We welcome you to
Tandridge Local Committee
Your Councillors, Your Community
and the Issues that Matter to You

Supplementary Agenda

Petition Response – Sunnybanks
Petition – Stafford Road
Written Questions

Venue

Location: Tandridge District Council offices, Station Road East, Oxted, RH8 0BT
Date: Friday, 3 December 2021
Time: 10.15 am
To receive any petitions in accordance with Standing Order 68. Notice should be given in writing or by email to the Community Partnership and Committee Officer at least 14 days before the meeting. Alternatively, the petition can be submitted on-line through Surrey County Council’s e-petitions website as long as the minimum number of signatures (30) has been reached 14 days before the meeting. Deadline 12 noon on 18 Nov.

One petition has been received as follows:-

PETITION TO SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL TO INSTALL TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURES & A 20 MPH SPEED LIMIT IN SUNNYBANK, WARLINGHAM

We the undersigned residents of Sunnybank, Warlingham, request Surrey County Council to install traffic calming measures in Sunnybank due to the excessive speeds observed in the road which are a threat to pedestrian safety. These should be supported by a 20 mile an hour speed limit.

The petition response is attached.

A second petition was received as follows:-

Stafford Road in Caterham specifically from 224 to 310 is characterised by parking on both sides of the road with limited passing spaces. This results in a narrow road and any speeding even when only marginally over the current 30mph speed limit risks accidents or damage to vehicles as demonstrated by the accident on Saturday 3rd July 2021 where a number of vehicles were damaged.

Residents request the following

1. Reduction in speed – Limit to 20mph.
2. Appropriate speed mitigation measures to ensure appropriate speed. i.e. Speed bumps.
3. Review feasibility of a one-way system due to lack of parking spaces.
4. Tandridge council to investigate additional off street parking for the flats which have been converted from elderly care to general needs housing.
5. Increased police speed monitoring until appropriate mitigation is put in place.

The petition response is attached.

**FORMAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

To answer any questions from residents or businesses within the Tandridge District area in accordance with Standing Order 69. Notice should be given in writing or by email to the Community Partnership and Committee Officer by 12 noon four working days before the meeting.

Four questions were received and the questions and responses are attached.
SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

JOINT COMMITTEE (TANDRIDGE)

DATE: 3 DECEMBER 2021
SUBJECT: TRAFFIC CALMING IN SUNNYBANKS, WARLINGHAM
DIVISION: WARLINGHAM

PETITION DETAILS:

A petition has been received asking the County Council to install traffic calming measures and a 20mph speed limit in Sunnybank, Warlingham.

The petition includes the following details:

We the undersigned residents of Sunnybank, Warlingham, request Surrey County Council to install traffic calming measures in Sunnybank due to the excessive speeds observed in the road which are a threat to pedestrian safety. These should be supported by a 20 mile an hour speed limit.

RESPONSE:

Sunnybank is a residential road that links Farleigh Road at a mini roundabout junction at its northern end to a mini roundabout junction with Chelsham Road at its southern end. The road is street lit, with residential properties on both sides and is subject to a 30mph speed limit.

A traffic calming scheme was installed in Sunnybank in approximately 1995. Speed cushions were used rather than full width road tables as Sunnybank is on a bus route, and there are a large number of dropped kerbs for private driveways. However, in 2010 following resurfacing works, and a trial period during which the traffic calming measures were not reinstated, it was decided by the Tandridge Local Committee not to reinstall the traffic calming measures on Sunnybank.

However, it is appreciated that residents would now like traffic calming measures to be reinstalled to support a 20mph speed limit. When prioritising requests for improvements to be carried out on roads throughout the county due to resident’s concerns about vehicle speeds and road safety, several factors are considered. The factor that is given the most weight is the collision history of the road. An assessment has been carried out of the collision history on Sunnybank in Warlingham, between November 2018 and October 2021 (the latest 3 year data
for which data is available). During this period there have been no personal injury collisions on Sunnybank.

Taking account of the collision history, Sunnybank would not prioritise over other requests for the installation of traffic calming measures to a support a 20mph speed limit on roads within Tandridge to reduce vehicle speeds.

**RECOMMENDATION**

The Tandridge Local Committee is asked to note the report.

Contact Officer: Anne-Marie Hannam, Highways
Stafford Road in Caterham specifically from 224 to 310 is characterised by parking on both sides of the road with limited passing spaces. This results in a narrow road and any speeding even when only marginally over the current 30mph speed limit risks accidents or damage to vehicles as demonstrated by the accident on Saturday 3rd July 2021 where a number of vehicles were damaged.

