

### Appendix 1 - Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council - performance indicators

Financial Year	2001/02			2002/03		
Survey dates	May 2002	AE average	Quartile	Jan, Feb, Mar, Jul 2003	AE average	Quartile
BVPI 223 (96) (A)	7% (Deflec)	12%	2	0% (CVI)	7.90%	1
BVPI 224a (97a) (B & C)	37.47% (CVI)	13%	4	6.11% (CVI)	18.50%	1
BVPI 224b (97b)	5.19% (CVI)	13%	2	1.69% (CVI)	19.40%	1
BVPI 187 (Footways)	N/A	N/A	N/A	27.91% (DVI)	30%	3

Financial Year	2003/04			2004/05		
Survey dates	Dec 03 & Jan, Feb 04	AE average	Quartile	Sept, Oct, Nov 04 & Mar 05	AE average	Quartile
BVPI 223 (96) (A)	1.44% (CVI)	8.34%	1	25.73% (TTS)	38%	1
BVPI 224a (97a) (B & C)	15.42% (CVI)	19.77%	2	14.55% (CVI)	16.34%	2
BVPI 224b (97b)	15.51% (CVI)	18.56%	2	6.03% (CVI)	16.70%	1
BVPI 187 (Footways)	26.90% (DVI)	29%	2	28.25% (DVI)	25.33%	3

Financial Year	2005/06			2006/07		
Survey dates	Jan, Feb, Mar 06	AE average	Quartile	Nov 06 & Jan, Feb 07	AE average	Quartile
BVPI 223 (96) (A)	(14%) 6% (SCANNER)	N/A	N/A	5% (SCANNER)	10%	1
BVPI 224a (97a) (B & C)	(16%) 7% (SCANNER)	N/A	N/A	7% (SCANNER)	14%	1
BVPI 224b (97b)	7.96% (CVI)	N/A	N/A	9% (CVI)	15%	1
BVPI 187 (Footways)	31.36% (DVI)	24%	3	22% (DVI)	24%	2

Financial Year	2007/08		
Survey dates	Aug, Sep, Dec 07 & Jan, Feb 08	AE average	Quartile
BVPI 223 (A)	(4%) 2% (SCANNER)	5.4%	1
BVPI 224a (B & C)	(7%) 4% (SCANNER)	7.7%	1
BVPI 224b	4% (CVI)	13.9%	1
BVPI 187 (Footways)	30% (DVI)	22.4%	4

**Notes:**

BVPIs 223, 224a & 224b replaced BVPIs 96,97a & 97b in 2005/06.

Initial figures for BVPIs 223 and 224a in 2005/06 were found to be based on incorrectly processed data and were too high. After re-processing the data, DCL recalculated the BVPIs and re-issued them on 25 April 2007.

Figures for BVPIs 223 and 224a were calculated using DfT revised weighting set in 2007/08 which gave lower results. Figures in brackets for 223 and 224a in 2007/08 are those calculated using the original weighting set.

AE average = Average performance of 'All England' (national) comparator group of local authorities. Quartile reflects performance falling into the 1st, 2nd, 3rd or 4th quarter.

SCANNER is a mechanical survey that picks up road defects.

CVI = Coarse Visual Inspection - relies on passenger observation - entries are recorded into a data entry device.

DVI = Detailed Visual Inspection - carried on on foot and data recorded.

Road categories 1, 1a and 2 - only these are inspected - 50% each year. Capital allocation is determined on the results of these surveys.

A = Principal roads

B & C = Non-principal roads

U = Unclassified roads

## Appendix 2 - Ipsos MORI Residents' Survey 2008 results

Beginning in 1998, the residents' survey is carried out every two years. During summer 2008, researchers for Ipsos MORI, the national opinion company, surveyed local people about their views about the Council, amongst other issues. The Council uses the survey results to help shape its future plans to meet the priorities of local people. What people think of the Council's services makes a big impact on how they perceive the Council as a whole.

One of the key areas identified under areas for improvement was continuing to improve road and pavement maintenance.

There have been encouraging improvements in perceptions of roads maintenance and pavements maintenance across the Borough since 2006, perhaps reflecting investment and efforts in previous years (there is often some notable time lag between changes in service delivery and changes in users' perceptions).

Roads and pavement maintenance continue to feature in the top ten most important services for local people as shown in the table below. Since 2002, road maintenance has increased in importance from 7<sup>th</sup> to 4<sup>th</sup> in 2008. Similarly, pavement maintenance has increased overall from 9<sup>th</sup> in 2002 to 7<sup>th</sup> in 2008.

	2002	2004	2006	2008
Road maintenance and repairs	7 <sup>th</sup> (21%)	7 <sup>th</sup> (21%)	5 <sup>th</sup> (23%)	4 <sup>th</sup> (23%)
Pavement maintenance	9 <sup>th</sup> (18%)	10 <sup>th</sup> (17%)	7 <sup>th</sup> (20%)	7 <sup>th</sup> (21%)

### Satisfaction with the quality of each service

#### Road maintenance and repairs

Satisfaction with road maintenance and repairs has increased. In the 2008 survey, 55% of respondents were satisfied, an improvement of 12 percentage points from 2006 (43%). Net satisfaction improved by 21 percentage points and fewer people were dissatisfied with the service, down 9 percentage points from 39% in 2006 to 30% in 2008.

