

MINUTES of the meeting of the **ENVIRONMENT & TRANSPORT SELECT COMMITTEE** held at 10.30 am on 15 December 2014 at Ashcombe Suite, County Hall, Kingston upon Thames, Surrey KT1 2DN.

These minutes are subject to confirmation by the Committee at it's meeting on the 22 January 2015.

Elected Members:

- * Mr David Harmer (Chairman)
- Mr Mike Bennison (Vice-Chairman)
- * Mrs Nikki Barton
- * Mrs Natalie Bramhall
- * Mr Mark Brett-Warburton
- Mr Stephen Cooksey
- * Mrs Pat Frost
- * Mr David Goodwin
- * Mr Ken Gulati
- * Mr Peter Hickman
- * Mr George Johnson
- * Mr Adrian Page
- * Mr Michael Sydney
- * Mr Richard Wilson
- * Mrs Victoria Young

In attendance

Mike Goodman, Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning
John Furey, Cabinet Member For Highways, Transport and Flooding

78/14 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Mike Bennison and Stephen Cooksey.

Will Forester substituted for Stephen Cooksey.

79/14 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING: 27 OCTOBER 2014 [Item 2]

These were agreed as a true record of the previous meeting.

80/14 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

There were none.

81/14 QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS [Item 4]

A member question was received from Cllr Jonathan Essex. The question and response are attached as annex 1 to the minutes.

Declarations of Interest:

None

Witnesses:

None

Key Points Raised During the Discussion:

1. The Member began by asking if the current Preventative Maintenance Strategy was verbally agreed or available in a written format. Officers explained that all current strategies and policies are published online via the SCC website and that a link to these strategies would be sent to the Member in due course.
2. Officers were asked if they could demonstrate assertions made within the response regarding the level of preventative maintenance currently being carried out. It was explained that current Department of Transport rankings place SCC above some neighbouring counties and in a good position overall nationally on this issue.

Actions/Further Information to be Provided:

None

82/14 RESPONSES FROM THE CABINET TO ISSUES REFERRED BY THE SELECT COMMITTEE [Item 5]

Key Points Raised During the Discussion:

1. It was re-iterated by the Committee that one of the chief concerns among Surrey residents was the quality of communication with groups involved during the flood recovery process and that this should continue to be addressed going forward.
2. The Committee welcomed efforts made by Cabinet Members to secure recovery funding for residents. It was established that the Cabinet Member is pursuing an extension of the current date of limitation on flood recovery funding (from central government) to allow residents having difficulty claiming financial support more time to do so. The Cabinet Member explained that both DEFRA and the Secretary of State had yet to offer a response to requests for an extension of this kind.

83/14 RECOMMENDATION TRACKER AND FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME [Item 6]

Witnesses:

None

Key Points Raised During the Discussion:

1. Members discussed the need for more specific information regarding the breakdown of injury and non-injury accidents involving cyclists in Surrey for the period of 2013/14.
2. Members asked why they had not been shown the most recent report regarding the Canal Centre Redevelopment Proposals which was discussed at the previous Basingstoke Canal Joint Management Committee. It was made clear to the Committee by the Cabinet

Member, and Officers, that the report had been commissioned as a means of establishing the implications of compiling a business case for the redevelopment of the Canal Centre Site rather than a business case in full.

Recommendations:

None

Actions/Further Information to be Provided:

- Members requested further data be provided delineating between injury and non-injury accidents involving cyclists for 2013/14.

Committee Next Steps:

None

84/14 HIGHWAYS & TRANSPORT MEMBER REFERENCE GROUP REPORT ON THE KIER CONTRACT [Item 7]

Witnesses:

Jason Russell, Assistant Director for Highways and Transport
Mark Borland, Works Delivery Group Manager

Key Points Raised During the Discussion:

