

Report to: **Scrutiny Committee for Economy, Transport and Environment**

Date: **18 March 2013**

By: **Chairman of the Project Board**

Title of report: **Scrutiny Review of Street Works in East Sussex – final report**

Purpose of report: **To present the outcomes of the scrutiny review and make recommendations.**

RECOMMENDATION: That the Committee considers the report of the Project Board and makes recommendations to Cabinet for comment, and County Council for approval.

1. Financial Appraisal

1.1 There are no specific financial implications at this stage.

2. Summary

2.1 The Project Board comprised Councillors Richard Stogdon, (Chairman), Godfrey Daniel and Jon Freeman.

2.2 The attached report contains the findings and recommendations of the Project Board. An evidence pack of supporting documentation is available on request from the contact officer.

2.3 The Committee is recommended to receive the Project Board's report for submission to Cabinet and County Council on 11 June and 16 July respectively..

3. Recommendation

3.1 The Committee is requested to consider and endorse the report of the Project Board for submission to Cabinet and Full Council.

COUNCILLOR RICHARD STOGDON
Chairman of Project Board

Contact Officer: Paul Dean Tel No. 01273 481751

Local Members: All

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

None

Scrutiny review of street works in East Sussex

Report by the Review Board

of the Economy, Transport and Environment Scrutiny Committee

Councillor Richard Stogdon (Chairman)

Councillor Godfrey Daniel

Councillor Jon Freeman

March 2013

Economy, Transport and Environment Scrutiny Committee – 18 March 2013

Cabinet – 11 June 2013

Full Council – 16 July 2013



Report of the scrutiny review of street works in East Sussex

Contents

Recommendations	3
Overview	4
Issues	5
1. Access to information about works on the highway	5
2. Permit scheme for East Sussex	6
3. Communication and street works	7
4. Standard of reinstatements	9
5. Code of conduct between the Council and utility companies	11
6. Concluding comments	12
Appendix	14
Scope and terms of reference	14
Review Board Members	14
Witnesses	14
List of evidence papers.....	15

Recommendations		Page
1	As part of their requirement to cooperate, utility companies should share their annual operating plans with the Council as soon as they have been agreed.	6
2	The Highways team should share its resurfacing programme with the Highways Development Control team to get as early warning as possible of new developments likely to require works to the highways to provide utility connections.	6
3	The County Council should attend meetings of stakeholders organised by relevant utility companies to gain early notice of draft operating plans.	6
4	The Review Board supports the introduction of a shared permit scheme for East Sussex and Surrey; the extent to which the expected benefits of the scheme in reducing disruption are realised should be monitored carefully, and reported to scrutiny in due course.	7
5	The Council should encourage utility companies to adopt the kinds of positive publicity and communication practices followed by Southern Water and Southern Gas Networks regarding: branding, information on signs, and problem reporting.	8
6	The Council should collect and publish utility companies' communication performance, the objective being to encourage the poor performers to improve, or risk a negative response amongst their wider stakeholder group.	8
7	Utility companies should be urged to inform local councillors of projected street works in their area, and consider sharing their internal newsletters and communications with staff about expected standards when carrying out street works.	9
8	The Council should undertake coring tests on a higher percentage of highway reinstatements, but targeted more towards utility companies that have a historically high failure rate.	11
9	The Council should collect and publish utility companies' reinstatement performance information based on the coring programme results.	11
10	The Council should compare highway reinstatement coring test results work with those of neighbouring authorities to help determine and tackle the underlying reasons for poor reinstatement performance.	11
11	Where reinstatements persistently fail to meet DfT specifications and alternative or 'soft' approaches fail to result in improvements, the Council should not hesitate to prosecute the companies responsible for every failed reinstatement; and, publicise the outcome of such action.	11
12	The use of temporary reinstatements of highway works should be actively discouraged. Where they are essential, those responsible should ensure their works identify the relevant utility company and the anticipated date of the full reinstatement.	11
13	The Council should develop and introduce a code of conduct between the Council and utility companies with an appropriately high level of political endorsement and involvement.	12