Year	Dissatisfaction	Satisfaction	Net satisfaction
2008	30%	55%	+25
2006	39%	43%	+4
2004	37%	43%	+6
2002	37%	48%	+11

The Ipsos MORI Poll invited responses to a range of questions about Council services. The following questions related to road and pavement maintenance:

#### **Qu 3(a) Why do you say you are satisfied with the way Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council is running the Borough?** (Base: all respondents satisfied with the Council)

Under the heading of Transport/ Roads, 2% of respondents stated 'good/ resurfaced roads' in response to this question.

**Qu 3(b) Why do you say you are dissatisfied with the way Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council is running the Borough** (Base: all respondents dissatisfied with the Council)

Under the heading of Transport/ Roads, the top three reasons provided by respondents to this question were as follows:

Poor state of roads	9%
Roads constantly dug up	4%
Concurrent road works	3%

**Qu 4 - Thinking now about your "quality of life". What do you think are the most important improvements needed in this area to improve your quality of life?** (Base: all respondents)

Under the heading of Transport, 4% of respondents gave improved maintenance of roads as one of their reasons and 4% said improved maintenance of footpaths.

**Qu 44 - Why do you say you are dissatisfied with road maintenance and repairs in this area?** (Base: All respondents dissatisfied with road maintenance and repairs)

The top three reasons provided by respondents to this question were as follows:

General poor condition of roads	67%
Repairs are slow/ long time take to repair roads	35%
Poor quality of repairs	35%

**Qu 56 - Looking at this list of local services, which four or five do you think are the most important to your quality of life?** (Base: All respondents)

In answer to this question, 23% of respondents included road maintenance and repairs as one of the four or five local services most important to their quality of life.

Pavement maintenance

Satisfaction with pavement maintenance has increased, up 8 percentage points from 42% in 2006 to 50% in 2008, showing a net improvement of 17 percentage points between those two years.

Year	Dissatisfaction	Satisfaction	Net satisfaction
2008	36%	50%	+14
2006	45%	42%	-3
2004	42%	39%	-3
2002	45%	44%	-1

In connection with pavement maintenance, in responses were as follows:

**Qu 3(b) Why do you say you are dissatisfied with the way Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council is running the Borough?** (Base: all respondents satisfied with the Council)

Only 2% of respondents chose poor state of pavements as their response to this question.

**Qu 47 - Why do you say you are dissatisfied with pavement maintenance in this area?**  
(Base: All respondents dissatisfied with pavement maintenance)

The top three reasons provided by respondents to this question were as follows:

General poor condition of pavements	69%
Uneven/unsafe pavements	44%
Poor quality of repairs	25%

**Qu 56 - Looking at this list of local services, which four or five do you think are the most important to your quality of life?** (Base: All respondents)

In answer to this question, 21% of respondents included pavement maintenance as one of the four or five local services most important to their quality of life.

draft

## Appendix 3 – Viewpoint focus group consultation questions

### Questions and Answers

**Q. What is the policy for inspection and repair?**

A. There are inspections at a minimum of every six months. In some areas, there are inspections more frequently, for example town centres are inspected on a monthly basis. The inspector walks each road and looks for problems, using the guideline that anything on a pavement 20mm or more should be repaired and anything on a carriageway 40mm or more also meets these guidelines for repair. Where a defect meets these guidelines, the inspector will record this onto his inspection sheet and raise an order for repair within 28 days. There are approx 500 miles of carriageway and 1,000 miles of pavement to be inspected.

**Q. Is there a budget for these repairs? There is no point inspecting if there is no budget for repair.**

A. There is a budget allocated for unscheduled maintenance of £575,000. There is a separate budget for structural maintenance i.e. major schemes such as resurfacing and footway renewals. Part of this comes direct from Government, as part of their commitment to stop the deterioration of roads and pavement and the other part of this comes from Council Tax. In total there is £2.75million (£1.25m Capital from Central Government and £1.5m Revenue from Council Tax and revenue support grant).

**Q. What do you do to ensure utility companies reinstate the roads?**

A. The cable companies, back in 1996, carried out work when Cleveland County were still looking after the Borough. Cleveland County had inspectors that were looking at the work back then. Now Stockton Council has inspectors that do the work.

Utility companies have a statutory right to open roads; the Council have the right to inspect 10% of these openings and charge the utility company for doing so. There are approximately 5,000 notices per year from the utility companies to open the roads, but they must reinstate the road to the standard it started in. The work is also guaranteed for two years. Therefore the Council Inspectors can look at a reinstatement two years after it has been carried out and if it is no longer up to standard, they can order that it is reinstated again with a further two years' guarantee.

**Q. What pressure is there on the utility companies to reinstate the roads and pavements as soon as possible?**

A. When the utility companies give notice to dig up the road they have to state a 'reasonable duration' for the work. If they don't meet this deadline they can be penalised and the money goes back into the maintenance pot. There is also pressure on the companies to reduce the 'reasonable duration for the work so that they are forced to meet more timely deadlines.

**Q. Can we issue fines for people damaging pavements with their vehicles?**

A. Yes, however, there would need to be proof that it was their vehicle causing the problem and this can sometimes be difficult.

