



Environment & Transport Select Committee  
19 September 2012

## **Review of the Surrey Priority Road Network and Associated Projects**

### **Purpose of the report:**

For Members to consider options for change, based on current best practice, legal precedent, network characteristics and functionality, as they affect the existing Surrey Priority Network (SPN). Approval of the recommendations, including ongoing activities concerning revised policies, practices and standards, will recognise the current and forecast situation in Surrey and better inform future decision making on this key highway asset.

This report also introduces for consideration a variety of Highway and Asset Management projects that are either directly or indirectly associated with the review of the SPN and have influence on policies, programmes and procedures.

### **Introduction:**

The SPN hierarchy forms the basis for Asset Management and Highway Maintenance Management and, as such, is the foundation for a coherent, consistent and auditable maintenance regime in the county.

Since the SPN was introduced 25 years ago there has not been a review on the scale of this project. Previous attempts have been undertaken but a lack of good traffic data, particularly for the lower class roads, has been a stumbling block. When the SPN was originally set up the M25 and other main routes and links were still not fully operational and subsequently brought significant change to traffic movements in and around the county.

SCC does not currently comply fully with the Code of Practice for Well-Maintained Highways 2005 (CoP). Benchmarking work with other local authorities indicates that they have increasingly moved over time to identify their networks into categories broadly reflecting the COP guidance. Best practice, supported by Asset Planning Group (APG), Highways Senior Management Team, the Directorate Leadership Team and Legal Services, indicates there is now a need to revise the SPN and include five categories of network, with enhanced safety inspection frequencies in Surrey.

The current review of the SPN hierarchy has specifically considered, using all the available data, each road section on the network. The hierarchy categories identified through this process will become the hook on which Asset Management and Highway Maintenance Management policies and standards are attached, together with associated performance targets and Asset Management 'Outcomes based' objectives in due course.

E&TSC are asked to consider the work undertaken to date and the options and recommendations relating to the SPN, together with the associated projects identified in this report. This is in order to approve appropriate amendments that reflect changes in network characteristics and functionality so maintenance policies, practices and standards can then be revised to reflect the current situation on the highway network in Surrey.

It is subsequently intended to report agreed proposals for change to Cabinet as these will have extensive and far reaching impacts on the way Surrey addresses and implements its Asset Management and Highway Maintenance Management regimes in the future.

<b>Details:</b>
-----------------

1. It is important that the SPN, our Asset Management and Highway Maintenance Management network, reflects the current needs, priorities and actual use of each road in the network and that it is updated regularly. Current work, detailed in this report, begins to fulfil this requirement and recognises that hierarchies are dynamic and require regular review and amendment to reflect ongoing changes to the network and its use and demands throughout the county.
2. The identification and use of a highway network hierarchy provides the council with the foundation for coherent, consistent and auditable maintenance strategies and regimes. It is also essential for Asset Management in establishing appropriate Levels of Service (LoS) on our extensive, diverse and heavily used highway network and to facilitate our role in managing, co-ordination and regulating occupation of the network effectively.
3. With reference to the current Well-Maintained Highways (CoP), 2005, the following may be used in determining the network and as the basis for assessing risk:-
  - Importance – relating to strategic and local demands, centres of community, traffic flows, including Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGV's) and use e.g. access to major hospitals, shopping areas etc.
  - Environment – rural, urban, busy shopping or residential streets, protected streets, streets with engineering difficulty, traffic sensitive streets etc.
  - Non-vehicular factors – e.g. footway and cycle usage requiring their own defined hierarchies
4. Collectively these issues are referred to as the 'functionality' of the section of highway in question. Priorities, maintenance standards, resource allocation, performance target are then directly linked to the functionality of each part of the hierarchy. The key issue is that the hierarchy, therefore, determines the link between policy and the successful implementation of Asset Management and Highway Maintenance Management regimes.