Residents request the following

1. Reduction in speed – Limit to 20mph.
2. Appropriate speed mitigation measures to ensure appropriate speed. i.e. Speed bumps.
3. Review feasibility of a one-way system due to lack of parking spaces.
4. Tandridge council to investigate additional off street parking for the flats which have been converted from elderly care to general needs housing.
5. Increased police speed monitoring until appropriate mitigation is put in place.

Residents struggle to report damage to vehicles due to the time on hold to 101 and no clear action taken. As such we have requested that residents confirm if their car has been damaged when parked on the road.

RESPONSE:

Stafford Road is a residential road running from Church Hill in the south to Burntwood Lane in the north. The speed limit on Stafford Road is 30mph.

1 & 2 The petition is requesting that the speed limit is reduced to 20mph and that appropriate speed mitigation measures eg speed bumps are installed to ensure appropriate speeds.

Three speed surveys have been carried out in Stafford Road since 2014 and the results of the surveys are shown in the table below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Date</th>
<th>Survey Location</th>
<th>Average Mean Speed northbound (mph)</th>
<th>Average Mean Speed southbound (mph)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 2014</td>
<td>Outside 251 Stafford Road</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2019</td>
<td>Outside 251 Stafford Road</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August/September 2021</td>
<td>Outside 169 Stafford Road</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table Showing Results of Speed Surveys on Stafford Road

These results show good compliance with the existing 30mph speed limit. However, the recorded speeds do not comply with Surrey’s policy for a signs alone speed limit reduction to 20mph. Therefore, in order to reduce the speed limit to 20mph additional measures such as road tables or speed cushions would be needed in order to reduce traffic speeds.

Such measures are not always popular with local residents. They can increase traffic noise and emissions as drivers tend to accelerate between measures. Large vehicles, in particular empty lorries, can be very noisy when going over road tables. When such schemes are progressed, consultation is always carried out with local residents and a scheme is only taken forward if a majority of residents are in favour.

When prioritising requests for improvements such as the installation of traffic calming, a number of factors are considered. The factor that is given the most weight is the personal injury collision history of the road. Surrey County Council has investigated the personal injury collision history of Stafford Road between November 2018 and October 2021 (the latest 3 years for which data is available). During this period there have been three reported collisions on Stafford Road resulting in personal injury. Two of these collisions occurred near the library and one involved a vehicle turning into Stafford Road from Burntwood Lane. Although Surrey County Council has a record of personal injury collisions reported to the Police, no date is collected on collisions which involve damage to vehicles or property only. In none of the recorded personal injury collisions did the Police Officer attending consider that exceeding the speed limit or travelling too fast for conditions were contributory factors in these collisions. The collision referred to by the petitioner does not appear on our collision history and may either have been damage only or was not reported to the Police at the time.

Considering both the collision history and traffic speeds, Stafford Road would not prioritise over other requests for the installation of traffic calming measures.

3 The petition is requesting that Stafford Road is made one-way due to the lack of parking spaces.
Experience elsewhere is that when roads are made one-way, traffic speeds tend to increase. This is because drivers do not need to slow down or stop when another vehicle comes the other way. The petitioners have expressed concern about traffic speeds on Stafford Road, therefore implementing a one-way system would not address residents’ concerns and could increase traffic speeds on Stafford Road. In addition, if a road is made one-way, traffic is displaced onto neighbouring roads. For these reasons Officers would not recommend that Stafford Road is made one-way.

4 The petition is requesting Tandridge District Council investigate additional off-street parking for the flats.

Officers are not able to comment on the provision of off-street parking for the flats, which is a matter for Tandridge District Council.

5 Increased police speed monitoring until appropriate mitigation is put in place.

Officers will raise the concerns of the petitioners with Surrey Police, who are responsible for enforcing the 30mph speed limit on Stafford Road. However, it is unlikely that Stafford Road would prioritise over other roads in Tandridge for Police enforcement action as the measured average mean speeds are well within the 30mph speed limit.

It is appreciated that residents continue to be concerned about the speed and safety of Stafford Road, as well as damage that is being caused to their vehicles. The requests that have been received by residents within the petition are the responsibility of a number of different agencies, such as Tandridge District Council, Surrey Police and Surrey County Council. Therefore a Local Neighbourhood Engagement meeting will be held with the local residents and the various different agencies to discuss and agree a way forward.

RECOMMENDATION

The Tandridge Local Committee is asked to note the report and that a Local Neighbourhood Engagement Meeting will be held.