1. The report was introduced by the Assistant Director for Highways and Transport (ADHT) who provided a brief overview of the report, highlighting the good level of contact between Surrey, Kier Officers and the Member Reference Group (MRG) both before and during the formation of the report.
2. The ADHT advised that, in line with the MRG's assessment, Kier be allowed to develop a 5 year business plan - in conjunction with Surrey Officers - covering the 2016/21 period to be delivered to Cabinet by the end of next year. As part of this process it was recommended by the ADHT that a one-year extension be granted to the existing contract to allow a business plan to be drawn up. It was also established that the existing MRG should be closely involved in this process.
3. Members were informed that the MRG had also been instrumental in identifying areas requiring improvement such as the current IT infrastructure employed by Highways teams. It was stressed by the Committee that the management of IT infrastructure of this kind would be essential to the success of normal operations going forward and that it was important for Officers to continue to identify areas where SCC and Kier systems can align and to ensure software compatibility where possible. This was noted as being critical to the long term success of the contract; particularly in light of recent IT upgrades being carried out by Kier internally.
4. Members expressed concern over the issues raised in Paragraph 26 regarding the level of communication SCC and Kier are reported to have had with residents up to this point. The Committee stressed the

importance of SCC and Kier representatives having regular contact with Local Committees and endorsed that officers find means of achieving this in the long term.

5. The Committee expressed the view that communication problems impacted local businesses during periods where road maintenance was carried out. Members cited issues with the quality of road signage and the inadequate level of consultation prior to road closures as having adversely affected businesses as a result. The Committee expressed a desire to see the development of a clearer communication strategy in order to tackle this more appropriately in future.
6. Members noted issues concerning the efficiency of current gully cleaning efforts being administered by Conway and expressed a desire to see this addressed more acutely in future.
7. The Committee raised concerns with the points raised in Paragraph 30 regarding the existing organisational structure of Surrey Highways. Members maintained that further restructuring was unnecessary and stressed that previous efforts had resulted in a worsening of communications between stakeholders rather than an improvement.
8. The ADHT advised the Committee that both Kier and SCC are continuously making improvements to the service to make it as robust as possible. It was also acknowledged that improving the quality of communication with residents was key to this and would continue to be at the forefront of this approach going forward.
9. The Committee was informed that one means being considered to address this was the creation of a dedicated public liaison officer within the terms of the contract. Members were concerned whether this was feasible with the funding constraints of the current contract. It was explained that such a position would be funded through further efficiencies in the current contract.
10. Officers explained to the Committee that sub-contractors have been used in the existing framework. It was noted that the service was looking to more localized supply chains for sub-contractual work where appropriate (in line with Kier and SCC standards).
11. Members were made aware that SCC was in a good position in comparison to other authorities on this item. The ADHT explained that the proposed 5 year extension consideration allowed for SCC's proposals to be both more comprehensive in a national context and was unique in this respect.
12. Members of the MRG explained to the Committee that they plan to continue holding each body to account through site visits and conversations directly with Kier and SCC representatives. It was also established that the MRG will meet with Members from Northamptonshire in the New Year to evaluate their experiences with Kier and identify areas where this can improve SCC's existing arrangement.

Recommendations:

The Environment and Transport Select Committee agreed the following recommendations;

- a) That the Select Committee endorse the proposal that Cabinet approve an initial extension to the Kier contract of at least one year; during which time Kier will be given the opportunity to work with Surrey to develop a 5 year business plan covering the period 2016-2021.
- b) That the Highways and Transport MRG provide ongoing member insight and scrutiny and report back to Select Committee before October 2015.

Actions/Further Information to be Provided:

- Officers to provide the Committee with the finalised Kier contract before it goes to Cabinet in October 2015.
- Member Reference Group to provide the Select Committee with a progress update in due course.

Committee Next Steps:

None.

85/14 COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY OVERVIEW/ THE HORLEY MASTER PLAN [Item 8]

Witnesses:

Paul Druce, Infrastructure Agreements Manager
Peter Boarder, Horley Regeneration Project Manager, SCC / Reigate and Banstead BC

i) CIL Overview Report

Key Points Raised During the Discussion:

1. The Chairman began by inquiring with officers as to the potential for a regular update with Members on the status of Surrey district and boroughs readiness for CIL in line with the issues raised in Paragraph 24 of the report. The Infrastructure Agreements Manager (IAM) raised the potential for the distribution of a quarterly one page bulletin by Boroughs on this going forward to members of the select committee and local committee chairman.
2. Members raised concerns regarding authorities yet to fully implement CIL and how this may impact existing development. The IAM informed the Committee that the failure to adopt CIL could allow certain development to avoid paying developer contributions but the government's chief planner has said, where the issue has been raised, that LPA's have had 5 years to adopt CIL and any shortfall in contributions is therefore a matter for them.