**Background:**

5. The SPN was initially created in 1987 as a network around which policies, strategies and programmes were developed specifically for highway maintenance management purposes. Its relationship with other networks, used for alternative purposes nationally and within the county, was again reviewed by Members in the early 1990's with policies and standards included in MaPS Volume 1, Highway Maintenance, and published with member approval in May 1993.
6. At that time it was recognised the various network types e.g. Classified Roads, Strategic Routes, Primary Routes etc. could cause confusion in terms of their use and objectives. However, MaPS records the fact that, after consideration of the then Highway Maintenance Code of Good Practice (1987), members decided to establish the SPN hierarchy based on the Code, but modified to reduce the number of categories to 'manageable proportions' in order to simplify administration and outputs. Ultimately the intention was, and remains, to target available maintenance funds to where they are most needed and to provide a robust defence for the authority under Section 58 of the Highways Act 1980 in the event of a challenge in the courts of a failure to maintain.
7. The current CoP was published in July 2005. The Code confirms the importance of reviewing hierarchies to reflect changes in network characteristics and 'functionality', so that maintenance policies, practices and standards reflect the current situation, rather than the use expected when the hierarchy was originally defined. To progress this in Surrey, the current project commenced in the summer of 2010 with the aim of reviewing work done previously and consulting with Area Highway Managers (AHM's), and their teams, to identify the need for change and any anomalies in the current SPN, both perceived and actual.
8. As a result of this exercise approximately 300 new manual survey sites were identified countywide to support proposed change and update the county traffic model. In addition to automatic surveys undertaken annually, manual surveys have been included to produce forecast changes to traffic flows as a result of major capital works e.g. A3 Hindhead Tunnel and M25 Junction 10, Wisley Services. Combined with the latest information on county network usage in the vicinity of M25, M23, M3, A3 A331, and other primary routes in and adjacent to Surrey, the model now provides us with the most resilient traffic data on which to base the current review of the SPN.
9. Much of the current work explained in this report provides the framework for subsequent, regular reviews that, it is proposed, should be undertaken annually by the Asset Planning Group. This will enable the variety of changes expected each year on our highway network to be properly evaluated and revisions made to the SPN as necessary. It is also recognised that the current work is only the start of this ongoing process and there will be anomalies and gaps identified that require further investigation and resolution to further modify our network data and inventory, together with our standards, policies and procedures.
10. The current work also drives the regular review and publishing of relevant web based Asset Management and Highway Maintenance Management information for stakeholders. Furthermore, much of the work will be used, by APG, to consolidate, update and publish Asset and Highway Maintenance documentation for use and reference internally and externally. Both the Surrey Transport Asset Management Plan (STAMP) and Surrey Highway Network Maintenance Management Plan (SHNMMP) are currently undergoing review and this work, together with a similar

review of our Manual of Policies and Standards (MaPS), Volume 1, Highway Maintenance, will provide a sound basis for future highway maintenance and asset management implementation and operations in the county.

### **SPN – Current Surrey situation**

11. As previously indicated, Surrey has operated the currently designated SPN since the early 1990's, with minor amendments to category descriptions in the interim. Most recent reference to the SPN is included in the Highway Safety Inspection Policy (Fourth Edition) published, following Cabinet approval, in May 2011.
12. This report contains traffic flow trend and forecast information, produced by the Surrey County Traffic Model Team, which is recognised as an integral part of any hierarchy review.
13. Based on the traffic flow data provided by the model, and consideration of other factors, this report also proposes an alternative SPN in order to accommodate identified changes while balancing current resources and public expectations with the most current risk management and insurance demands.
14. This process to date, with the inclusion of officers and members to scrutinise and comment on the proposals, its documentation and ultimate consideration and approval by Cabinet, is considered to provide an appropriate audit trail for decision-making. It will also enable Asset Management and Highway Maintenance Management policies, strategies, processes and regimes to be revised and publicised to further enhance the council's defence against future claims relating to the SPN.

### **SPN Review**

15. During the autumn of 2010 consultations took place with Area Highway Managers (AHM's) and their teams to review the existing SPN and identify those roads which, from local knowledge, experience and feedback from customers, should either be considered for an increase or decrease in status.
16. This exercise identified some anomalies when comparing local network status and usage and also gaps in traffic flow data to corroborate such change. As a result, approximately 150 new sites were initially identified for manual traffic counts to supplement existing data, including automatic count data, and these were mainly completed by July 2011. Work to process the data was undertaken jointly, by APG and colleagues in the Traffic Modelling Team, to provide a current and robust traffic model for the SPN and other purposes.
17. Work with the AHM's and their teams also identified changes by virtue of what has previously been referred to collectively as 'functionality'. This effectively took into account those changes in network use and management required to ensure that the whole network is as reflective of current circumstances and conditions as it can be based on currently available information and knowledge.