**Q. What can be done about damage to the footpath by tree roots in Drover's Lane, Redmarshall?**

A. The crack in the footpath does not constitute a danger at this time but there is obvious deterioration caused by the tree. Highways Asset Inspectors will continue to monitor this area on the 6 monthly zonal inspection – the tree is on adopted highway & is Council responsibility therefore the inspectors will liaise directly with the arboricultural team

- Q. Thirsk Road in Yarm is in a poor state of repair, can this be investigated?**
- A.** The Asset Inspectors looked at this site and reported that no actionable defects were present (defects meeting the guidelines of 20mm/40mm). The carriageway is also in a reasonable condition at this time. There has been a recent footpath scheme near the Kirklevington prison with the works carried out by SBC. This road will be monitored on a monthly basis during the driven inspections.
- Q. Billingham Town Centre footpath from the car park to police station often floods on the footpath and ices over in the winter. Who owns the land and who is required to repair it?**
- A.** This piece of land was transferred to the police station in 1974 and new records and plans were drawn up in 1998 showing the ownership of the Police authority. However this footpath will be transferred to SBC land ownership and an order for repair (lift and relaying the flag stones) has now been raised and will be carried out within 28 days, in the interest of public safety.
- Q. True Lovers Walk in Yarm, overgrown vegetation is bad, restricting access along walkway.**
- A.** This land is in the ownership and is the responsibility of the environment agency. We have reported the issue to the Manager, Mr Brian Hird who will investigate and take any necessary actions.
- Q. Can Leven Road be restricted from Heavy Vehicles trafficking?**
- A.** The transportation section will arrange a traffic survey to be undertaken for the feasibility of restricting HGVs.
- Q. It was understood that there was a grant obtained for the footpath at old Castle Eden, but it has never been finished. Why is this?**
- A.** Castle Eden Walkway has various sections which are paved with associated street lighting. There are proposals to further upgrade the walkway. However, there are rural sections which will remain unmade as rural walkways (e.g. Harrogate Lane northwards).
- Q. Is there a limit to how narrow new roads can be built to? Is the width intended to slow traffic?**
- A.** Roads and footpaths are designed in accordance with national guidelines and recommendations. In Stockton, there is a 'Design Guide for Residential and Estate Roads' which developers must comply with for development areas. Similarly, traffic calming measures etc follow similar design criteria.

## Appendix 4 - Care for Your Area – Analysis of Highways Satisfaction Surveys for November 2007

Abstract: Analysis of surveys where customers gave both a low and high satisfaction rating for Highway Maintenance. Updated surveys undertaken to identify if perceptions had changed.

### Introduction

During the surveys period, 71 respondents gave an overall satisfaction rating for highway maintenance. Of those contacted 14 respondents had originally given a low rating with 57 respondents originally giving a high rating when initially surveyed in October 2005. Follow up surveys were completed by Customer Services Staff in November 2007 to identify their main areas of concern although, more importantly to question whether their perceptions of the service had changed since the survey was completed.

### Questions and Results - Part 1

For those who originally provided a high rating the results are as follows:

1. What particular elements of the service were you happy with when the initial survey was completed? **(NB – Some respondents gave multiple reasons)**

Reduced level of potholes in the road	31
Better quality footpaths	30
Response to repair requests	33
Design of road and footpath layout	28
Good inspection regime	26
Publicity	25
Winter Maintenance	26
Other	10 (generalised list below)

Happy with levels of repair;  
Good quality roads and maintenance;  
Particularly happy as a wheelchair user;  
Pleased with approach to disabled access;  
Very pleased with Find and Fix;  
Improving village.
  
2. Have you noticed an improvement in the standard of highway maintenance since the original survey?

Yes	24	(42%)
No change	33	(58%)
  
3. If you think the service has improved, please tell us why?
  - Responding quickly to requests
  - Footpath repairs have improved
  - Increase in repairs to roads
  - Competent personnel
  - Streets are much cleaner
  - Pleasant walk into Town Centre
  
4. Can you identify any improvements in the highway maintenance service?
  - Mud and potholes from ongoing redevelopment
  - Pavements in Stockton Town Centre require improving
  - Cracks and dents in tarmac path due to construction vehicles on nearby redevelopment



- Weed removal
- More road sweepers
- Tactile paving is unnecessary
- Footpaths require levelling
- Parking is an issue
- Length of time taken to carry out repairs

5. What rating would you give the service now, with 10 being the highest level of satisfaction and 0 being the lowest?

For the purpose of this analysis exercise a High Satisfaction Rating is 6 – 10 (inclusive).

Rating table to show the members of public who originally gave a High Satisfaction Rating:-

Number of Ratings	New Rating
1	1
6	5
2	6
9	7
1	7.5
21	8
1	8.5
12	9
1	9.5
3	10

Of the surveys completed, what is the overall satisfaction rating (previously 100%): **89.5%**

### **Questions and Results - Part 2**

For those who originally provided a low rating the results are as follows:

1. What particular elements of the service were you unhappy with when the initial survey was completed? **(NB – Some respondents gave multiple reasons)**

Too many potholes in the road	7
Condition of footpaths	7
Response to repair requests	2
Design of road and footpath layout	0
Inadequate inspection regime	0
Publicity	0
Winter Maintenance	2
Overgrown/overhanging vegetation	1
Other	7 (generalised list below)
	Footpath uneven and muddy due to constant utility works in respondents street;
	Subsidence on road and road closure;
	CFYA always unsure of ownership of land;
	Problems with parking.