Overview

1. The maintenance and improvement of the road network, and the utility distribution networks that run beneath it, are vital to the prosperity of East Sussex. However, the associated street works often cause considerable disruption to road users, local residents and businesses.
2. East Sussex County Council (as the highway authority) and the utility companies responsible for gas, electricity, water, sewerage and telecommunications carry out the vast majority of street works on the highways of East Sussex. In 2011/12, the Council received some 14,900 notifications of street works from utility companies. This is a similar number to previous years, although there has been a slight downward trend over time.
3. Highway authorities are responsible for co-ordinating planned street works on the non-strategic road network and have the power to fine or prosecute utility companies if, for example, works overrun or reinstatements fail inspection. Good coordination is important because it leads to the highway being disrupted for less time, with less congestion and fewer newly resurfaced roads being dug up.
4. Utility companies have the right to access, replace and repair their underground 'apparatus'. They are required to notify the highway authority between three days and three months in advance of any planned street works and must reinstate the highway to the standards set in the Department for Transport (DfT) Code of Practice.
5. Most street works (around 90%) are planned in advance. The remainder are classed as emergency works although the proportion varies considerably between utility companies. Highway authorities have little opportunity to manage the impact of emergency works because, by definition, they invariably happen at short notice.
6. Utility companies produce a five-year investment programme for their regulators (Ofcom, Ofgem and Ofwat). The DfT recommends that companies share their programmes with highway authorities to assist them in the co-ordination of street works. However, in practice, the Council does not receive the plans early enough to be helpful.
7. Despite the powers that the Council possesses to manage street works, and the requirement for utility companies to co-operate, there is evidence that:
 - there is an insufficiently effective dialogue between the Council and utility companies, making the Council's co-ordination role more difficult;
 - advertisement of street works to local communities is defective in many cases;
 - the quality of many reinstatements is demonstrably poor – which has left a legacy of underlying problems on the East Sussex highways network.
8. We have made recommendations to address these issues. We also recommend that the County Council and the utility companies establish and work to a new 'code of conduct' on street works. Such an agreement between Transport for London (TfL) and utility companies in London has proved to be very effective at tackling some of the most intransigent highways works difficulties.

Issues

1. Access to information about works on the highway

9. The Council has a duty to co-ordinate street works for the purposes of safety, minimising disruption and maintaining the road network and the utility apparatus beneath it.

10. Street works vary considerably in size and impact and can helpfully be categorised using Department for Transport (DfT) definitions:

- **Major works**, having a planned duration of more than 10 days, are usually undertaken to upgrade infrastructure often with significant impact on road users and local communities. In such cases the Council receives at least three months notice.
- **Minor or standard works** comprise the vast majority of all street works. Typically, they are for new customer connections. In these cases the Council receives three to ten days notice.
- **Emergency works** are mainly carried out by the water and gas companies to repair leaks and bursts. Works typically last from a few hours to a couple of days. The Council normally receives very little advance notice, if any.

11. The Council's ability to coordinate emergency works is clearly problematic given the short notice and short duration of these kinds of works. The better provision of advance notice for street works offers the greatest scope for improvement.

Major works

12. Utility companies are required to notify the Council of all major works. The Review Board found that companies currently tend to give only the minimum required notice for these works, which, in turn, makes it difficult for the Council to carry out its coordinating role effectively. Yet, these companies do produce five-year investment programmes, along with detailed annual operating plans, for their regulators. These plans identify most major works they intend to carry out for a period of up to a year ahead.

13. Therefore, it would be highly beneficial if the Council could see the operating plans as soon as they are produced, rather than waiting for the three months notice of each individual project. To date, that has not happened. However, all the utility companies interviewed by the Review Board indicated a willingness to share their operating plans sooner.

14. South East Water holds annual meetings to discuss its draft plans with interested stakeholders. The Board recommends that the Council take part in these kinds of utility-led initiatives.

Minor or standard works

15. Minor and standard works require only a few days' notice to be provided to the Council and therefore they potentially create a significant coordination problem. Particularly galling is the number of newly surfaced roads being damaged by utility works. More notice and improved coordination between works by utility companies and council highways could lead to fewer cases of newly resurfaced roads being dug up.