### **The Surrey County Model and Traffic Flow Trend Analysis:**

18. National traffic data issued by the DfT (Road Statistics 2009), the most recent available information, indicates nationally a 1% fall in overall traffic volumes in 2009, which followed a 0.8% fall between 2007 and 2008. HGV traffic also fell by 8.2% in 2009, to a level below that recorded in 1999. Based on this, and other locally

derived data, the following summarises trends and forecast traffic conditions likely to affect Surrey:

19. Since 2000, traffic growth in Surrey has been hovering around 0%, with some years just above and some years just below. Since 2007, traffic (vehicle kilometres) has been declining, mirroring the national trend due to the economy. On the Surrey road network traffic levels fell by 1.3% between 2007 and 2008 and fell by a further 1.1% between 2008 and 2009.
20. This trend is also reflected in congestion data, which continued its downward trend in 2009-10, with journey times falling to 3 minutes and 21 seconds per mile during the weekday school term morning peak period (07.30 – 09.30), a reduction of 1 second over 2008-09.
21. The Department of Transport also monitors traffic speeds on 'A' roads during the weekday morning peak period (07.00 – 10.00) and this data confirms the trend in Surrey with average speeds increasing slightly over this period on the local road network. Average speeds rose from 23.9 mph in May 2008 to 24.3 mph in 2009 and again to 24.6 mph in 2010.
22. Traffic growth tends to follow national economic trends so there will be a tendency for traffic to grow (or decline) along with economic growth. In the short-term, especially with the recent lowering of economic growth prospects for the UK, traffic growth can be expected to be low. It can also be expected that traffic growth rates will increase as economic growth strengthens.
23. In Surrey, traffic levels in peak periods have been relatively stable. This trend can be expected to continue and, although there may be some traffic growth in these periods, it is anticipated that a large proportion of traffic growth will occur in the inter-peak period. The pattern of trip-making has changed over recent years, with individuals making less commuting trips but higher numbers of leisure related trips, which tend to take place outside the main peaks.
24. In terms of identifying the SPN, this trend data suggests the current thresholds (18,000 Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) and 12,000 AADT for SPN 1 and 2 networks respectively) are currently adequate. However, they are likely to need adjustment in future years and should, therefore, be kept under regular review.
25. The Surrey County Traffic Model (SINTRAM) is used to forecast traffic levels on the county's roads and informs various projects, for both internal and external stakeholders. The model includes all 'A' and 'B' roads in and around the county, most 'C' roads and a limited number of 'D' roads. The 'C' and 'D' roads currently included are those previously identified as carrying relatively high traffic flows, including those links that carry through traffic and act as 'rat-runs'.
26. As such, the model has been used to review the current SPN. There is no other tool available that provides such up-to-date data and comprehensive coverage of the county highway network.

#### **Traffic Model Methodology:**

27. The SPN relies on AADT data for decision-making, whereas SINTRAM models average hourly traffic flow data for three different time periods, the morning peak (07.00 – 10.00), evening peak (16.00 – 19.00) and the inter-peak (10.00 – 16.00).

Through calibration and extensive checks the hourly data has been converted into AADT.

28. The AADT model data and integral HGV flow data have both been validated according to current DfT standards and, following verification against observed data, found to be a good match.
29. Following the validation and verification stage, APG also ran the SPN database and model data jointly to test network coverage, continuity and compatibility and maximise confidence in the options data generated. It is key that these databases are combined in due course to maximise our ability to test options and opportunities while minimising manual intervention.
30. As anticipated on a countywide project of this scale, some anomalies and data gaps existed but these have been identified and recorded for future traffic counts.
31. The 'repeatability' of this methodology is essential to provide a framework for future review.