Contact Officer: Philippa Gates, Traffic Engineer, Tel: 0300 200 1003
SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL
LOCAL COMMITTEE (TANDRIDGE)

DATE: 3 December 2021

SUBJECT: Public Questions

DIVISION: All

Question 1 – Wendy Russell, The Coach House, Tupwood Scrubbs Road

Can I respectfully ask the committee if they consider that an outdated country road speed limit of 60 mph is appropriate in 2021?

Specifically for this committee I refer to Tupwood Scrubbs Road which leads to Caterham viewpoint, then on to Gravelly Hill and War Coppice Road. There are many blind bends, it is a residential area and an AONB with a beauty spot at the viewpoint attracting many walkers, cyclists and horse riders.

There are several off-road accidents a year and sadly last year a death. Please consider reducing this speed limit and introduce traffic calming accidents before another fatality occurs.

Answer from Philippa Gates, Traffic Engineer, 0300 200 1003

Tupwood Scrubbs Road is a single carriageway rural road that runs from Tupwood Lane in the north to Caterham Viewpoint, where the name of the road changes to Gravelly Hill. Gravelly Hill runs from Tupwood Scrubbs Road at Caterham Viewpoint in a westerly direction to the junction of War Coppice Road and Weald Way. There is a right-angle bend at Caterham Viewpoint where Tupwood Scrubbs Road joins Gravelly Hill.

There is currently a 60mph speed limit on Tupwood Scrubbs Road and Gravelly Hill. It is not unusual to have a 60mph speed limits on rural roads such as Tupwood Scrubbs Road and Gravelly Hill, and this is the national speed limit for roads of this nature. We receive many more requests for speed limit changes than it is possible to deliver in a given year. These are prioritised and need to comply with our “Setting Local Speed Limits” policy. This policy sets out the process of how speed limits can be changed.

Part of the prioritisation process is to consider the collision history of the road. An investigation has been carried out into the collision history of both Tupwood Scrubbs Road and Gravelly Hill in the three year period between 1 November 2018 and 31 October 2021 (the most recent 3 year period for which data is available). The County Council has a record of collisions resulting in personal injury that are reported to the Police, but not damage only collisions. During that period there has been one reported personal injury collision, on Tupwood Scrubbs Road and Gravelly Hill which occurred on 1 February 2020. This is the collision referred to in the question, that very sadly resulted in a fatality. It is appreciated that it is very distressing for those affected when there is a collision that they have either seen or heard about on a road close to where they live. Officers are not able to comment on the circumstances of this collision.
The County Council does take concerns about road safety seriously and road collisions across the County are continually monitored. This sad accident was referred to the Tandridge Road Safety Working Group in December 2020 for action to be determined. This group consists of Road Safety experts from both Surrey Police and the County Council as well as engineers from Surrey Highways. The minutes of the meeting record that there was no highway defect and other engineering measures including a change in speed limit were not recommended at that time.

There are a number of rural roads in Tandridge north of the A25 and west of the A22 that have a speed limit of 60mph. It is proposed that these roads are grouped together and added to the Integrated Transport Scheme (ITS) list for future prioritisation for a reduction in speed limit. This would investigate whether these roads would comply with Surrey County Council’s Policy “Setting Local Speed Limits” for a signs only speed limit reduction. If some or all of the roads comply with the policy it will be necessary to make a legal Speed Limit Order and put up the necessary signs to enable the Police to enforce the new speed limit. The Local Committees Forward Programme of funded schemes is made up from schemes on the ITS list. The Forward Programme been agreed for the 2022/23 and 2023/24 financial years.

There are currently no plans to implement traffic calming measures on Tupwood Scrubbs Road or Gravelly Hill as is suggested. However, Officers will investigate improving the bend signing on Tupwood Scrubbs Road and Gravelly Hill during the 2022/23 financial year, and any work will be subject to available funding.

**Question 2 – Cllr Alun Jones, Tandridge DC re Operation Horizon**

Background:

In the LAC meeting on 12th Feb 2021, there was a great discussion regarding the committee having a written forward plan of works to be undertaken as part of the “horizon” programme as requested by Cllr Morrow. He was advised that all the information was available online and available for “anyone” to access.

In July of this year, I had a meeting with Zena Currie regarding another highways issue with several other councillors. Zena was very clear with the meeting the the LAC would be focusing on decisions to be made, indicating that anything added or removed from the highways programme would need to be agreed by the LAC.

Back in February Tillingdown Hill and Gaist Avenue were on the “horizon” map. This was where councillors were advised to find information. It was due to be completed in the year 21/22.