2. Have you noticed an improvement in the standard of highway maintenance since the original survey?

Yes	4	(29%).
No change	10	(71%).

3. If you think the service has improved, please tell us why?

- Improved maintenance
- Recent repairs carried out near properties
- Response to repairs has increased

4. Can you identify any improvements in the highway maintenance service?

- Increase cleansing frequency especially in back streets
- More regular inspections
- Improve road surfaces
- Recently installed speed humps are now starting to fail
- Quicker response to repairs
- More footpath and road repairs

5. What rating would you give the service now, with 10 being the highest level of satisfaction and 0 being the lowest?

For the purpose of this analysis exercise a Low Satisfaction Rating is 0 – 5 (inclusive), a High Satisfaction Rating is 6 – 10 (inclusive).

Rating table to show the members of public who originally gave a Low Satisfaction Rating:-

Number of Ratings	New Rating
1	<b>No Rating*</b>
3	<b>0</b>
2	<b>2</b>
1	<b>3</b>
1	<b>4.5</b>
1	<b>6</b>
3	<b>7</b>
1	<b>9</b>
1	<b>10</b>

\*For the purpose of the report we will assume that the one member of public who did not provide a rating will be assessed as low.

Of the surveys completed, what is the overall dissatisfaction rating (previously 100%): **57%**

## Overview of Results

- A. There was a drop in satisfaction by those respondents who originally rated the service high of 10.5%. This was however superseded by the increase in satisfaction rates by those respondents who originally rated the service low of 43%.
- B. The overall satisfaction results for both sets of ratings shows a high rate of satisfaction of 82% when taking both sets of figures in account. This is opposed to the original set of results which only showed a high satisfaction rating of 80%.
- C. The survey was, as expected, very positive on the whole and shows that the ratings have increased, though slight the public perception of the Highway Maintenance Service is that of an improvement to the service.
- D. The largest area of satisfaction is with the response to requests with 58% of all respondents citing this as an area of high satisfaction. 54% of those surveyed also stated that there had been a reduction in the level of potholes in the road.
- E. The largest area of dissatisfaction is too many potholes in road and condition of footpath, both with 50% of all respondents citing this as area of low satisfaction. No comment as to the design layout of the roads and footpaths, inspection regime and publicity was received.
- F. In total over both surveys 28 respondents (39%) stated that the service had improved since the original survey. 33 (47%) who originally rated the service high stated that there had been no change. 10 (14%) who originally rated the service low also gave a response of no change to services, though it must be noted that only 8 actually still gave a low rating. These figures in mind it would indicate that the highest level of satisfaction still remains.
- G. Of those who said that the service had improved, the reduction in the level of potholes in the road was sited as a major factor with 21 of the 71 respondents citing this factor. Design of road and footpath layout came a close second with 18 of the 71 respondents citing this factor.
- H. The areas identified for improvement were based generally around a need for more road and footpath repairs. Many of the others related to utility or redevelopment works or the installation of speed humps which are beyond the control of Highway Maintenance and in these instances we can offer only a service whereby the matter is forwarded to another department from which we can simply monitor.

## Care for Your Area – Analysis of Satisfaction Surveys for November 2007

Abstract: Analysis of surveys where customers gave a satisfaction rating for Care For Your Area services and suggestions for possible improvements.

### Introduction

During the surveys period, 95 respondents gave an overall satisfaction rating for some of the services provided by Care For Your Area. Age ranges, ethnicity, gender and residency periods were taken to identify if these factors had any bearing on the overall opinion of the services and if there was a gap and a need for service improvement within any particular group of people.

### Questions and Results

#### Personal Details

1. How long have you been living in the Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council area?

Less than 6 months	1
1 – 2 years	2
2 – 5 years	3
5 – 10 years	2
10 – 15 years	3
15 – 20 years	4
20 – 30 years	17
Over 30 years	62
Don't Know	1

2. Gender

Male	46 (48%)
Female	49 (52%)

3. Age Range

16 – 17	0
18 – 24	4
25 – 34	10
35 – 44	14
45 – 54	13
55 – 64	26
65 – 74	17
75 – 84	10
85 years or over	1

4. Ethnicity

White British	91
Chinese	1
Indian	1
Pakistani	1
White European	1

## Local Services

5. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the following Care for Your Area services?

	Very Satisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Fairly Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know
Parks & Open Spaces	19	48	10	9	4	5
<b>Road Maintenance &amp; Repairs</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Pavement Maintenance</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>3</b>
Refuse Collection	54	29	4	2	3	3
Street Cleansing	28	37	11	12	4	3
Street Lighting	33	35	13	8	3	3
Public Conveniences	6	27	26	13	10	13
Blue Box Doorstep Recycling	48	29	8	3	1	6
Recycling Facilities	40	35	12	3	1	4

6. Why are you satisfied or dissatisfied with these services?

- Wary when walking along footpath
- Litter in the streets
- Chewing gum on footpaths and litter around shops
- Poor road and footpath surfaces
- Prefer paving stones to tarmac
- No immediate action to broken/sinking footpaths or potholes
- A need for more wheelchair friendly access
- Would like the option of plastics and cardboard recycling with doorstep recycling
- Difficult to access SITA site at Haverton Hill as non-driver
- More recycling needed
- Moss on paving requires removing
- Pavements covered in fouling
- Street Light repairs required
- Maintenance is poor and does not last
- Refuse collectors should pick up litter following collection of wheelie bins

- Lack of public conveniences
- Not provided with any explanation since the recycling service was changed
- Public Conveniences in Yarm High Street are old and unclean putting you off using them
- You do a good job
- Area is generally tidier
- Norton High Street and The Green very well maintained
- CFYA accommodate a lifestyle which is adequate

7. Have you contacted Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council within the last 12 months?

Yes	55
No	40

8. Thinking about the last contact that you made, how did you contact Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council?