#### **SPN Options Review:**

32. The most significant outcome of the 2011/12 traffic modelling exercise is that AADT flows on many of the network links across the county was found to be less than might have been anticipated. Network testing using the same criteria (18,000 and 12,000 AADT - already agreed with the Traffic Modelling Team) created a substantially different SPN network with large areas, especially in the southern, rural districts served mainly by SPN 3 routes.
33. Further option testing was undertaken by reducing the existing criteria (by 1,000 AADT incrementally) to assess when the network 'reappeared' based on the 2011 traffic flows. The testing re-confirmed that the 18,000 and 12,000 AADT totals are appropriate but with a large number of SPN2 (2009) roads being reclassified as SPN3 (2009). A further level of testing, using 8,000 AADT, was extremely helpful in defining differences between C and unclassified D road networks and also identified anomalies in other areas of network definition that have been recorded for further clarification.
34. The lower tier SPN 3 (2009) roads cannot currently be based on AADT data, as for SPN 1 and 2, because of the unrealistic level of traffic count data that would be required. For this reason the definition relies on usage, including the size of settlement served and the number of buses that use the route.
35. A 'property density grid' has also been developed by APG for both the 'Rural' and 'Urban' definitions and to identify link roads between settlements. The grid, comprised of 200m squares, spatially joins a count of 'address points' within each area to graphically illustrate property density across the county. The grid also counts 'organisation points' that identify areas of commerce and industry. This information has enabled identification of a further priority band in SPN3 (2009), to differentiate between link roads and local access roads, which is an important improvement to our network knowledge.
36. As a result the alternative SPN developed provides the opportunity to practically adjust the existing hierarchy, including route descriptions and definitions, so it more readily aligns with the CoP (2005). It also includes reference to Rights of Way, previously unallocated roads and private roads.

37. Based on the all the above and considering CoP 2005 guidance, the most recent legal precedent (*Wilkinson v York*) and legal advice referred to later in this report, there is considered to be a very strong and compelling case for introducing a revised SPN with a phased implementation as soon as practically possible.
38. The comparison of existing and proposed SPN categories and descriptions, together with revised inspection frequencies, is included at Annex 1.
39. This revised SPN provides a number of significant advantages to the council, as indicated below:-
- The proposal is substantially in accordance with CoP guidance and thus more generally satisfies the increased legal demands for compliance generated by recent legal advice following *Wilkinson v York*.
  - The five proposed SPN categories for carriageways will enable improved identification of the network and better definition of Asset Management and Highway Maintenance Management needs and priorities.
  - The categories have been revised to include AADT and HGV totals (HGV's revised up to 650 cvpd from 600) developed to suit 2012 network changes.
  - Descriptions of typical use include reference to population size to reflect community issues raised through winter service development and gives a gauge for anticipated network usage.
  - The proposed introduction of population centres helps to demonstrate network connectivity, both in Surrey and across the borders into neighbouring authorities.
  - Population centres also illustrate the density and close proximity of communities, especially in the north of the county. They also identify those centres affected by through route(s) based on enhanced AADT /HGV data and locally identified issues.
  - By defining five rather than three SPN categories improved and focused asset data will become available, especially on proposed Link (4a) and Local Access (4b) roads. This will facilitate future decision-making on prioritisation, LoS, maintenance planning, and funding allocations for example.
  - The proposed distinction between 'Urban' and 'Rural' network lengths referred to in the descriptions is based on property density rather than the normal convention of a speed limit above or below 40mph. This is because the county has previously introduced extensive 40mph speed limit orders, e.g. Surrey Hills, that make the existing definitions and network extents unrepresentative.
  - Within the proposed SPN the maintenance history and future works proposals for each highway link will be more easily identified and focused when based on five categories.
  - The five categories will also enable further work to properly include Countryside assets and clarify the status and maintenance requirements of other highways such as Byways Open to All Traffic (BOATS) and Restricted Byways that currently exist but without agreed inspection and maintenance regimes (SPN 5).
40. An appraisal of national best practice suggests that HGV flows are not widely used in the hierarchy road descriptions developed by other authorities. This may be due to the fact that they do not have the benefit of a particularly well established and validated county traffic flow model, as in Surrey, to provide analyse across their highway networks.
41. Current SPN descriptions refer to 600 HGV movements over > or < 25% of the route as one criteria in the road descriptions. The current review has established that a growth factor of 131% should be applied to the HGV criteria between 1986 and 2009

(based on 500 cvpd in 1986). This relates to the proposed figure of 650 HGV movements in the 2012 SPN proposal.

42. Bus route distribution and service frequency has been investigated in detail over the last two years, as part of the Winter Service Review and has been used to inform the 2012 SPN proposals and route descriptions where appropriate.

