

**MINUTES OF THE SCRUTINY REVIEW - REPAIRS TO HIGHWAYS & FOOTPATHS
MONDAY, 31 OCTOBER 2005**

Councillors Winskill (Chair)

Apologies Councillor (none)

Also Present: Councillor (none)

MINUTE NO.	SUBJECT/DECISION	ACTION BY
SCRHF01.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (IF ANY)</p> <p>None received</p>	
SCRHF02.	<p>URGENT BUSINESS</p> <p>None notified</p>	
SCRHF03.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST, IF ANY, IN RESPECT OF ITEMS ON THIS AGENDA</p> <p>None notified</p>	
SCRHF04.	<p>MINUTES - TO CONFIRM AND SIGN THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 20 OCTOBER 2005</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held on 20 October 2005 were agreed and signed</p>	
SCRHF05.	<p>INTERVIEW SESSION WITH JOHN CROWLEY (MAINSTONE) CONTRACTORS & RICHARD CARTER (GABRIEL, CONTRACTORS)</p> <p>*This was an informal meeting of the review panel.</p> <p>Next Day Fix Project Closure</p> <p>It was noted that the next day fix pilot began in April 2005 and scheduled to run for 6 months in the east of the Borough under a fixed based contract with Gabriels. The purpose of the pilot was to improve the performance of reactive repairs to the street scene through the review, redesign and improvement of the Street scene reactive maintenance process. The following benefits of the pilot were identified:</p> <p>(a) To improve public perceptions on the condition of roads and footways in the borough.</p> <p>(b) To achieve a faster response time to repair highways defects.</p> <p>(c) To improve the quality of fault reporting data</p> <p>(d) To reduce the likelihood of insurance claims resulting from accidents and injuries on the highway.</p> <p>Inspect and fix – this related to inspection carried out by the</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE SCRUTINY REVIEW - REPAIRS TO HIGHWAYS & FOOTPATHS
MONDAY, 31 OCTOBER 2005**

contractors before the due inspection date. Repairs were carried out in accordance with the Council's inspection manual. This was central to the process change since it removed the 24 hour, 7-day and 28-day time limits and ensured a faster response time.

Next day fix – contractors responded to defects reported by Members of the council and the public. These were inspected when reported and a works order generated for work to be carried out the next day. The purpose of this was to ensure a faster response to reported defects.

In addition regular monthly monitoring meetings were held between the contractors and the service.

Due to concerns about the quality of repair works undertaken by the contractors, officers reported that 100% pre-fix inspections were carried out by the Council's inspectors during the final two months of the pilot. This assessed and monitored the standard and numbers of repairs. Where this was deemed unsatisfactory the contractors were requested to bring the quality of the work up to standard. At the start of the contract the percentage was 20% pre-fix inspection. A system of penalties could be incorporated into any new contract in the future.

Currently there are four inspectors in the borough. It was noted that some authorities such as LB Camden used in-house inspectors to undertake pre inspection work but external consultants were commissioned to undertake performance inspection.

Insurance Liability

Under the pilot scheme once defects were reported insurance liability became the responsibility of the contractor – it is unclear at the present time how this would impact on insurance premiums.

Tendering – The Chair wanted to know how prospective contractors were made of the tendering process since only Gabriels have been carrying out the work over a number of years. There was a need to ensure that as many companies were involved in the tendering process as others firms were doing similar works. Officers stated that the service was looking for quality as well as value for money; details of inspection regime and investment would be provided to perspective contractors.

Highways Asset Management Plan

Officers stated that all local authorities are required (by the Government) to have an (AMP) Asset Management Plan in place by 2007. Haringey have appointed an external consultant (OPUS) to carry out an analysis of cost, and future investment needs of its Highways infrastructure. It was anticipated that a draft AMP would be presented to Members in November 2005. The AMP would enable improvements to be made to the infrastructure of principal (A) roads Classified and Unclassified Road. Consultation included carriageway and footways. Transport for London has carried out surveys of

**MINUTES OF THE SCRUTINY REVIEW - REPAIRS TO HIGHWAYS & FOOTPATHS
MONDAY, 31 OCTOBER 2005**

principal roads, using a traffic signal method to indicate how critical the conditions of the roads are.