16. Department for Transport guidelines do enable the Council to restrict utility companies from undertaking planned works on newly resurfaced roads for a period of two years. However, some works, such as new customer connections, are excluded from this provision. The County Council needs better and quicker access to intelligence about when and where these kinds of works are likely to occur.

17. County Council Highways Development Control has links with district and borough development control teams. These teams are likely to have the most detailed intelligence about planning applications that will require utility highways works.

18. As a minimum, the Council's Highways team should share its highway resurfacing plans with the County Council's Highways Development Control team on a regular basis to provide the best chance of improving coordination of utilities' minor or standard works.

Recommendations

- 1. As part of their requirement to cooperate, utility companies should share their annual operating plans with the Council as soon as they have been agreed.**
- 2. The Highways team should share its resurfacing programme with the Highways Development Control team to get as early warning as possible of new developments likely to require works to the highways to provide utility connections.**
- 3. The County Council should attend meetings of stakeholders organised by relevant utility companies to gain early notice of draft operating plans.**

2. Permit scheme for East Sussex

19. Permit schemes are currently authorised by the Secretary of State under the Traffic Management Act (2004). Over 50 highway authorities, including Birmingham, Manchester, Kent and most London boroughs, have already adopted schemes in recent years.

20. On 28 January 2013 the Lead Member for Transport and Environment approved the application for a common shared permit scheme for East Sussex and Surrey. The scheme should provide greater opportunities for the Council to co-ordinate the street works of different utility companies alongside its own highways works. The key feature is that utility companies will need to *seek permission* to dig up the road, by applying for a permit, instead of merely *notifying* the Council as they do at present.

21. The anticipated benefits from the permit scheme in East Sussex include:

- a reduction in the time utility companies occupy the highways (Kent County Council found that its scheme led to an annual reduction of about 5%)
- utility companies planning their works more efficiently by, for example, consolidating what might otherwise be separate jobs under one permit rather than repeatedly returning to the same road;
- different utility companies either sharing street excavations or 'taking turns' occupying the same stretch of highway, to avoid multiple street works in the same area at the same time;
- less inconvenience caused by unsuitable storage arrangements for associated machinery and excavated material;
- more reinstatements of the highway being done properly first time and fewer temporary or faulty reinstatements.

22. The utility companies interviewed by the Board acknowledged that there were benefits to introducing a permit scheme in East Sussex. Some were sceptical as to whether the benefits would outweigh the costs, especially on smaller roads where the scope to realise beneficial coordination was limited. Undoubtedly, the charges levied by the Council for permits would be passed on to the companies' customers, but the amounts per individual customer are projected to be minimal.

23. The annual cost to the Council of running the scheme is estimated at £140,000. This will be covered by the income from the permit fees.

24. The Review Board supports the Lead Member's decision to introduce a permit scheme for East Sussex. However, in so doing, the Board recognises that it may not be a universal solution to all the problems the Council faces. The aims of the scheme in reducing disruption should be set out very clearly when it is introduced. The extent to which the benefits are realised should be assessed in due course.

Recommendation

4. The Review Board supports the introduction of a shared permit scheme for East Sussex and Surrey; the extent to which the expected benefits of the scheme in reducing disruption are realised should be monitored carefully, and reported to scrutiny in due course.

3. Communication and street works

25. Regardless of what utility or highways operators do on the highways, there is a justifiable expectation by everyone affected that those carrying out the work will provide adequate information about the timing of the works, and their scope. What constitutes 'adequate' depends on the nature of the works. Most importantly, the level and type of communication needs to be proportionate to the size of the works and anticipated level of disruption.

26. Local residents, businesses and road users complain about street works for reasons that are often attributable to a simple failure to communicate:

- a lack of prior notice of works;
- no indication who is carrying out the street work or why;
- street works appearing to have been left unfinished for days;
- works overrunning without warning;
- an apparent lack of coordination with multiple works appearing, one after another, on the same stretch of road.

27. Effectively communicating these most basic pieces of information for every street works operation should, to a great extent, alleviate many people's grievances about street works.