#### **SPN - The Current Legal View:**

43. As indicated in the background to this report, members originally approved the current SPN categories on the basis that they provided Surrey with a generally compliant maintenance hierarchy but with the categories reduced to 'manageable proportions' for administration and management purposes. The CoP 2005 provides further guidance and clearly indicates that compliance is, in terms of risk and liability management, the best approach with approval from members required, particularly for any deviations from the Code. Invariably these matters have great influence and standing in court when officers are required to personally appear to defend claims against the council.
44. Approval of the Highway Safety Inspections (HSI) Policy, published in May 2011, including reference to the SPN hierarchy, indicates that members support the long-standing, current approach within the county.
45. It is, however, important to consider options to further clarify the SPN, with reference to the CoP 2005, and obtain Cabinet approval to the methodology and any policy changes for the foreseeable future. Member scrutiny and approval of the maintenance network hierarchy is a key element in the procedure and provides clear endorsement of the work that constitutes a general risk assessment of the county's approach to Asset Management and Highway Maintenance Management policy and implementation. It is also believed to provide the best possible defence against future claims involving road category and/or inspection frequency issues, as referred to previously.
46. Investigation of the standards adopted by other authorities countywide since the CoP 2005 guidance was published suggest that inspection frequencies currently adopted by Surrey remain 'broadly in line' with that considered best practice.
47. However, the results of a consultation exercise involving nineteen unitary and county authorities spread across England suggests that 'best practice' standards for the frequency of safety inspections applied by the majority exceeds those currently applied by Surrey.
48. The current SPN arrangements in Surrey demonstrate a long history of successful risk and claims management, substantiated by the level of claim repudiation. The evidence, therefore, suggests that our policy of broadly matched compliance with the CoP has been successful to date.
49. However, judgement by the Court of Appeal in the case of *Wilkinson v City of York Council* (18 January 2011) indicates that resource constraints can play no part when looking at a defence under Section 58 of the Highways Act 1980. Furthermore, supporting comment produced by our barrister indicates that, although not binding, the COP is regarded by the courts as 'authoritative' and variations from its inspection frequencies can only be undertaken following a risk assessment and an approval and adoption process involving Cabinet.



50. This is further substantiated by *Stephens v LB Bromley (10 August 2011)* where it is stated that the COP inspection frequencies, although a guide, are held in high regard by the courts. It would, therefore, be unwise for a local authority to depart from the COP without risk assessing the reasons for doing so, and to demonstrate that the departure from Code was appropriate.
51. Further to a recent court case successfully defended by SCC, legal opinion indicates that HSI documentation should in future also make specific reference to the inspection of highway verges, with appropriate intervention standards clearly defined.

#### **Footways and Cycleways:**

52. Inventory data for footway and cycleway categories has historically been less well developed than for carriageways and some other assets. However, Surrey is better placed now as survey work is well into its third year, on a projected four year cycle. This is supported by information provided by our aerial survey.
53. The current designation of footpaths and cycleways has previously been limited to existing category 1 and some 2 footways. Surrey has no category 1a footways and the identification and appropriate categorisation of type 3 and 4 footways has been problematic in the past.
54. Data obtained from the footway network survey is now providing essential information and knowledge building a sound basis for the determination of footway categories by their location and usage into the appropriate categories. The review and update of these categories, together with appropriate adjustments to inspection frequencies, to reflect Surrey's current circumstances, is a continuing priority.

#### **Town Paths and 'D' Road footpaths:**

55. Considerable work has been completed over time by the Highway Information, Rights of Way and Local Delivery Teams to review and record the location and extent of Town Paths and 'D' Road footpaths in each of the Borough and District areas.
56. Based on this information it can now be confirmed that the current length of Town Paths countywide is 127kms while the total length of 'D' Road footpaths is 119kms.
57. The extent to which these footpaths are currently included on inspection routes and maintained remains work in progress. The impact on inspection resources is not, however, considered to be significant in the context of the overall network.
58. Most of these footpaths, due to their nature and location, are situated off and between Link and Local Access Roads on the network and will, therefore, attract an annual inspection frequency. Based on a safety inspector completing 5kms of walked inspections a day it is calculated the whole Town Path and 'D' road footpath network can be inspected in approximately 50 days.
59. It is noted that the revenue cost of bringing these footpaths up to a serviceable standard may be considerable and there is likely to be a significant workload that will require prioritisation and planning, in addition to funding.