In Person	19
By Phone	43
By Letter	1
By E-mail	2
Web-site	1
Via Councillor	4
Ombudsman	1
Through some-one else	2
Police	1

9. When you contacted Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council, how did you find the staff?

Helpful	48
Unhelpful	4
Efficient	42
Inefficient	3
Neither/Don't Know	1
Able to deal with your Query/Enquiry	29
Unable to deal with your Query/Enquiry	6
Neither/Don't Know	1

10. How was getting hold of the right person?

Easy	41
Difficult	9
Neither/Don't Know	1

11. Where you Satisfied or Dissatisfied with the final outcome?

Satisfied	46
Dissatisfied	6
Neither/Don't Know	2

12. Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council has a website on the internet, have you accessed this site in the last 6 months?

Yes	18
No	31
No answer	46

## Overview of Results

- A. The general consensus of opinion is the majority of services, all barring one which is maintenance of pavements, were deemed to be satisfactory.
- B. Refuse Collection was deemed the most satisfactory service with 57% of those surveyed stating they were 'very satisfied' with this service. Blue Box Doorstep Recycling came a close second with 51% giving a 'very satisfied' rating.
- C. Another service area which rated highly was Parks & Open Spaces with 51% of residents who stated they were 'fairly satisfied' with this service. This is also highlighted in the table as the service area which rated the highest within the 'fairly satisfied' category itself.
- D. Though the majority of results for Pavement Maintenance resulted in 32% of those surveyed rating this service 'fairly dissatisfied' this was almost counterbalanced by the fact that 26% rated it 'fairly satisfied'. However the majority of 'very dissatisfied' and 'fairly dissatisfied' results did fall within the Pavement Maintenance category and therefore is a service which can be seen as an area for most concern by the general public.
- E. Public Conveniences were rated as 'fairly satisfied' by 28% of those surveyed, however 41% of people were 'neither satisfied nor dissatisfied' or 'did not know' which would indicate that a large number of people do not use public conveniences. There was however a recommendation for more public conveniences when asked the question 'why are you satisfied or dissatisfied with these services?'
- F. The survey results for Recycling Facilities increased low to high from 'very dissatisfied' to 'very satisfied' respectively, the majority of results (79%) falling within the category of 'very/fairly satisfied'.
- G. Street Lighting results followed a similar pattern with 72% of those surveyed rating this as 'very/fairly satisfied'.
- H. Though the majority of results for Road Maintenance and Repairs were 'fairly satisfied', the overall majority deemed this service as 'fairly/very dissatisfied', 43%, as opposed to 'very/fairly dissatisfied' at 40% of those surveyed.
- I. Over half of those people surveyed confirmed that they had contacted Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council within the last 12 months, for those who answered 'no' the survey was ended at that point.
- J. It must be noted that those who answered 'yes' to contacting Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council may not specifically be referring a query or enquiry relating to a Care for Your Area service area. Recommendation for future surveys of this kind should relate this question specifically to Care for Your Area.
- K. Contact by telephone was seen as the most popular method of contact with personal contact coming a not so close second. Once contact through an ombudsman was noted though no details of what department or service this particular form of contact related to was identified.
- L. Of those people who contact Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council a high majority found the staff helpful, efficient and able to deal with enquiry. Once more a high majority found

it easy getting hold of the right person and were satisfied with the final outcome. A suggestion for future surveys of this nature would be to enquire as to why those who answered questions 9 to 11 with a negative did so.

- M. When finally asked if they had access the Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council web-site within the last 6 months of those 55 people who completed the whole survey 32% said they had. We were unable to identify if the remaining 40 who did not complete the whole survey did or did not access the web due to their previous answer of 'no' to question 7.

draft



## Appendix 5 – meeting with representatives from the utilities companies on 4 August 2008

The Chair and Vice Chair of the Regeneration and Transport Select Committee were invited to the New Road and Streetworks Act (NRASWA) quarterly co-ordination meeting held at Kingsway House, Billingham on 4<sup>th</sup> August 2008, hosted by the Council's Technical Services department. The meeting was attended by representatives from various utilities companies responsible for installing and maintaining services including gas, water and communications. The questions set out below were put to the representatives from the utilities companies and form part of the information gathered during the course of the Highway Network Management Scrutiny Review.

Matters arising from the co-ordination meetings feed into the North East Highways Authorities and Utilities Committee (NEHAU), which meets to discuss national issues in connection with streetworks, streetworks co-ordination and works under the Act. Highways management matters are discussed at a regional level and at local level meetings are synchronised to match NEHAU meetings.