28. Most utility companies admit that, historically, they have not taken their obligations to communicate to residents, and provide relevant publicity, particularly responsibly. In recent years some have begun to address these concerns as they have realised that failing to properly manage this aspect of their business impacts directly on their reputation.

29. Some of the utility companies interviewed by the Board, especially the regional companies, have considerably improved the way they manage communications about street works. To enhance their role as 'corporate citizens', two companies, in particular, outlined particularly impressive initiatives:

Southern Water:

- has clear branding signage on all contractor vehicles and a visible *Southern Water* branded poster on every works site – so there is no 'hiding behind' a contractor;

- places an 'Image is everything' poster at every site. Primarily directed at contractor staff, the poster says "The way we manage our street works affects the way our customers think of us" – so the gangs take greater care and pride in their work and the poster provides a direct line for anyone to report problems to Southern Water directly.

Southern Gas Networks:

- stated that they use a suite of signs that explain the reason for works, in particular the absence of any gangs onsite. For example: "We are waiting for the concrete to cure";
- encourages site managers to report any problems with street works to alert the highway authority to possible delays.

30. The Review Board welcomes these initiatives and wants to see every utility company adopting similar approaches towards improving their customer communications. Ultimately, the Board wishes to see customers and stakeholders receiving an appropriate and consistently high level of communication from all utility companies about street works. The Council should use its influence to promote good practice and publicise both positive and negative examples.

Elected Members as important stakeholders

31. Elected Members receive considerable numbers of complaints from residents about the disruption caused by works on the highways. This is typically where a utility company has failed to inform local residents about the works in advance, or posters or leaflet drops have not been read, or where it is unclear who is carrying out the works leaving the resident unsure about where and how to complain.

32. If all councillors were to receive advance notice of street works, along with basic information such as the duration and level of anticipated disruption, then they would be in a good position to help and advise complainants.

33. Southern Water publishes an in-house newsletter called "Improving Customer Experience (ICE) News". Amongst other things, ICE News sets out the company's expectations of its staff when carrying out street works and describes expected minimum standard in site working arrangements.

34. The Review Board considered that all councillors would benefit from receiving this kind of information from the utility companies working in their area. Even though the material is aimed primarily at the company's staff, elected Members would find the information useful when, say, trying to determine the right course of action for an aggrieved resident.

35. Armed with all this information and their local knowledge, Members may even be able to pre-warn utility companies of particular issues or likely adverse local public reaction. They would thus help to play a part in maintaining good public relations between the companies and local communities. Utility companies should therefore view elected councillors at parish, district/borough and county level as particularly important and helpful stakeholders.

Recommendations

5. The Council should encourage utility companies to adopt the kinds of positive publicity and communication practices followed by Southern Water and Southern Gas Networks regarding: branding, information on signs, and problem reporting.

6. The Council should collect and publish utility companies' communication performance, the objective being to encourage the poor performers to improve, or risk a negative response amongst their wider stakeholder group.

7. Utility companies should be urged to inform local councillors of projected street works in their area, and consider sharing their internal newsletters and communications with staff about expected standards when carrying out street works.

4. Standard of reinstatements

36. The utility companies that dig up roads and pavements in East Sussex have the responsibility to reinstate them once the works are completed. Utility companies remain liable for the repair of reinstatements for a period of two years, and beyond that if the reinstatement is not carried out in accordance with the specifications. The technical specifications for highway reinstatements are contained in a DfT code of practice: "*Specification for the reinstatement of openings in highways*".

37. The act of digging up the road, and then reinstating it, has the potential to weaken the structure of the road around it. However, the risk is considerably greater if the reinstatement does not meet DfT specifications. These reinstatements are far more susceptible to water damage and increased wear and tear, giving rise to potholes and other problems. If these defects are not detected and repaired early, the costs escalate and ultimately fall upon the Council for repair.

38. A huge legacy of many years of poor reinstatements on East Sussex highways has now left the Council with a network in a significantly worse state than it should be.