**Gullicksen and Ley:**

60. The case of *Gullicksen v Pembrookshire County Council (July 2002)* concerned a trip resulting in personal injury that occurred on a housing estate footpath. The council lost the case on the basis that the footpath in question was ultimately deemed, by the court, to be a highway maintainable at public expense and, therefore, liable for its maintenance. The case has probably cost local authorities across the country millions of pounds in the interim.
61. The case of *Ley v Devon County Council* was brought on similar grounds but, on appeal, the grounds for the case, and *Gullicksen*, were fully re-examined and the original ruling overturned. The outcome remains that each case must be dealt with individually and based on the facts, including where necessary, Land Registry records, OS maps, photographic evidence, length of public use etc. and with common sense applied to determine whether the public has a right to pass and re-pass unhindered.
62. In these circumstances the determination and joint agreement between local authorities on the highway boundary in each housing development, and along all road frontages, is essential. The establishment of maintenance responsibilities up to and beyond the agreed boundary, with documentary evidence, will then determine liability.

**Highway Information Team Boundary Project:**

63. The result of *Gullicksen and Ley* is that each area and length of the public highway must be determined and agreed, with evidence where necessary, in order to identify the extent of all highway and transport assets for which the authority has a maintenance responsibility and potential liability. The process enables the asset inventory and condition data to be properly updated and maintenance plans and inspection regimes to be established and recorded as required.
64. Failure to do so will ultimately result in dispute and the potential for the council to be held liable for claims and maintenance activities that are not its responsibility.
65. The current HIT Boundary Project addresses these issues and essentially provides an 'invest to save' opportunity. The detailed legal, technical and plotting work involved in the project is extremely resource hungry but the outputs are fundamental to efficient and effective stewardship of the highway network. Furthermore, the project enables the council to respond to highway boundary and development queries etc. from internal and external stakeholders and assist in resolving risk and insurance issues.
66. This project is ongoing and running in parallel with the footway surveys for each of the Borough and Districts.

**Highway Safety Inspections:**

67. The benefits of aligning our inspections with the CoP by increasing frequency on high usage sections of the network, both road and footway, will have the following effects:-
- improve our response to defects forming on the network
  - the same number of defects may be initially identified annually

- over time a larger proportion of defects will be P3 rather than P1 or P2 allowing for improved programming and reduced unit cost
  - improved intervention will lead to a reduction in reactive responses over time with more efficient and effective capital programmed works
  - a reduction in the number of defects reported by Community Highway Officers (CHO's) and the Public (from sample audit 50% of all defects)
  - public perception of highway maintenance operations and outcomes should improve with less defects reported leading to improved local and national survey results
68. CoP guidance supports the use of driven inspections, except in built areas with adjacent footways, where walked inspections are suggested in particular circumstances.
69. An evaluation of the proposed new inspection regime referred to in Annex 1, suggests that whilst the frequency of highway inspections would increase this will be offset by increased driven inspections which can cover a substantially greater distances.
70. Currently highway inspections are undertaken on predetermined monthly inspection cycles. The revised inspection regime and frequencies proposed will redefine the inspection schedules leading to more efficient and effective ways of working.
71. The revised SPN network will provide the opportunity to re-design driven routes for carriageway inspections and, subject to approval, a phased implementation could commence on 1 April 2013.
72. The Footway and Cycleway Network review is part of a 4 year programme which includes both survey and highway boundary definition. As previously reported, the survey is currently in the third year of a four year cycle and, due to its complexity, it is proposed walked safety inspections on this network should also be phased in commencing in the NW area.
73. This proposed phased approach for both carriageway and footway/cycleway inspection changes will provide an opportunity to review the new arrangements on a sample network or area and make any necessary adjustments prior to its roll out across the county. During the transition period it has been agreed with Legal Services that the council will continue to maintain and defend highway claims as detailed in the current HSI Policy for those sections remaining on the existing network.

**Financial implications:**

74. The proposed inspection frequency and methodology previously referred to has been tested with Finance Team colleagues to ensure it is auditable and sustainable. The objective has been to identify opportunities to improve efficiency (i.e. more driven inspections) and productivity (by testing theoretical data against actual) to demonstrate improved compliance against the CoP is possible within current resource levels.

**Introduction and implications of new SPN:**

75. Introduction of the proposed SPN will significantly impact on many Highway functions and activities and also influence work undertaken by other groups in E&I and across the council.