3. Members noted that local committees should be scrutinising in detail how CIL funds are distributed and spent as CIL is adopted across Surrey.

i) Recommendations:

The Select Committee endorsed the following recommendations:

- a) That there be continued collaboration with Borough and District colleagues in their preparation of Local Plans, Infrastructure Delivery Plans, CIL Charging Schedules and Regulation 123 Lists.
- b) Officers continued collaboration with Borough and District colleagues on draft CIL documentation to ensure the County Council is able to support development in each of the areas by securing and providing infrastructure at the required time.
- c) Officers continuing to seek agreement as to how the governance regime for CIL will operate in each of the areas by way of a memorandum of understanding or other suitable agreement, and
- d) The further work required to secure a suitable governance regime in each of the areas, in the light of the possible different models for governance, given that the Woking model is one that appears to offer the most open and transparent collaborative process for deciding which schemes CIL monies should support.

ii) CIL/Horley Master Plan Report

1. The Committee inquired as to the impact of SANGS on CIL payments for Surrey Heath. It was clarified to Members that up to 80% of CIL contributions are diverted to SANGS currently. The Committee asked Officers if this was something that could be determined by Surrey's Districts and Boroughs in future (due to SANGS impact on West Surrey authorities) however it was explained that control of SANGS framework is determined by the E.U. and as such can't be avoided in this instance.
2. The Horley Regeneration Project Manager (HRPM) informed the Committee that authorities can set different CIL rates for different areas of any one borough, in line with a geographical and viability assessment.
3. It was recognised by Members that SCC and its District and Boroughs have a long relationship of working together on these types of items and despite the Committee's recommendations not being fully enforceable it was agreed that this issue would remain a matter of trust between Surrey and its local authorities.

ii) Recommendations:

The Select Committee endorsed the following recommendations:

- a) The principle of the Borough Council's proposal to charge a higher levy for residential development in the North West Sector
- b) Officers making formal representations on the Borough Councils Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule including its Regulation 123 list, as necessary
- c) The two authorities work together to reach agreement by way of a memorandum of understanding to ring fence monies to ensure that there is sufficient funding to deliver the identified infrastructure in and service improvements in the HMP

Actions/Further Information to be Provided:

None

Committee Next Steps:

None.

86/14 SURREY HIGHWAYS- SAFETY DEFECT YEAR 1 REVIEW [Item 9]

Witnesses:

Mark Borland, Works Delivery Group Manager
Paul Wheadon, Commercial and Performance Team Manager

Key Points Raised During the Discussion:

1. The Works Delivery Group Manager (WDGM) introduced the report by explaining that eighty five thousand potholes were fixed in Surrey annually. The Committee was also informed that a six step action plan was developed to provide a framework for the project. Fundamental to this plan was the introduction of a new IT system which went live in August 2014 to replace the previous May Gurney system.
2. The WDGM clarified to the Committee that the flooding event in the beginning of 2014 resulted in an impact on the final Safety Defects Performance figures; causing the performances in these periods to notably miss the current 98% target.
3. Members queried the length of guarantee for each maintained pothole. The WDGM clarified that the time period guaranteed for each repaired pothole by Kier is currently two years.
4. Officers informed Members that the product Viafix was being considered as a replacement for the current material used to repair potholes. It was explained that Viafix offers the same permanent repair option as current methods but offers a guarantee of two years under both dry and wet conditions and minimizes the need for follow up visits.
5. The WDGM explained that the managerial hierarchy had been addressed to enable Surrey and Kier managers to report to one another directly and fully integrate as a result.

6. It was make clear that the quality assurance team focussed on road defects throughout the project.
7. Members inquired as to the current technology used to track potholes within the Surrey area. Officers explained that a new GPS device was being rolled out to enable greater levels of mobile working and identification however it was noted there was still a focus on public reporting. The Chairman noted that Surrey Police had also recently adopted the same hardware for in-the-field application and could be consulted on the implications of such a rollout for Surrey.
8. The Committee agreed that pothole targets should remain high, rather than be lowered, in order to maintain and improve current practice and standards.

Recommendations:

The Select Committee noted and commented on outcomes of the Surrey Defect project's first year.

Actions/Further Information to be Provided:

- Scrutiny Officer to arrange site visit for approximately 6-7 members of the Select Committee to the Incident Response Centre at Meroo.

Committee Next Steps: None.