United Kingdom Pavement Management System

UKPMS is the standard system for the assessment of UK local road network conditions and for the planning of investment and maintenance on paved carriageways, kerbs, footways and cycle-tracks within the UK. There are currently 5 accredited systems that incorporate UKPMS.

Endorsed and promoted by the Roads Board, it is required by the government for the production of Best Value Performance Indicators on Local Roads, and is recommended as best practice for local road maintenance in the *Code of Good Practice for Maintenance Management*. Its objective is to ensure an efficient UK pavement Management System is in place to allow monitoring of highway condition to assess whether 10-year Transport Plan targets of eliminating highway maintenance backlog are being reached.

UKPMS comprise a wide range of highway maintenance management functionality, include the following broad requirements:

- ✚ The location and referencing of highways, including footways and cycle ways.
- ✚ The recording of an inventory of maintenance assets within the highway.
- ✚ Recording of condition indicators collected from various visual and machine surveys.
- ✚ Selection of options and requirements for remedial works.
- ✚ Costing of potential works.
- ✚ Management of budgets.
- ✚ Analysis of budgetary and maintenance needs for highways networks.
- ✚ Prioritisation of potential works on a condition (i.e. 'worse first') basis.
- ✚ Projection of future condition based on historic deterioration, and on engineering models of deterioration for given designs, constructions types and pavement life profiles.
- ✚ Prioritising of potential schemes for work using econometric principles; for example, assigning higher priority to those schemes where to intervene would obviate the need for a more costly future treatment.

Officers stated that this model was in place in the Highways Service however training was needed on how to operate the system. It is a central government requirement to have UKPMS and the data is used to inform the AMP.

Use of buses.

The increased used on back streets by buses have also put added

**MINUTES OF THE SCRUTINY REVIEW - REPAIRS TO HIGHWAYS & FOOTPATHS
MONDAY, 31 OCTOBER 2005**

pressure on the infrastructure. It was noted that the Highways Service was considering reclassifying some of these roads in an attempt to lever funds from Transport for London (TfL) and strong representation would be made to TfL.

Best Value Performance Indicators

With reference to Best Value Performance Indicators (BVPis) it was noted that these are based on government standards to improve road condition and street infrastructure. The following indicators were noted:

To improve road condition and street infrastructure (EIP Priority)		
TARGETS & PERFORMANCE MEASURES		
BVPI 96 Improve condition principal roads by 3%.		
BVPI 97a Improve the condition of classified roads to 8%.		
BVPI 97b Improve the condition of unclassified roads to 18%		
BVPI 187a Reduce % footways needing repair to (TBC)		
BVPI 105 Make safe 100% of dangerous damage to roads & pavements within 24 hrs		
RS Improve satisfaction with roads and pavements by to 37%		

Risk Management - Trees

We noted that insurance claims relating to trees was the largest claims made against the council. With reference to other authorities, we noted that Westminster Council used a planned tree replacement programme, replacing larger trees with smaller ones. Cones are then placed in the ground; new trees are planted in the cones which encouraged the roots to grow downwards resulting in reduced insurance claims. It was the view of the panel that each time a tree was replaced or removed pavement works should be carried out immediately; that this should form part of the formal contract between the council and contractors.

The panel requested the following information:

- ✚ Flow chart mapping the process from when repairs are reported to when they are repaired.
- ✚ Comparison before and after Next Day Fix pilot scheme
- ✚ Indication of the response time between the east and west of the borough.
- ✚ A briefing note outlining new requirements on highways maintenance by the Government.

**MINUTES OF THE SCRUTINY REVIEW - REPAIRS TO HIGHWAYS & FOOTPATHS
MONDAY, 31 OCTOBER 2005**

COUNCILLOR DAVID WINSKILL

Chair