Jeffrey Gray met with a Surrey officer in July where multiple issues were discussed, this road included. In email discussion he requested a date for completion and to review adding in Waltham Road which is as bad and laid at the same time as Tillingdown Hill and Gaist Avenue, and to review the sunk pavement between Rodgers Close and Abotts Walk.

In September when reviewing the dates for completion, it appeared that the dates for completion of this project have moved to 2022 or 2023. The latest update on the website is it will be completed in 2022. At no point were the Ward Councillors or the Divisional Member consulted or informed.
Questions asked together with answers provided by Matthew Gallop, Asset Policy and Programme Team Leader, SCC Network and Asset Management Group:

Can you confirm when these roads will be completed?  
Tillingdown Hill & Gaist Avenue will be prioritised 2023 at the earliest. They have both provided difficulties in programming due to their construction being concrete and necessity for additional feasibility in selecting a suitable treatment. Tillingdown Hill is proposed for concrete restoration, Gaist Avenue will be considered for alternative treatment such as micro-asphalt following further engagement with our new Highways Management Contractor.

Can you confirm if Waltham Road can be added to the programme?  
Waltham Road will be assessed in the next few months for inclusion on the Horizon programme.

Can the pavement between Rodgers Close and Abbots Walk be added to the programme?  
The pavements in Tillingdown Hill do not currently prioritise for planned maintenance and inclusion on the Horizon programme. The local member may be able to consider using their allocation short lengths such as between Rodgers Close & Abbots Walk.

Can you confirm who on this committee approved the change in date?  
Maintenance programmes do not require approval from the Local Committee, and none was sought.

Can you confirm if no elected member approved or was informed of the change, who was accountable for making this decision?  
Highways maintenance programmes are determined and issued including revisions by the Asset Programme Manager.

Can you confirm in writing the look forward programme for 2022/23 financial year for Caterham Valley, Whyteleafe and Harestone given the inaccuracy of the online tool?  
Programmes will be published for 2022/23 after budgets are approved in the new year. Unfortunately, we cannot provide written versions of the programmes however it is possible for users to export selected areas in MS Excel and create their own written versions. Accuracy should be equal as published programmes both past and present are sourced from the same database with the web map being updated more frequently.

It was unfortunate that Tillingdown Hill & Gaist Avenue were prematurely displayed on the 2021 programme web map. These schemes were put forward with others for consideration to include in a trial of an innovative technique of fine milling and acrylic repair. The scope of work potential had not been defined which has led to their postponement. The way we treat trial sites, and their publication has been reviewed with additional steps in the process to ensure this doesn’t happen in the future.

Question 3 – Cllr Jenny Gaffney & Cllr Alun Jones, Tandridge DC re Grit Bins

Background:

Over the summer, I noted two grit bins had been removed from my ward. One outside 355 Stafford Road and the other at the junction of Milner Approach and Stafford Road.

When I queried this with the highways team, I was advised that “All grit bins owned by Surrey County Council are given a score to determine their value to the network. If a grit bin falls into a state of disrepair and does not meet a minimum score threshold, we do not automatically reinstate a new one in its place. In this instance, the bin did not meet the score
required for renewal, therefore a new one will not be put back.” This was from the “Asset Policy and Programme Team.”

Following this email I submitted a request for the information around this as I hadn’t seen a change in policy to grit bins or the impact it would have come through the LAC.

At a meeting in July, Zena Curry suggested I email her with my questions and she would look into it. Following a number of follow up emails, I am still yet to have a response. My most recent follow up was 3rd October.

From Cllr Gray, I have been advised that the bin at the bottom of Stafford Road will be reinstated, but this is yet to happen and we are now in winter.

Questions asked and answers provided by Dan Squibb, Highways

How many grit bins have been removed from Tandridge this year?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset ID</th>
<th>Bin Plaque Number</th>
<th>Road Name</th>
<th>USRN</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Work Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1699</td>
<td>10545</td>
<td>KINGS CROSS LANE</td>
<td>39500588</td>
<td>Tandridge</td>
<td>Remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1553</td>
<td>10538</td>
<td>STYCHENS LANE</td>
<td>39501011</td>
<td>Tandridge</td>
<td>Remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1605</td>
<td>10728</td>
<td>BANSTEAD ROAD</td>
<td>39500047</td>
<td>Tandridge</td>
<td>Remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6210</td>
<td>11797</td>
<td>GUN PIT ROAD</td>
<td>39500469</td>
<td>Tandridge</td>
<td>Remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1681</td>
<td>10597</td>
<td>NUNAPPLETON WAY</td>
<td>39501311</td>
<td>Tandridge</td>
<td>Remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1709</td>
<td>10590</td>
<td>SHIP HILL</td>
<td>39500926</td>
<td>Tandridge</td>
<td>Remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6255</td>
<td></td>
<td>HARESTONE HILL</td>
<td>39500479</td>
<td>Tandridge</td>
<td>Remove</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When was the scoring of grit bins introduced?