87/14 AGREEMENT WITH SURREY WILDLIFE TRUST FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL'S COUNTRYSIDE ESTATE [Item 10]

Witnesses:

Lisa Creaye-Griffin, Countryside Group Manager

Key Points Raised During the Discussion:

1. The Countryside Group Manager introduced the report by stressing the services commitment to reducing Surrey's total contribution to the Surrey Wildlife Trust (SWT) to 0% by 2021. It was emphasised that this would be achieved through supporting the re-organisation of the trust and the increased commercialization of its assets in the following 18 months.
2. Members congratulated the Countryside Group Manager on the current turnaround of SWT as it stands in the report. The Committee was encouraged by SWT's move towards greater commercialisation and the efforts to find partners in this regard. It was noted that Property will be looking at how SWT deal with the County's property and smallholdings. SWT's performance in dealing with the built property on the Countryside Estate will be covered in the report that will come to Committee in March 2015.
3. The Committee stressed that it was important to encourage the development of a strong management and oversight structure in the

coming months. It was recognised that this should be as robust as possible and was as crucial to the long term success of SWT as any other future agreements.

4. It was acknowledged by Members that in light of the financial savings being sought across SCC, it would prove difficult to find all the resources necessary to oversee the restructuring of the SWT and SCC agreement.
5. The Committee inquired as to the potential sanctions at SCC's disposal should SWT not achieve its KPIs. Officers explained that should SWT breach an agreement the County were in their rights to break the contract however it might be in the county's interest to avoid this. It was noted that there will be an annual review of the SWT agreement which would go to both the Select Committee and Cabinet for comment. A review would be undertaken every five years to understand whether KPIs were being met.

Recommendations:

The Select Committee agreed the principles of the revised Agreement with Surrey Wildlife Trust before the report goes to Cabinet.

Actions/Further Information to be Provided:

None.

Committee Next Steps:

None.

88/14 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 11]

The next meeting of the Select Committee will be on 22 January 2015.

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

Environment and Transport Select Committee- 15 December 2014

Item 4: Members questions

Submitted by: Cllr Jonathan Essex

This report (item 9) presents a safety inspection policy with identification of defect severity (page 81 of the report).

The report refers to the Department of Transport document, 'Prevention and a Better Cure' which says that maintenance should be planned at the right time, to minimise cost as well as safety. The following points follow on from recommendations set out in this document.

A) Please provide details of Surrey County Council's current Preventative Maintenance Strategy for highway maintenance, and how this is calculated to deliver best value for money as well as maximise road safety over the lifetime of our roads.

B) What routine and preventative maintenance works are planned to reduce the occurrence of potholes in the first place such as crack sealing (see Prevention and a Better Cure, page 29) as opposed to giving higher priority to the worst roads?

C) How much money will be saved by adopting this preventative maintenance strategy, and could more be saved by extending it? If so, how?

D) Has Surrey County Council considered localisation of Highway Routine and Periodic Maintenance (not including surface dressing) to district and borough councils like verge maintenance as part of this review, and what the costs and benefits of adopting such an approach in future are estimated to be?

E) Please confirm details of how the material types used for resurfacing have been reviewed against best practice. In particular what surfacing materials are currently used (eg HRA or TSCS) and how does this affect the rate at which potholes are likely to occur after resurfacing is completed.

F) Please confirm how the planned number of potholes repaired per day will change based on the change from 24 hour to 5 and 20 day repair targets. Please also confirm what the unit costs for pothole repair and crack sealing currently are for the Surrey County Council highway contract and how this will be affected by this change.

G) The report 'Well Maintained Highways' suggests that Category 1 defects should be made safe at the time of highway inspection. Please confirm whether this is Surrey's current or proposed approach, and whether such repairs are temporary or permanent. Does Surrey use, or has Surrey recently trialled 'Inspector Gangs' (Prevention and a Better Cure, page 34).

H) Does Surrey County Council currently require utility companies to adopt minimum dig or trenchless technologies, and if so, in what cases?

I) What percent of potholes in Surrey are reported by the public and how has this changed since 2010?

Response:

A) Surrey recognised the benefits of preventative maintenance long before the "Prevention and a Better Cure" report was published. For many years we have implemented a major maintenance programme for sections of roads that have come to the end of their useful life as well as a preventative maintenance programme to extend the useful life of roads. The preventative maintenance programme comprises primarily of surface dressing and micro asphalt treatments, but also utilises other treatments such as crack sealing of concrete roads. We recognise that preventative maintenance is both cost effective and enables us to enhance the life of roads by resealing the surface from the ingress of water and restoring skid resistance properties.

