4: Hamilton

Footways Participatory Budgeting	Allocation (£)	Theme
<b>Theme 1, Minor / Residential (Budget £502,500)</b>		
Willow Drive, Blantyre	104,500	Minor / Residential
Highfield Road, Larkhall	90,000	Minor / Residential
Sycamore Grove, Blantyre	30,000	Minor / Residential
Avonbrae Crescent, Hamilton (North Side)	100,000	Minor / Residential
St Ninians Place, Hamilton	48,000	Minor / Residential
Selkirk Street, Blantyre	50,000	Minor / Residential
Wilson Place, Stonehouse	20,000	Minor / Residential
St Laurence Avenue, Stonehouse	30,000	Minor / Residential
Sherry Drive, Hamilton	30,000	Minor / Residential
<b>Total</b>	<b>502,500</b>	
<b>Theme 2, Main / Distributor (Budget £209,375)</b>		
Bellshill Road - Service Road	50,000	Main and Distributor
Carlisle Road, Ferniegair	50,000	Main and Distributor
Main Street, Blantyre	109,375	Main and Distributor
<b>Total</b>	<b>209,375</b>	
<b>Theme 3, Business Areas (Budget £125,625)</b>		
Central Avenue, Blantyre	125,625	Business Areas
<b>Total</b>	<b>125,625</b>	

Other Footway, Service Capital (Budget £334,800)	Allocation (£)	Theme
Lime Grove, Blantyre	10,000	Minor / Residential
Larch Court, Blantyre	45,000	Minor / Residential
A723, Strathaven Road, Hamilton	99,400	Main and Distributor

Bardykes Road, Blantyre	40,000	Main and Distributor
Darngaber Gardens, Quarter	40,000	Minor / Residential
Glenburn Avenue, Stonehouse	100,000	Minor / Residential
<b>Total</b>	<b>334,400</b>	

## Appendix 5: East Kilbride

Footways Participatory Budgeting	Allocation (£)	Theme
<b>Theme 1, Minor / Residential (Budget £433,500)</b>		
Gilderdale, East Kilbride	26000	Minor / Residential
Threshold, East Kilbride	71280	Minor / Residential
Glen Cannich, East Kilbride	32500	Minor / Residential
Newlands Rd, East Kilbride	60000	Minor / Residential
Wellesley Dr, East Kilbride	71000	Minor / Residential
Kype View, Strathaven	91000	Minor / Residential
Douglas St, Strathaven	30870	Minor / Residential
Applegarth Rd, Strathaven	50850	Minor / Residential
<b>Total</b>	<b>433,500</b>	
<b>Theme 2, Main / Distributor (Budget £180,625)</b>		
High Common Rd, East Kilbride	59000	Main and Distributor
Kirktonholme Rd, East Kilbride	30000	Main and Distributor
St Leonards Rd, East Kilbride	51625	Main and Distributor
Newton Rd, Strathaven	40000	Main and Distributor
<b>Total</b>	<b>180,625</b>	
<b>Theme 3, Business Areas (Budget £108,375)</b>		
Colvilles Place, East Kilbride	83200	Business Areas
Thomson St, Strathaven	25175	Business Areas
<b>Total</b>	<b>108,375</b>	
<b>Other Footway, Service Capital</b>	<b>Allocation (£)</b>	<b>Theme</b>
A71 Darvel Road, Strathaven	74000	Main and Distributor
Carnegie Hill, East Kilbride	121,000	Minor / Residential

Mungo Park, East Kilbride	65000	Minor / Residential
Glen Morriston, East Kilbride	33000	Minor / Residential
Bank Park, East Kilbride	32000	Minor / Residential
	<b>325,000</b>	

## Appendix 6: Cambuslang and Rutherglen

<b>Footways Participatory Budgeting</b>	<b>Allocation (£)</b>	<b>Theme</b>
<b>Theme 1, Minor / Residential (Budget £256,500)</b>		
Lettrickhills Crescent, Cambuslang	25470	Minor / Residential
Cairns Road, Cambuslang	55,000	Minor / Residential
Rosslyn Ave, Rutherglen	56,550	Minor / Residential
Ryan Way, Rutherglen	33150	Minor / Residential
Calderwood Rd, Rutherglen	60,080	Minor / Residential
Woodlands Crescent, Cambuslang	26,250	Minor / Residential
<b>Total</b>	<b>256,500</b>	
<b>Theme 2, Main / Distributor (Budget £106,875)</b>		
Dukes Road (from A724 uphill), Cambuslang	86,875	Main and Distributor
Hamilton Road, Cambuslang	20,000	Main and Distributor
<b>Total</b>	<b>106,875</b>	
<b>Theme 3, Business Areas (Budget £64,125)</b>		
Main Street, Rutherglen (streetscape repairs)	64,125	Business Areas
<b>Total</b>	<b>64,125</b>	

  

<b>Other Footway, Service Capital</b>	<b>Allocation (£)</b>	<b>Theme</b>
A749 East Kilbride Road, Cambuslang	69,000	Main and Distributor
Castlefern Road, Rutherglen	66,000	Minor / Residential
<b>Total</b>	<b>135,000</b>	