Scoring was introduced in approximately 2010-11 through a Cabinet approved Task Group

What are the measures that the grit bin is assessed against?

Please see assessment form below
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Severity</th>
<th>Points weighting</th>
<th>Points allocated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vehicular Movement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site on Priority One precautionary treatment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Void location rejects application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>route</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is treatment area off priority one routes on which</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bin will be safely located</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1:10 or over</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than 1:10</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Less than 1:10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface gradient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Exit traffic at peak times)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate Traffic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Light traffic</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult junction requiring precise timing to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exit, or Within 25m of and falling towards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>junction with:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bends on slope</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>with moderate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>traffic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic density at peak times</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate Traffic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Light traffic</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedestrian Movement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concentration of use by pedestrian’s steps,</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ramps, footbridge, subway.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Category 1 &amp; 2 Footways)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bin condition damaged yes / no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locality density</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL POINTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retain/Remove</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Who you notified about the decision to remove grit bins this year and which elected member approved it?
The County Councillor for this location, Caterham Valley Electoral Division, is Mr Jeffrey Grey. Cllr Grey does not have sufficient capital maintenance funding available for the replacement of an unprioritised grit bin. However, the Parish Council are able to fund a new grit bin should they choose to prioritise this from their budgets.

District Councillors are not able to fund replacement grit bins directly, but could in collaboration with the County Councillor.

When will the grit bin be reinstated at the junction of Stafford Road and Milner Road?
6282, Stafford Road: We had several requests to remove the bin from outside No. 355 over the last year. The first reason being that it had become damaged around the back, allowing salt to leak out. The second reason being that the resident of No. 355 was looking to install vehicle cross over (VCO) and the bin was obstructing the area at this time. When this bin was initially identified, it was agreed the score was not particularly high, therefore, after being removed there was no justification for it to be replaced as far as our policy went, unless the Member wishes to fund one at this location from their budget (although they do not have funds remaining for this year). This is on a P2 salting route.

1803, Milner Approach: Our inspection data and an enquiry alerted us to the disappearance of this facility. According to our records, this bin met the required 100 point threshold and we will be reinstating a new one in its position before the winter season. Our programmes have gone out to tender and we expect delivery will commence around early to mid-October.

If the Parish wishes to adopt, fund or install their own bins along this road, they are welcome to do so.

**Question 4 – Cllr Annette Evans & Cllr Alun Jones, Tandridge DC re Pavements**

**Background:**

The pavement from Waspes Lodge to Greenhill Avenue along Croydon Road has been completed in Valley Ward recently. This was not on the look forward programme for 2021 back in February.

The work is described as “Slurry Surfacing”. Following a number of complaints from residents, I have visited the “work”. The surface is patch leaving the subsurface tarmac showing. This will result in damage to the new surface following winter ice. There are several tyre marks and foot prints across it. Underlying surface unevenness has not been resolved, making the pavement more dangerous as there are now no colour changes where there is uneven surface. Finally, in places the surface is breaking up.

**Questions and answers from Matthew Gallop and Jane Young, Highways:**

Who made the decision to add this section of pavement to the 2022 works and who was it agreed with? Why were local councillors not consulted or informed?

Croydon Road pavements were included by the Asset Programme Manager on the first revision of the provisional programme issued to Contractors in May 2020. There is no consultation for maintenance programmes and no approval is required. Provisional programmes are issued early to supply chain partners for planning & coordination purposes to reduce delivery risk. The programme is made visible to Councillors & the public at the same time via the Horizon webmap in Feb / March following budget approvals.
What quality checked are carried out on contractors completing these works?
The subcontractor carrying out the works is supervised by our Principal Contractor Kier. The works are checked for finished quality by our SCC Engineer when the work has been completed.

What issues had been reported in the last 12 months with regard to the surface in this section of pavement?
Sorry we have not had time to find this information yet, we will check the street history for any reported issues.

When will the pavement be revisited to make good the “work” that has been completed?
The work was completed 20/11/21 and will be checked for quality by our SCC Engineer before any payment is agreed, this should be within the next few weeks. Any work that is not up to the required standard will need to be redone by the contractor at their own cost.