

Report

Report to:	Hamilton Area Committee
Date of Meeting:	8 September 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 2021/2022.

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 and 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 4 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 5 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 and 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 and Cambuslang	Resurface footpaths in parks and 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 and 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 Hamilton 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 2021/2022.
- 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 the Council'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	0.085				0.085

Avenue, East Kilbride					
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 and Cambuslang	Resurface footpaths in parks and 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
---------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------