B) Surrey's major maintenance programme is prioritised using data such as road condition, road hierarchy, pothole defects etc. as such roads are dealt with on a predominantly worst first basis. The preventative maintenance programme however, is not prioritised based on those types of aspects. The primary drivers for the preventative maintenance programme are;

- road surfaces which are between 7 and 10 years old are assessed for suitability for addition to the programme in order to seal the surface before defects such as potholes form
- road surfaces which have been assessed as having poor skid resistance properties via machine survey or where there is a known accident history, are investigated to assess their suitability for addition to the programme
- roads which have had patching work carried out in the previous 12 months are assessed for addition to the programme in order to seal the patches and restore the uniformity and skid resistance of the road

These programme drivers help us to reduce the occurrence of potholes developing as well as improving safety by restoring skid resistance.

C) We have been developing lifecycle plans for roads which include using preventative maintenance treatments rather than waiting until a road fails before treating it. Early indications suggest lifecycle costs of £5,300 per year /km for roads when an asset management strategy using preventative maintenance is adopted as opposed to £12,000 per year/km for roads if a "worst first" strategy using conventional resurfacing and continuous patching is adopted.

We split our roads budget on a 70/30 major maintenance/preventative maintenance basis and the price differential between the two types of treatment means that we can carry out more preventative maintenance for less cost; for instance in 2013/14 we carried out 130km of major maintenance treatments and 230km of preventative using a 70/30 budget split. We believe that we are carrying out the right level of preventative maintenance currently and do not feel that there is justification for extending the amount we do at the present time.

D) Localisation of routine and periodic maintenance would not represent best value and could lead to a decrease in the quality of overall repair and increase risk on the network. This is based on seven critical reasons:

1. **Specialist Material** - A permanent repair for potholes is only possible if it is repaired using specialist hot material, which has a shelf life of just 24 hours. Further to this, based on Geography, this material is only available from 2 plants in the South East. Therefore each day the council must collect the material from one of the batching plants. As there is only 2 batching plants, economies of scale and effective buying power are critical to cost control.

Equally the batching plant allocates collection times to companies based on order value; a small company would not be able to collect material until late in the day.

2. Flexible Resource - There is no way to effective forecast where potholes will appear, on one day there may be large volume in Reigate and the next, high volume in Waverley. Therefore a county wide resource of a minimum of 12 full time gangs is needed, with the gangs being allocated to work based upon need. If resource was localised, then districts and boroughs would need to employ extra full time gangs to cope with the weekly peaks, as a minimum resource would not be able to cope with unforecast emergencies. The current approach also enables resilience for illness and holidays.

3. Winter Gritting - Delivering the county's winter gritting routes requires a minimum of 36 drivers. SCC, and almost all other councils, use the pothole resource to also support winter gritting and snow clearance. Removal of this resource would increase risk of delivery of the winter service as SCC would not have any fixed in-house resource.

4. Training - Kier employ a high level training programme for how to repair potholes properly and have supervisors to quality check work, the local supply chain would not be able to afford this cost as it is a Kier liability and not paid for by SCC.

5. Overhead - SCC currently employs 4 area managers and 4 schedulers to manage the pothole service. They are responsible for ensuring potholes are inspected and scheduled in the most cost effective way to gangs. Localisation of this activity would increase managers and schedulers from a total of 8 staff to 32 staff.

6. IT System - One of the biggest drivers for improvements in the reactive service was the installation of the new WMS scheduling and software system. This system cost Kier over £1m to fully implement and it would be unlikely that economies of scale could support this level of system if it was localised.

7. Insurance Claims - Currently insurance claims are the responsibility of SCC and are managed through highway budget and central insurance teams. Local parish and districts would find it difficult to accept and maintain this level of risk and cost, for example, legal fees, court fees and any accepted claims.

There is also further operational and commercial implications which would impact best value, however, the reasons above are the primary reasons why a central county wide solution continues to represent best value for the taxpayer.

E) SCC along with its term partnering contractor carried out a joint review of surfacing material options against best practice during the supplier engagement phase of operation horizon in Oct 2012.

The range of proposed materials were developed into a materials matrix that is used to determine on a site by site basis the best product most suited to resolving defects for the local conditions. The matrix allows the user to choose the preferred option by assessing its engineering features along with the various known risk and benefits.

The current materials matrix allows the use of both HRA and TSCS and their resilience to potholing is further enhanced through the application of stringent testing, an extended 10 year warranty and lifecycle planning for future preventative maintenance.

