

## Post Project Review

Project Title	Reactive Weed Maintenance
Author	Fenella Lillywhite
Date	04/11/2022
Version	0.1

### Purpose of This Document

To collate and review the information and feedback from the trial of the reactive weed maintenance undertaken through the weed maintenance season of 2022.

To understand the successes and issues faced by undertaking reactive weed maintenance on select roads.

To present the outcome and conclusions made from this trial.

### Trial Overview

The reactive trial worked on the same principle as other highways reactive services, such as potholes, whereby ESCC would only attend to weed control when areas are identified by a highway steward inspection or via a customer report. Weeds would be removed when posing a health and safety risk or potential damage to the infrastructure.

The method of control would vary depending on location but would not include use of Glyphosate.

This was only an option on cul-de-sacs or residential roads with low-speed limits. See **Appendix A2** for list of reactive roads.

### Benefits Noted

- No Glyphosate used.
- Appeases residents against the use of glyphosate .
- Potential cost saving due to not going out across the County.

### Issues Noted

- Potential cost increase due to call out for specific tasks.
- Deterioration of assets over time.
- Summer 2022 was a dry season which means the effect of weeds cannot be fully understood.
- Public perception e.g. Highways are not undertaking works they are responsible for, cost cutting.

### Customer Cases

Year	Number of cases to do with weeds in trial areas.
2022	9
2021	4
2020	6
2019	8

From the 9 cases in 2022, 2 were in unadopted areas and 1 asking a general question. There has been no noted increase in customer cases due to the trial.

### **Highway Steward Feedback**

The Highway Stewards responsible for inspecting the trial locations have not noted any problems or safety issues due to the trial.

### **Contract and Commercial Supervisor Visits**

The Contract and Commercial Supervisors responsible for inspecting the trial locations have not noted any problems or safety issues due to the trial. However, have stated that it does look more untidy. See **Appendix B2** for images.

## **Costs**

There is potential for these situations to become more frequent if weeds are not maintained appropriately, year on year.

## **Outcome & Conclusion**

From the trial we have not identified any safety issues with this approach.

However, moving to a reactive approach would lead to a deterioration in asset condition if regular maintenance is not undertaken. The full impact will take several years to understand, however it is known that growth in road gullies and channels can slow down or prevent free drainage and therefore presents a safety hazard and weed growth can damage paved surfaces, displace kerb stones and crack walls, all of which make maintenance difficult and costly.

In addition, summer 2022 was not a typical season as it was abnormally dry. Suggestion would be to extend the trial another year and implement lessons learnt to improve the process.

## **Appendix A2 – Reactive Roads**

- Albion Street – Lewes
- Alfred Street, North Street, Union Street – Hastings
- Emmanuel Road – Hastings
- Hillyfield – Lewes
- Rotten Row – Lewes
- Springfield Road – Hastings
- St Georges Road – Hastings
- Courthouse street – Hastings
- All Saints Street – Hastings
- Highstreet – Hastings
- Dane Road – Hastings
- Dudley Road – Hastings
- Beaufort Road – Hastings
- Pleasant Row – Hastings
- Edmund Road – Hastings
- Mount Road – Hastings
- St Saviours Road – St Leonards
- Winterbourne Close – Lewes

## Appendix B2 – Images

### Rotten Row, Lewes



### Alfred Street – Hastings



**All Saints Steet – Hastings**



**Beaufort Road**



**Courthouse Street**



**Dane Road**



**Dudley Road**



**Edmund Road**



**High Street**



**Mount Road**



**North Street**



**St Georges Road**



**St Saviours Road**



**Springfield Road**





**Union Street**