There are approximately 5,000 utilities highway openings within Stockton Borough each year. Generally there are five notices generated for each opening resulting in 25,000 notices received per annum. The job of the Council, as the Highway Authority, is to co-ordinate activities on the highway.

Question	Response
<p>1. How would you consider the working relationship with Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council regarding works on the highways?</p>	<p>The general consensus coming out of the meeting was that the utilities companies and SBC work well together. One utility company representative cited Stockton as the best authorities to work with compared to other authorities in the area.</p> <p>CE Electrics said that this is absolutely fine and there are no real issues. They have a good working relationship with the Council.</p> <p>United Utilities Gas said that co-ordination and co-operation were essential and cited the work on Stockton High Street as a good example of this.</p> <p>BT is happy with the working relationship with the Council. There was the odd example where they had started on the wrong day to that stated in the Notice.</p> <p>A1 (responsible for major road networks) said it was all about having good communications. The working relationship with the Council is generally good and the recent Surtees Bridge project</p>

	<p>was put forward as an example where this had worked well in practice.</p> <p>SBC work together with the utilities companies to get the best possible out of the working relationship. The Council follows the industry codes of good practice.</p>
<p>2. How well would you consider that the coordination of works on the highway in Stockton-on-Tees is undertaken?</p>	<p>Comments same as 1 above.</p> <p>Schedules of work sufficiently precise – a spreadsheet of major works ongoing is kept up to date which gives details of ongoing and planned works during the course of the current financial year. This is emailed out to utilities on a timely basis and in advance of the co-ordination meetings. As much advance information is given as possible to allow the utilities to progress their works).</p> <p>The Council’s Highways Dept. acts to protect the Council’s interests e.g. to prevent unnecessary road openings taking place (except in emergencies) following road resurfacing.</p> <p>Co-ordination with the Council’s planning department was raised e.g. new housing estates - utilities companies are involved at an early stage as services are installed before houses are built.</p> <p>Potential service diversions arising planning applications are also picked up at an early stage. It was noted however that some pre-planning enquiries are commercially sensitive.</p> <p>The Council operates EXOR, the software system used for managing notices and collating all information necessary in order to undertake works.</p>
<p>3. How frequently would you say that you exceed the agreed timescales for works on the highway? What policies do you have in place to try and prevent this occurring and what would you identify as the main reasons for this occurring?</p>	<p>Overruns are always discussed between the Highways dept and the utilities companies. Utilities companies notify the Council of the ‘reasonable duration’ of the works and can apply for extension. It is in the utilities companies’ interest to allow for a reasonable period of</p>

	<p>time to undertake the works. There is a duty to co-ordinate works so that everything operates as smoothly as possible.</p> <p>Extensions of time are negotiated where unforeseen problems arise. In some circumstances extensions may arise due to emergencies such as gas or water leaks.</p> <p>Penalties for overruns are applied on a daily basis (these can be as much as £2,000 per day).</p> <p>BT said it had 9 overruns on S74 works; United Utilities Gas - since April 2008, no overruns have been notified from SBC.</p> <p>When things go wrong, retraining/ re-education of utilities' companies' staff are provided as appropriate.</p> <p>Problems often arise as a result of poor communication between field staff and office staff. As a result improvements are generated within the organisation.</p>
<p>4. How do you ensure quality of reinstatements following works being completed? What pressures are there on utilities companies in respect to this?</p>	<p>The utilities companies have their own internal audit systems for checking the quality of reinstatements.</p> <p>SBC carries out regular inspections on category A, B and C reinstatements.</p> <p>Reinstatements are guaranteed for two years or three years where the reinstatement is more than 1.5 metres in depth.</p> <p>There is a statutory inspection programme of 30% of utilities' works, selected randomly by SBC and paid for by the utilities companies, who are required by law to pay councils the cost of the inspection programme. Reinstatements reported as defective by third parties are also inspected though these don't count towards the 10% (see below).</p> <p>The Council is statutorily obliged to carry out:</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 10% of sample inspections during progress of works (A);</li> <li>▪ 10% within 6 months of reinstatement (B); and</li> <li>▪ 10% within 3 months preceding the end of the two or three year guarantee period (C).</li> <li>▪ 10% of S74 notices.</li> </ul>
<p>5. What is the volume of complaints you receive from members of the public concerning excavations and reinstatements?</p>	<p>United Utilities said that it had received 700 complaints from 14 highway authorities covering an area from Berwick to Leeds.</p> <p>Procedures for notifying the public are covered under the requirements of the Code Of Practice. This includes placing courtesy boards to inform the public of works being undertaken (to include the utility company's telephone contact number).</p> <p>Normally, calling cards are given to all residents and there are liaison officers (for planned works). However this is not always practical in emergency situations.</p>
<p>6. What information do you provide to members of the public when you are about to undertake works in their area?</p>	<p>Covered in 5 above.</p> <p>Immediately affected residents are given a letter as well as those in the surrounding area.</p> <p>Also use letter and card drops depending on the type of work and how long the work is likely to take.</p>
<p>7. How well do you consider that your own objectives can work correspondingly with those of the road authority? Do you ever feel there is any disparity between these two sets of objectives?</p>	<p>Relates to questions 1 and 2 above.</p> <p>Overall, there is a good degree of co-operation with the Council.</p> <p>There is parity between what the utility companies have to do when serving notices and what highways have to do to 'notice' the work.</p> <p>The Council has a duty to demonstrate parity and send in notices in the same way utilities companies do (a national requirement). Parity between noticing systems is seen as a more level playing field.</p>