F) Gang Productivity has increased significantly over the past 12-18 months - prior to the change in response times, which came into effect Nov 13, gangs were completing 8-9 defects per day. This is currently at 14-15 per day. There are several factors which have

affected this and it is difficult to attribute % increases to any one intervention however most notably we believe the shift to 5 days has had the biggest impact as work is more easily clustered based upon an area for each team as opposed to simply attending everything that came in yesterday however far apart the defects are - any travelling time is lost repair time.

The service is based upon a fixed annual sum which pays for all defects and so it is not easy to specify a price per defect. This change has allowed repairs to be completed more efficiently (enabling more to be completed with the same level of resource) and in a lot of cases allowing the gang to repair all defects in a road rather than just those that have the shortest time to be repaired.

G) 'Well Maintained Highways' recommends that Category 1 defects are at least temporarily repaired within 24 hours and permanently repaired within 28 days. Since the inception of the contract in 2011, defects deemed to require an Immediate Response are attended within 2 hours. In the case of a defect being captured as part of a routine Inspection, the report is called into the Control Hub and the Highways Inspector will remain on site (if safe to do so) to mark the hazard until a repair crew arrive. There will be defects that are considered to be Category 1 defects which do not require an immediate (2 hour) response but do require attention within 24 hours. These are recorded as High Priority Defects which require attendance the following day.

H) Surrey County Council welcomes and encourages the use of Minimum Dig and Trenches Technologies to reduce disruption to both traffic movements and the highway fabric. These techniques are however not always suitable for use, dependant on such factors as the nature of the work being undertaken, subsoil conditions, condition of existing pipework etc.,

Minimum Dig centres around the use of the Core and Vacuum extraction technique with a core or plug of up to 600 mm diameter removed from the highway pavement. This maximum size does limit the works that can then be undertaken. No Department for Transport specification exists for reinstatements and SCC have experienced problems with contractors using this technique. Whilst taking a cautious approach Surrey generally promotes this process due to the time saving and associated reduction in traffic disruption.

There is a recently published DfT Transport Advisory Leaflet TAL 2/14 covering this activity. https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/383712/tal-2-14-core-and-vac.pdf

There are many names given to Trenchless Technologies however the basic methods are covered by Moling (Directional Drilling or Auger Boring), Pipe Bursting or Slip Lining. With all Trenchless Technologies, account has to be made for the necessity of launch and reception pits hence not being truly Trenchless.

Moling involves a mechanical mole device creating a void in the sub soil through which new pipe work is then inserted. This can only be used on relatively small pipe sizes, where subsoil composition is suitable and no obstructions exist in the intended path. (Reference <http://www.surreymirror.co.uk/Damaged-water-main-closes-Chipstead-road/story-24686664-detail/story.html> "telecommunications contractor caused significant damage by drilling through a water trunk main whilst laying new cables").

With Insertion, new pipe work is literally pushed (inserted) inside existing pipe work. This can be done where the capacity of a system does not require increasing and the run is relatively straight and short.

Pipe bursting follows the route of existing pipe work however using mechanically applied force from within, the existing pipe is broken with the fragments being forced into the surrounding ground at the same time a pipe of the same or large diameter is drawn in. This technique again is soil condition dependant and cannot be used when the pipe is in close proximity to other underground services due to the aggressive nature of the activity.

At a recent presentation by Southern Gas Networks, robotic technology for metallic pipe repair was presented along with new systems to make connections to properties from a newly laid main without the need to excavate. These new techniques are welcomed by Surrey County Council. It is unlikely however that they will be available before 2017 at the earliest.

l) As detailed in the report, the % reported by the public varies throughout the year and understandably increases significantly during the winter months. In part, this will relate to roads inspected in the middle of the year on an annual basis as defects occurring as a result of bad weather would not have been present during the previous inspection and if not reported by the public might wait a number of months to be identified by routine inspections.

	Sept 13 - Nov 13	Dec 13 - Feb 14	Mar 14 - May 14	Jun 14 - Aug 14
Total Defects	16402	25758	26412	16374
Reported via SCC Website	3085	12677	11183	6134
% Reported by Public	19%	49%	42%	37%

The change in the inspection frequency introduced earlier this year should go some way to reducing this as defects will be identified sooner through a routine inspection than in previous years. Officers were not specifically recording the source of defect reports in 2010 so the change cannot be measured however as this is now captured trends can be monitored over time.

David Harmer
Chairman of the Environment and Transport Select Committee

This page is intentionally left blank