39. As well as complying with technical specifications, the Council also requires roads to be reinstated, using like for like materials, as far as practicable. This is particularly important in town centres and conservation areas where specialist stone or other rare surfacing materials are often found.

40. Utility companies, interviewed by the Board, highlighted some of the reasons why reinstatements seem to cause them so many problems. They described how difficult it can be to meet the tough technical specifications in practice, and suggested that East Sussex is perhaps 'tougher' in its inspection regime than elsewhere. This might account for differences in their performance in different local authority areas.

Testing more reinstatements for quality

41. The County Council randomly selects 30% of all street works for an inspection both whilst works are in progress and after completion. There were approximately 4,000 inspections in 2011/12, out of 14,900 notified street works. Inspection testing is carried out visually, or by using a more detailed 'coring' method which involves physically removing a core of the reinstated section of road for analysis.

42. If a reinstatement fails the coring test, the utility company currently pays the Council £130 (to cover costs) and additionally up to £150 in 'fines'. However, the company pays nothing for reinstatements that pass.

43. The Council uses an independent contractor to core test a randomly selected 10% of all reinstatements. The coring test produces a significantly higher failure rate (76% in 2011/12) than the visual inspections (10%) because visual inspections are less likely to identify underlying faults that become apparent on a more detailed physical inspection.

44. Extrapolating this result to the complete set suggests that there may be as many as 11,000 road-work reinstatements carried out in just one year in East Sussex that fail to meet DfT specifications. There is considerable variation in the pass rate for reinstatements between the utility companies. Two companies in particular (Southern Water and South East Water) currently have a comparatively lower failure rate of 40-45%.

45. An initial response to this situation might be to propose that the Council should undertake a coring test on every reinstatement. However, there is no evidence that this approach works well elsewhere or that it would be the most cost effective use of the Council's resources in the long term. Should the failure rate fall below approximately 50%, then there is likely to be a net cost to the Council of running the testing programme.

46. However, the Review Board recommends that it would be worth shifting the focus of coring tests to reflect the historical performance of utility companies. In other words, the Council could test a greater proportion of the reinstatements by the worst performing companies, and fewer by those companies that perform well. This is likely to prove more beneficial overall than simply increasing the number of random coring tests across the board.

47. The council should collect and publish utility companies' reinstatement performance information based on the coring programme results in the same way as we have proposed for their communication performance above. This would hopefully encourage the poor performers to improve, or risk a negative response amongst their wider stakeholder group.

48. Utility companies could commission coring tests on all their own reinstatements, using suitably independent testing operators; they would then automatically deal with all defects that came to light. Some companies interviewed by the Board responded more favourably than others to this suggestion, as there are clearly significant cost implications both in carrying out the tests and in dealing with the consequences. This is an idea that is perhaps worth pursuing under the code of conduct 'umbrella' discussed below.

Temporary reinstatements

49. In certain instances, such as for emergency works, utility companies sometimes install a temporary reinstatement that can be in place for several months before returning to complete the job permanently. Many residents' complaints are about temporary reinstatements being of poor quality or unsightly, for example when bitumen is used in place of paving stones. Repairing a temporary reinstatement involves two visits and therefore creates double disruption.

50. We consider that the Council should actively discourage the use of temporary reinstatements on the basis that it is hard to envisage any benefit for anyone at all. However, if there is absolutely no alternative, then the County Council should require further steps to minimise the problems.

51. South East Water, for example, plans to date stamp their temporary reinstatements so that it is clear to whom the works belong and gives an indication of the date by which the highway will be reinstated properly. We would like to see all companies adopt this practice.

Sub contractors

52. A further strand concerned the relationship between the large utility providers and their sub-contractors. The extent to which the utility companies exercise sufficient oversight and control of the work performed by their sub-contractors appears, at best, patchy. Teams and gangs are purported to move between sub-contractors, depending which has approved utility company listing at any given time. In short, merely switching sub-contractors is no guarantee of improved performance.

53. Sub-contractors' work is clearly responsible for many of the long-term defects to the highway. While it has not been common practice hitherto, the prospect of the Council taking legal action against offending sub-contractors may result in better standards of operation in general and reinstatements in particular. The Board considers that this option should be explored.