## Appendix 6 - Financial Questions and Responses

The Regeneration and Transport Select Committee would require information on:

1. The Council's current total capital budget for Highways and past budgets for comparison (last 2-5 years maybe?) (including winter maintenance budgets, street lighting etc);
2. The Council's current total revenue budget for Highways and past budgets for comparison (last 2-5 years maybe?) (including winter maintenance, street lighting etc);
3. The proportion of these budgets used for road maintenance;
4. The proportions of budgets used for planned and reactive road maintenance (links to allocations for capital / revenue budgets I presume?);
5. The costs of different road maintenance treatments (including surface dressing / treatment, resurfacing, reconstruction / strengthening roads, patching);
6. Industry specific inflation (I believe this is calculated using the Baxter Index?) – cost of bitumen etc;
7. The costs of condition surveys undertaken by DCL and internal highways inspectors;
8. The proportion of funding spent on maintenance of the different categories of road;
9. The proportion of total road maintenance budgets spent over the last few years including level of overspend (if any) or what would be considered a shortfall in budgets over the last few years;
10. Do you currently identify any future uncertainties or potential future impacts on highway budgets;
11. (Linking to question 4) The basis on which resources are allocated to road maintenance in Stockton and why this approach has been adopted – for example: BVPIs did include % of principal and non-principal roads which are likely to require maintenance on a 'fix worst first basis' (reactive maintenance), but there also appears the requirement now for a more explicit asset management approach (esp. through the requirement to produce an Asset Management Plan) and greater planned maintenance, repairing roads before they become the 'worst' – how are these managed and what are the tensions in managing budgets and allocating resources along these lines?
12. Is there funding flexibility to move to more planned rather than reactive road maintenance?
13. An understanding of the highway as an asset (e.g. current value and how this is calculated) and the usefulness of Asset Management Plans and the new emphasis on 'whole life costing' and 'depreciation accounting' in providing a basis for formulating highway maintenance budgets;
14. What is the rate of depreciation in value of the highway? How is this calculated?
15. Stockton is currently either top or second quartile for highway maintenance according to recent BVPI measures, what would you identify as the financial implications and budgetary pressures in maintaining this?

16. Would prudential borrowing be a consideration for highway maintenance in Stockton?

17. What was / is the funding following from the 2006 MORI Poll results been used for.

## **FINANCE RELATED QUESTIONS - responses**

### **Introduction**

The expenditure the Authority makes on its highways network currently sits within Development and Neighbourhood Services. Specifically within two of its Divisions: Technical Services, which provides a client role, and Direct Services which provides a contractor role.

The Authority makes both capital and revenue expenditure on its highways network. Capital expenditure relates to the creation / enhancement of an asset and revenue relates to the repair and maintenance.

### **Question 1**

Appendix 10 identifies the capital expenditure that has been made since 2004/5 through to 2007/8 and the planned expenditure for the current financial year 2008/09. This expenditure is split down over specific headings within the capital programme - such as non - principal roads and principal roads.

The funding for the majority of this work comes from the Structural Maintenance element of the Local Transport Plan (LTP), but some schemes can attract additional funding from developers. The level of capital expenditure made on the highway network each year is dictated by the level of funding allocated by Government through the LTP.

For 2007/8 and 2008/09 Council resources have been applied to carry out works relating to the Mori Survey. £500,000 was allocated for both these years.

### **Question 2 - 4**

Appendix 7A identifies the revenue expenditure that has been made from 2004/5 through to 2007/8 and the planned expenditure for 2008/09. There are a number of functions carried out under the banner of highway network as identified on the Appendix. Please note that the expenditure under Structural Maintenance includes work that is both programmed (approx £1.5m per annum) and reactive (approx £600k per annum). Also included is the public liability insurance charge, which is in excess of £1m per year.

### **Question 5**

The unit cost varies for different types of road treatment. The relevant form of treatment to give best value to the authority is more appropriate than quoting rates. However, the increasing cost of bitumen related to oil prices is addressed in question 6 below.

### **Question 6**

The increased cost of materials is addressed, in part, by the use of 'Baxter Indices'. This is a government issue (9 monthly) which reflects the increased cost of materials from a base date.

NB - further info to be provided at the meeting

The increased costs of materials may be compared to the incremental annual increase in the maintenance budgets. (1% or 2%)

### **Question 7**

On Appendix 7C under the Structural Maintenance there is a line titled HM Rating. This is the expenditure that has been made in relation to condition surveys and is usually in the region of £40k per annum. The main company used in this function is Data Collection Limited (DCL). In

relation to internal highways inspections there are four Asset Inspectors, which carry out this work. The annual salary cost for these members of staff is approx £90k for 2008/09.

**Question 8**

Appendix 7B identifies that total value of work that has been carried out on capital schemes for Principal and Non Principle road network for the periods identified in the review. The planned expenditure in 2008/09 for Principal Roads is £721k and for Non Principle this is £401k.

