

Appendix 2

| PLACE SCRUTINY REVIEW OF ROAD REPAIRS – ACTION PLAN | | | |
|--|--|---|--------------------------|
| SCRUTINY RECOMMENDATION | | DIRECTOR'S RESPONSE AND ACTION PLAN | TIMESCALE |
| R1. | The Council examines how it could better communicate with residents on highways maintenance policies and practices, and the Committee would welcome the opportunity to work with Officers to achieve this (e.g. how the Council achieves value for money). | <p>The Department has recently produced a Members' Guide to Highway Maintenance which the Review Board reported as being very useful. The Department would welcome the further opportunity to work with a sub-group of the Place Scrutiny Committee to advise on improving communications with those Members, parish and town councils.</p> <p>The Department would particularly welcome working with Members to expand the feedback from residents to help broaden our benchmarking data as the Service.</p> | On-going 12-18 months |
| R2. | Officers conduct a pilot into the feasibility of introducing a new approach to repair all neighbouring potholes at the same time, within a given distance of a category 2 or 3 intervention standard pothole using the funding allocated from the Department for Transport (DfT) pothole fund for the pilot. | <p>Moving away from the current approach to the repair of potholes risks undermining the Council's Asset Management Strategy. It would also increase the overall cost of the highways service. Moving from an asset management approach would impact outcomes and risk losing the Council's Department for Transport Band 3 status and associated incentive element of its funding.</p> <p>While we recognise the concerns of the board the Department works within a finite budget, at a time when financial resources are constrained, and it is more cost effective and best practice to invest in the planned resurfacing of roads to prevent potholes forming, rather than to repair potholes on a reactive basis.</p> | |

| | | | |
|-----|--|--|--|
| | | <p>The Department already addresses those neighbouring potholes that do not meet the Council's intervention criteria. When identifying a pothole(s) at intervention level the Highway Stewards also make recommendations for larger-scale patch repairs of adjacent potholes, where it is appropriate. Whilst not in the same timescale, these Steward recommendations are added to the Council's patching programme and repairs are carried out on a prioritised, planned basis.</p> <p>The approach to the repair of potholes accords with industry best practice and DfT guidance. It also supports the Councils statutory defence of claims under S58 of the Highways Act as well as Council Policy that sets out very clear intervention criteria and repair timescales.</p> <p>The Department recommends continuing with the current approach to repairing those safety defects that trigger the current intervention criteria and within the Council's prescribed timescales.</p> | |
| R3. | Scrutiny should be consulted on the use of any future one-off highways funding from Government, before work has been programmed via a Review Board of the Committee. | <p>Scrutiny Committee has oversight of all highways expenditure as all investment in highways, both base and one-off funding, is spent in accordance with the Asset Management Plan, which is available for review by Place Scrutiny.</p> <p>The timing of DfT announcements of pothole and other one-off funding does not always allow for consultation with Scrutiny Committee.</p> <p>The most recent funding of £4.7m was announced by the DfT shortly before Christmas, to spend before the end of the 2018/19 financial year. The timescales for spending this</p> | |