The future for reinstatement quality

54. From the evidence, the Review Board concluded that the County Council has hitherto had considerable difficulty in persuading utility companies to take the quality of highway reinstatements seriously. The coring test data shows this conclusively.

55. While the Board suggests that the County Council should adopt an uncompromising stance in regard to poor highway reinstatements, if necessary by raising legal proceedings, it is recognised that, initially, there is a need to build and maintain positive, co-operative relationships as a means to improving the quality of utilities' operations.

56. Twelve Highway Stewards were appointed in East Sussex in November 2011. Stewards are based in the community they serve and their main job is to look after the roads in their area. They are now familiar with their 'patches' and are in an ideal position to keep a close eye those who are actually digging up the roads. Stewards are able to build a working relationship with the gangs carrying out the works and can highlight any obvious reinstatement faults on the spot through visual inspections.

57. Stewards therefore provide the best opportunity to ensure that road work reinstatements meet DfT specifications. They should also help to obviate the need for more draconian, and expensive, means of enforcement. Problems are most likely to occur where faults develop afterwards or are not visibly apparent.

Recommendations

8. The Council should undertake coring tests on a higher percentage of highway reinstatements, but targeted more towards utility companies that have a historically high failure rate.

9. The Council should collect and publish utility companies' reinstatement performance information based on the coring programme results.

10. The Council should compare highway reinstatement coring test results work with those of neighbouring authorities to help determine and tackle the underlying reasons for poor reinstatement performance.

11. Where reinstatements persistently fail to meet DfT specifications and alternative or 'soft' approaches fail to result in improvements, the Council should not hesitate to prosecute the companies responsible for every failed reinstatement; and, publicise the outcome of such action.

12. The use of temporary reinstatements of highway works should be actively discouraged. Where they are essential, those responsible should ensure their works identify the relevant utility company and the anticipated date of the full reinstatement.

5. Code of Conduct between the Council and utility companies

58. A code of conduct between the Council and utility companies should help to improve and maintain the performance of utility companies on a range of road works issues that cause the greatest public concern. It would enable the Council to engage with the companies in a positive and productive way to secure many of the benefits and improvements that we have highlighted in this report. If it works well, there ought to be less need for the Council to use 'heavier' forms of enforcement such as prosecution.

59. Codes of conduct appear to work effectively elsewhere. All the utility companies working in London for example have signed up to the *Mayor's Code of Conduct for Road Works* which covers all stages of street works in the Capital. Utility companies meet with Transport for London (TfL) quarterly to explain their performance against agreed key performance indicators. The Code's success appears to be linked to the high profile leadership of the Mayor who personally meets company representatives every year. We consider that a similar high level Member commitment would help to ensure the scheme's success in East Sussex.

60. Two utility companies operating in East Sussex (UK Power Networks and Southern Gas Networks) are willing participants in, and endorse, the London Mayor's Code of Conduct. Two national bodies that have an interest in street works (the National Joint Utilities Committee and Highway authority Utilities Committee) endorse the 'code of conduct' approach.

61. In East Sussex the Review Board envisages that a code of conduct would cover a number of features including:

- details of the operation and benefits of the permit scheme;
- a commitment to provide standardised, high quality and proportionate public information about road works;
- improving the quality of reinstatements after road works are complete, and using like for like materials particularly in conservation areas and town centres;
- utility companies sharing investment programmes and annual operating plans promptly with the Council;
- minimising the use of temporary reinstatements;
- a commitment to sharing information and promoting good practices amongst signatories.

Recommendation

13. The Council should develop and introduce a code of conduct between the Council and utility companies with an appropriately high level of political endorsement and involvement.

6. Concluding comments

62. During this Review, the Board was considerably assisted by the participation of the various utility companies and it is of welcome significance that representatives attended to give evidence. The Board particularly welcomed the positive contributions by Southern Water and Southern Gas Networks. During our discussions, all the companies stressed the importance of their reputation.

