



**OFFICER REPORT TO LOCAL COMMITTEE
(EPSOM AND EWELL)**

**RELATIVE POSITIONS OF ROAD NETWORK AND STREET
LIGHTING ISSUES IN EPSOM AND EWELL**

10 SEPTEMBER 2007

KEY ISSUE

The report shows the relative position of the road network in Epsom and Ewell set against the Best Value Performance Indicators used to measure the highway network.

SUMMARY

The district of Runnymede appears to have the best highway network in Surrey with Epsom and Ewell sitting fifth. The level of street lighting faults show Mole Valley having the lowest level of faults with Epsom and Ewell being second.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATIONS

The Local Committee (Epsom and Ewell) is asked to agree that:

- (i) The Local Committee of Epsom and Ewell is asked to note this report.

1 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

- 1.1 The purpose to this report is to give a view as to where the various districts in the East of Surrey sit within a prioritised list with regard the state of the highway network when using best value performance data and to indicate the relative level of street lighting faults across the five eastern districts.
- 1.2 The four best value performance indicators used are based on the year 2005/06.
- 1.3 This report is not making judgements about intervention levels nor is it looking at any underlying causes, it is simply showing relative position of the districts.

2 ANALYSIS

Roads

The following tables show the position of the districts in Surrey against various B.V.P.I.s. with their road network requiring intervention: i.e. improvement works to its running surface.

Principal Road Network (B.V.P.I. 223)

Districts	BVPI 223 Value	Relative Position – least defects
Runnymede	9	2
Spelthorne	11	4
Surrey Heath	8	1
Woking	11	4
Elmbridge	15	5
Epsom & Ewell	17	7
Guildford	16	6
Mole Valley	10	3
Reigate & Banstead	11	4
Tandridge	9	2
Waverley	17	7

Non Principal Road Network (B.V.P.I. 224A)

Districts	BVPI 224A Value	Relative Position – least defects
Runnymede	13	3
Spelthorne	11	1
Surrey Heath	15	4
Woking	12	2
Elmbridge	16	5
Epsom & Ewell	16	5
Guildford	21	6
Mole Valley	25	7
Reigate & Banstead	27	8
Tandridge	16	5
Waverley	28	9

Detailed Course Visual Inspection –Cat 1 & 2 Footways B.V.P.I. 187

Districts	Cat 1 & 2 Footways B.V.P.I. 187	Relative Position – least defects
Runnymede	9.1	1
Spelthorne	43.8	10
Surrey Heath	10	2
Woking	33	6
Elmbridge	47.3	11
Epsom & Ewell	18.5	4
Guildford	35.1	8
Mole Valley	34.5	7
Reigate & Banstead	41.4	9
Tandridge	31.7	5
Waverley	18.2	3

Unclassified Network (B.V.P.I. 224B)

Districts	BVPI 224B Value	Relative Position – least defects
Runnymede	6.3	1
Spelthorne	18.3	10
Surrey Heath	10.1	2
Woking	12	6
Elmbridge	17.7	11
Epsom & Ewell	15.1	4
Guildford	14.6	8
Mole Valley	19.8	7
Reigate & Banstead	18.4	9
Tandridge	17.9	5
Waverley	14.9	3

From the above the following matrix can be derived:

District	BVPI223	BVPI224A	BVPI187	BVPI224B	Unweighted Average
Runnymede	2	3	1	1	1.75
Spelthorne	4	1	10	10	6.25
Surrey Heath	1	4	2	2	2.25
Woking	4	2	6	6	4.5
Elmbridge	5	5	11	11	8
Epsom & Ewell	7	5	4	4	5
Guildford	6	6	8	8	7
Mole Valley	3	7	7	7	6
Reigate & Banstead	4	8	9	9	7.5
Tandridge	2	5	5	5	4.25
Waverley	7	9	3	3	5.5

Therefore a very crude position statement of the districts would be:

District Relative Positions

District	Score
Runnymede	1.75
Surrey Heath	2.25
Tandridge	4.25
Woking	4.5
Epsom & Ewell	5
Waverley	5.5
Mole Valley	6
Spelthorne	6.25
Guildford	7
Reigate & Banstead	7.5
Elmbridge	8

It has not been possible to compare pot-hole data to kilometre length of carriageway and footway unfortunately to give a weighted position to compare to the above table.

Street Lights

The following table shows the number of reported faults per district in the East over the last financial year 2006 / 2007.

D	TU	A	M	J	JU	AU	S	O	N	D	J	F	MA
E	12412	156	248	158	155	174	201	231	266	153	315	231	248
EE	8069	84	148	127	114	158	109	127	169	95	255	192	243
MV	6873	102	159	123	108	140	100	136	161	125	166	160	176
RB	12450	136	241	160	233	258	244	253	258	181	310	257	269
T	6532	66	101	97	63	108	111	92	82	91	162	146	93

Legend for the above:

D = District
 E = Elmbridge
 EE = Epsom & Ewell
 MV = Mole Valley
 RB = Reigate & Banstead
 T = Tandridge
 TU = Total Units in district

From the above the following table has been derived

District	Total Faults	Faults per unit	Performance
Elmbridge	2536	4.894	4
Epsom & Ewell	1821	4.431	2
Mole Valley	1651	4.150	1
Reigate & Banstead	2800	4.4446	3
Tandridge	1212	5.389	5

3 OPTIONS

3.1 Roads – The table above titled District Relative Positions gives a crude listing and must be read with some health warnings. The table has not been weighted for road length / footway length against each B.V.P.I. category. The above data is best read as four separate tables, which are indicative of each district area.

3.2 Street Lights – The level of street lighting faults across the districts apart from Tandridge is relatively similar.

4 FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS

4.1 There are none.

5 EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS

5.1 There are none.

6 CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS

6.1 A high quality of street lighting kept to a good standard does reassure communities.

7 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 Roads – The only district which scores highly is Runnymede, which has had a high level of inward investment over a number of years. There does not appear to be any obvious patterns within the other districts.

7.2 Street Lights – Apart from Tandridge the relative fault level of the districts is relative similar.

8 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

8.1 There are none, the report is for noting only.

9 WHAT HAPPENS NEXT

9.1 There are no next actions.

LEAD OFFICER: Roger Archer-Reeves, East Area Transportation Group
Manager

TELEPHONE NUMBER: 08456 009 009

E-MAIL: RogerArcherReeves/ENV/SCC

CONTACT OFFICER:
TELEPHONE NUMBER:

E-MAIL:

BACKGROUND PAPERS:

Version No. Date: Time: Initials: No of annexes: