

---

STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS

---

**2005 No. 1794**

**The Midland Metro (Birmingham City  
Centre Extension, etc.) Order 2005**

**PART 2**

**WORKS PROVISIONS**

*Streets*

**Construction and maintenance of new or altered highways**

**15.**—(1) Any highway to be constructed under this Order shall be completed to the reasonable satisfaction of the highway authority and shall, unless otherwise agreed by the highway authority and the Executive, be maintained by and at the expense of the Executive for a period of 12 months from its completion and at the expiry of that period by and at the expense of the highway authority.

(2) Where a highway is altered or diverted under this Order, the altered or diverted part of the highway shall when completed to the reasonable satisfaction of the highway authority, unless otherwise agreed, be maintained by and at the expense of the Executive for a period of 12 months from its completion and at the expiry of that period by and at the expense of the highway authority.

(3) Paragraphs (1) and (2) do not apply in relation to the structure of any bridge carrying a highway over a tramroad of the Executive or carrying a tramroad of the Executive over a highway.

(4) Nothing in this article shall prejudice the operation of section 87 of the 1991 Act (prospectively maintainable highways); and the Executive shall not by reason of any duty under this article to maintain a street be taken to be the street authority in relation to that street for the purposes of Part III of that Act.

(5) Nothing in paragraphs (1) to (4) shall have effect in relation to street works as respects which the provisions of Part III of the 1991 Act apply.

(6) In any action against the Executive in respect of damage resulting from any failure by it to maintain a highway under this article, it is a defence (without prejudice to any other defence or the application of the law relating to contributory negligence) to prove that the Executive had taken such care as in all the circumstances was reasonably required to secure that the part of the highway to which the action relates was not dangerous to traffic.

(7) For the purposes of a defence under paragraph (6), the court shall in particular have regard to the following matters—

- (a) the character of the highway, including its use for a railway or tramway, and the traffic which was reasonably to be expected to use it;
- (b) the standard of maintenance appropriate for a highway of that character and used by such traffic;
- (c) the state of repair in which a reasonable person would have expected to find the highway;

---

**Status:** This is the original version (as it was originally made). This item of legislation is currently only available in its original format.

---

- (d) whether the Executive knew, or could reasonably have been expected to know, that the condition of the part of the highway to which the action relates was likely to cause danger to users of the highway;
- (e) where the Executive could not reasonably have been expected to repair that part of the highway before the cause of action arose, what warning notices of its condition had been displayed;

but for the purposes of such a defence it is not relevant to prove that the Executive had arranged for a competent person to carry out or supervise the maintenance of the part of the highway to which the action relates unless it is also proved that the Executive had given him proper instructions with regard to the maintenance of the street and that he had carried out those instructions.