Highway Safety Inspection Matrix

76. With greater emphasis on driven inspections full consideration must be given to the types of defect that can be identified by this method and reflected in the matrix. The HSI matrix is currently being reviewed as part of the 'Defect' workstream established at the Surrey Highways Roadmap Workshop held at Merrow on 8 March 2012 and includes reference to the SPN review.
77. The removal of condition defect reporting from the highway safety inspection regime will require alternative inspection and reporting processes to be established.

Influence on Lot 1 Contract

78. The proposed change in inspection type and frequency will affect the contract safety inspection matrix and impact on existing payment methods and revenue budgets. Further analysis of these and associated matters has still to be completed.
79. The new network will need to be incorporated within Maximo, May Gurneys management system. This system has still to be evaluated to ensure that it can meet the requirements of an enhanced inspection regime

Influence on Other Contracts

80. Both the gully cleansing and road marking contracts are appended to the current SPN with set frequencies of intervention. Whilst the overall road lengths within each priority will remain approximately the same there has been considerable movement in the middle band with roads being promoted and demoted. This particularly affects the "C" class roads, 80% of which have been reclassified to a lower priority. Further consideration of how these contracts are managed is required.

Major Maintenance Programmes

81. Work to date on Project Horizon includes use and reference to the proposed SPN categories. The process has enabled sample sections of the network to be reviewed on site to validate the hierarchy status assigned.

**Benefits to Surrey residents of proposed action:**

82. The SPN hierarchy is the foundation for coherent, consistent and auditable Asset Management and Highway Maintenance Management strategies and regimes that will be widely communicated and available to inform the public of what we can and cannot do.
83. The proposed SPN hierarchy reflects the current needs, priorities and actual use of each road in the network and will be used to identify needs based provision of services and identify appropriate LoS.
84. The proposed SPN will substantially improve data and information for decision-making and the subsequent drafting of revised Asset Management and Highway Maintenance Policies and Strategies.

85. The proposed SPN will enhance the ability of APG to fully evaluate and potentially implement 'Outcomes Based' Asset Management objectives in the future.

<b>Recommendations:</b>
-------------------------

**It is recommended that the Committee:**

- a) Approve for use Option 1 for the Carriageway Hierarchy (CoP standard) categories and inspection frequencies described in this report and detailed in Annex 1.
- b) Approve for use Option 1 for the Footway and Cycleway Hierarchy categories and inspection frequencies described in this report and detailed in Annex 2 and 3.
- c) Support the continued development of a phased introduction for a) and b) above, details of which will be reported to Cabinet on 27 November 2012.
- d) Approve an annual rolling programme of up to 150 new and updated traffic counts to facilitate the continued joint development of the Surrey County Traffic Model and SPN database (especially on the proposed SPN 3, 4a and 4b networks).
- e) Approve continued work to integrate the SPN database and Surrey County Traffic Model so future accuracy of options testing based on a single methodology is maintained.
- f) Agrees that APG should, in future, undertake an annual review to update the SPN in accordance with the methodology described in this report to ensure that network change and functionality continue to be appropriately reflected.
- g) Supports the continuation of the HIT Boundary Project and Footway Network Survey in support of the SPN review.
- h) Agrees that the data and analysis included in this report informs and supports the 'Defect' work-stream established at the Surrey Highways Roadmap Workshop held on 8 March 2012.

<b>Next Steps:</b>
--------------------

In addition to current reporting arrangements presentations on the SPN and associated projects are planned for ETSC and Cabinet.

A report will be submitted to Cabinet on 27 November 2012.

-----

**Report contacts:** Peter Agent (Asset Planning Group Manager) and Simon Mitchell (Maintenance Plan Team Leader)

**Contact details:** [peter.agent@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:peter.agent@surreycc.gov.uk) and [simon.mitchell@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:simon.mitchell@surreycc.gov.uk)

**Sources/background papers:**

Code of Practice for Well-Maintained Highways 2005 (updated August 2012).

Reports to the Surrey Highways Senior Management Team on 3 October 2011 and 9 February 2012.

Presentation to the E&I Directorate Leadership Team on 4 April 2012.

Presentation to the Cabinet Member. Risk and Insurance Group and Legal Services on 6 July 2012.

**Annexes:**

- 1 – SCC Carriageway Hierarchy
- 2 – SCC Footway Hierarchy
- 3 – SCC Cycleway Hierarchy