63. Nonetheless, a key question to which the Board reverted again and again was that relating to the motivation of the utilities in engaging with the County Council and their declared intention to improve performance in a number of areas, principally:

- better communication with the County Council in providing due notice of street works;
- better communication with residents, road users and Members in regard to the timing and scope of street works; and
- better reinstatement of the highway upon completion of works.

64. To the question, "Why should there be a better overall performance going forward than there has been hitherto?", the answer from all the utility companies' representatives was that the main driver is dependence on good reputation.

65. However, it was less than clear what role reputation plays in the determination of the quality of performance. The Review Board was left unconvinced that reputation, in itself, is sufficient motivation to bring about the Council's long term objectives of improving the quality of road works reinstatements.

66. Another, driver was purported to be the accountability the utility companies owe to their shareholders/stakeholders.

67. Looking, firstly, at accountability to *shareholders*, there is significant difficulty in identifying shareholder interests. Nonetheless, the utilities are large, high profile organisations, almost monopolies, and their shareholder base is relatively certain to embrace a very large number of the residents of East Sussex, through pensions and other shareholder interests.

68. Secondly, looking at accountability to *stakeholders*, it appears that the utility companies are taking too narrow a view as to who holds a valid stakeholder interest. Whether investors or not, every resident of East Sussex is an important stakeholder in the utility companies operating here, be they individual customers, businesses or council tax payers. All are adversely affected by poorly managed road works, and ultimately foot the bill for failed reinstatements and unduly lengthy disruption of the road network.

69. The Review Board considers that the utility companies need to demonstrate a wider responsibility that is not exclusively or predominantly geared to meeting solely their shareholders' or regulatory bodies' interests. By developing closer, more co-operative relationships between the County Council, its highways contractor and the utility companies, it is hoped that altogether better results shall be attained for the road and pavement infrastructure in East Sussex in future.

Appendix

Scope and terms of reference

With ongoing Member concern at the high level of unacceptable reinstatements of East Sussex highways by utility companies, on 19 June 2012 the Economy, Transport and Environment Scrutiny Committee established this scrutiny review board to investigate the matter further and make recommendations.

Review Board Members

Councillors Richard Stogdon (Chairman), Godfrey Daniel and Jon Freeman

Support to the Board was provided by the following officers:

Karl Taylor, Assistant Director – Operations
Roger Williams, Head of Highways
Oscar Akintoye, Network Manager

Witnesses

Patrick Clarke, Director of Network Operations, UK Power Networks
Colin Barden, Head of Network Operations - South East Region, UK Power Networks
Simon Robertson, Head of Distribution East, South East Water
Oluseyi Aikulola, Highways Manager, South East Water
Richard Price, Head of Capital Delivery, Southern Water
Roy Clarke, Highways Manager, Southern Water
Dave Turnbull, Senior Regulatory Specialist, BT Openreach
Malcolm Russell, Director of Operations, Southern Gas Networks
Trevor Hoath, Southern Gas Networks
David Bailey, Operations Manager, May Gurney
David Short, Communications Manager, May Gurney

Review Board meeting dates

12 September 2012
27 November 2012
17 December 2012
4 January 2013
31 January 2013

The Board would particularly like to thank the representatives of the utility companies who came to talk to us so candidly and helped us gain such an invaluable insight into their business.

List of evidence papers

Item	Date
Department for Transport, Code of Practice for the Co-ordination of Street Works and Works for Road Purposes and Related Matters	4 th edition, 2012
Department for Transport, (Code of Practice) Specification for the reinstatement of openings in highways	3 rd edition, 2010
Transport for London, Mayor's Code of Conduct for Road Works	Progress report 1, February 2010
Southern Water, Improving Customer Experience News, Issue 9	January 2013
Hastings Borough Council, Scrutiny review report	May 2012
Highways Authorities & Utilities Committee (UK), Code of Conduct	May 2011

Contact officers for this review:

Paul Dean, Scrutiny Manager

Harvey Winder, Scrutiny Support Officer

Telephone: 01273 481751 or 01273 481796

E-mail: paul.dean@eastsussex.gov.uk or harvey.winder@eastsussex.gov.uk

East Sussex County Council

County Hall

St Anne's Crescent,

Lewes BN7 1UE