| | | | |
|-----|--|--|-----------|
| | | money is extremely short, but the Council was able to allocate funding to those highest priority schemes across the county from its Asset Plan. | |
| R4. | That the existing level of capital investment in roads through planned maintenance and the Asset Management approach is maintained and if possible increased, as this is the most cost effective way of repairing potholes. | The Department welcomes this recommendation to support the Council's Asset Management approach to highway maintenance. | |
| R5. | The Council explores the possibility of identifying additional funding to improve the condition of pavements, via existing sources of funding and partnership working. | The Council invests £1.4m pa in pavement maintenance. Any additional funding would need to be provided within the current funding envelope and therefore an increase over and above the £1.4m would reduce funding available for other highway related improvements. Any additional funding for improving the condition of pavements would be explored within the RPPR context | |
| R6. | The condition of the remaining 50% of pavements is surveyed, and a measure of the condition of pavements is developed within the next 2 years, so that their condition can be monitored and the impact of any additional investment can be assessed. | Whilst there is no statutory requirement to do this and report to the DfT as there is with carriageways, the Department agrees with this recommendation and will put in place a condition survey regime to report on the overall condition of pavements across the county within the timescales suggested by the Board. | 24 months |
| R7. | The Council considers using its powers to ban parking on pavements and verges in problem areas, as part of regular parking reviews. | The Council already has the ability to introduce, and does introduce pavement and verge parking restrictions and corresponding enforcement. Such restrictions can be requested and considered through the annual parking reviews that are carried out in Lewes, Eastbourne and Hastings where the County Council has civil parking enforcement powers. | Ongoing |
| R8. | Safety defect intervention criteria are defined for the different types of pavement surfacing, and insurance claims for pavements are separately recorded. | The Department considers the existing intervention criteria are appropriate for pavements, irrespective of their makeup. The Department advocates a continuation of its Asset Management Strategy and to tackle defects in pavements | Ongoing |

| | | | |
|------|---|---|----------|
| | | through targeted planned maintenance programmes. | |
| R9. | Increase the amount of sampling and inspections to 20% to monitor and assure the quality of road repairs or reinstatements, and the work carried out prior to resurfacing, particularly those carried out by utility companies. | <p>The Department considers it meets its legal responsibilities under the Traffic Management Act and ensures adequate quality of workmanship from its current level of sampling and inspections.</p> <p>The management of utility workings through the Council's Permitting scheme and the inspection of those works are carried out by the Council's Highway Maintenance contractor. The highway maintenance contract is outcome based and is governed by the requirements of the Traffic Management Act which stipulates levels of sampling and inspection.</p> <p>The existing sampling and inspection regime comprises a number of different inspections at different timescales following a utility company repair, as well as taking core samples from finished reinstatements. The Traffic Management Act also enables financial penalties to be applied for compliance failures. The DfT is currently consulting on extending the period utility companies are responsible for road condition after undertaking works.</p> <p>The Compliance and Performance Team and Contract Supervisors carry out regular audits of the council's contractor. They collect performance data and evidence of compliance and non-compliance with the contract requirements. They develop specific actions and plans to correct and improve performance. This information is shared with Members annually and the Place Scrutiny Committee will be updated on the year 3 performance later this year.</p> | 6 months |
| R10. | Officers develop a work programme to complete the Council's knowledge of the highway drainage network, including determining the cost and | The Department recognises the importance of completing its knowledge of the highway drainage infrastructure which is undertaken in parallel with its aims to resolve flooding hot- | 6 months |

| | | | |
|------|---|--|----------|
| | <p>timeframe for this work, focussing initially on utilising the remaining additional capital investment to gain knowledge of parts of the network that require repair and replacement as a priority. The work programme is to be reported to the Scrutiny Committee in September 2019.</p> | <p>spots.</p> <p>The recent increase in funding for highway drainage is welcomed and drainage engineers are using the increased level of resource to complete a far greater number of investigations and resolve flooding problems at the same time.</p> <p>The Department will report progress to Scrutiny Committee in September 2019.</p> | |
| R11. | <p>Joint work is undertaken with District and Borough Councils to improve street sweeping, particularly in autumn, to prevent highway gullies and other drainage becoming blocked with leaves and other debris.</p> | <p>The Board heard that there is already a good level of partnership working with Borough and District Councils.</p> <p>Litter picking and street cleansing is a Borough and District Council responsibility and in Wealden, Rother, Hastings and Eastbourne the service is currently carried out by their waste collection contractor. That contract ends in June when a new contractor will take over waste collection and street cleansing in Wealden, Rother and Hastings, whilst in Lewes and Eastbourne the service is being brought back in-house. The Department has been working closely with all five borough and district councils in the lead up to the new arrangements to ensure the outcomes are reflected in these new arrangements.</p> | On-going |