In relation to revenue spend the works are not recorded within the general ledger system based on road classification. But as a rough guide I have broken down the revenue expenditure (Appendix 7) based on road lengths data. This is shown at Appendix C. Please note that insurance costs are not included as part of this breakdown. This is summarised in the table below:

	<b>Road Lengths</b>	<b>2004/05 £</b>	<b>2005/06 £</b>	<b>2006/07 £</b>	<b>2007/08 £</b>	<b>2008/09 £</b>
Principal	73.112	312536	317021	314857	327017	335972
Non Principal	729.411	3118054	3162796	3141210	3262524	3351863
Total	702.523	3430590	3479817	3456067	3589541	3687835

**Question 9**

The highway maintenance budget is managed within budget allocation.  
Ref Q.6

**Question 10**

Ref Q.6. Also, discussion on the impact of Traffic Management Act and parity for co-ordination on street and road works.

**Question 11**

Refer to paragraph 4.76 page 29

**Question 12**

Yes, there is scope for flexibility (virement) of budgets to reflect the demands/needs for planned/reactive maintenance.

**Question 13 and 14**

The value of infrastructure assets held on the balance sheet at 31st March, 2008, amounted to £112m. These assets are currently included in the balance sheet at historical cost, net of depreciation, with capital expenditure incurred being added to the value on an annual basis. There are moves to change the valuation basis from historical cost to current value, although this is not likely to be introduced before 2011.

Depreciation is generally charged to the revenue account each year on a straight line basis over 40 years, apart from traffic signals, street lighting and bus shelter equipment assets that are currently depreciated over 10 years. The value of depreciation charged to the revenue account in 2007/08 amounted to £4.3m.

The Council's Asset Management Plan and Capital Strategy provide supporting information on the management of our infrastructure over the period 2007/08 to 2009/10. These specifically outline that plans have been developed for over £10m of investment, including £6m for integrated transport initiatives, £4m for highway and bridge maintenance, including street lighting and up to £45m for major projects, notably the Tees Valley Bus Network Review and East Billingham Transport Corridor.

### **Question 15**

The funding for structural maintenance on the principal and non-principal roads is determined by the DfT formula-based upon the road condition data.

(Importantly for SBC, the formula has a degree of protection for those authorities that have consistently spent their allocation on road maintenance rather than other services)

### **Question 16**

Prudential borrowing could be a possibility for highway maintenance. A business case would need to be produced to identify if this was an affordable option. The main driver for any business case would be if sufficient revenue savings could be generated to repay the borrowing over the life of the approvals (25 – 30 years). The savings would be generated as there would be less need to carryout repairs and maintenance works if new road surfaces were laid.

### **Question 17**

The additional £1m has been spread over two years and the aim is to improve the network condition by targeting specific maintenance. This was agreed with Cllr Cook, Cabinet Member.

Year 1:

Unscheduled Maintenance	£200k
Unadopted housing f/paths	£100k
Street scene	£50k
Additional schemes	£100k
Dropped crossing	£35k
Marketing	£15k

Year 2:

Additional schemes	£300k
Housing footpaths	£100k
Streetscene	£50k
Dropped crossing	£25k
Marketing	£25k



## Appendix 7A – financial information and road lengths

### REGENERATION AND TRANSPORT SELECT COMMITTEE

#### HIGHWAYS NETWORK SCRUTINY REVIEW - REVENUE AND CAPITAL EXPENDITURE DETAILS

	2001/02	2002/03	2003/04	2004/05 Actual £	2005/06 Actual £	2006/07 Actual £	2007/08 Actual £	2008/09 Estimate £
<b>Structural Maintenance</b>								
Unscheduled Maintenance (Reactive) (1)	554,212	607,262	651,834	581,418	586,816	592,942	595,801	605,714
Programmed Maintenance (Planned) (2)	1,721,370	1,572,308	1,466,512	1,420,843	1,461,926	1,321,005	1,442,294	1,510,594
<b>Total Structural Maintenance</b>	<b>2,275,582</b>	<b>2,179,570</b>	<b>2,118,346</b>	<b>2,002,261</b>	<b>2,048,742</b>	<b>1,913,947</b>	<b>2,038,095</b>	<b>2,116,308</b>
Insurance Charges	411,867	576,013	921,667	1,050,911	1,083,805	1,052,748	1,039,746	1,176,330
<b>Note</b>								
Please note that these figures exclude all charges for asset rentals and central departmental and technical support (CDT's)								
CAPITAL PRN ('A' roads structural mtce.)	311,000	378,000	282,000	526,494	245,719	407,752	354,493	721,000
CAPITAL non-PRN ('B' & 'C' roads)	0	592,000	445,000	444,267	696,858	726,300	479,053	401,554
MORI allocation (unclassified roads & footpaths)							500,000	500,000
<b>TOTAT CAPITAL AND REVENUE</b>	<b>2,586,582</b>	<b>3,149,570</b>	<b>2,845,346</b>	<b>2,973,022</b>	<b>2,991,319</b>	<b>3,047,999</b>	<b>3,371,641</b>	<b>3,738,862</b>
(1) Allocation used for minor repairs on roads and footpaths								
(2) Allocation used for structural maintenance for unclassified roads, including roads and footpaths								
% of reative to planned maintenance	32.20%	38.62%	44.45%	40.92%	40.14%	44.89%	41.31%	40.10%

Appendix 7B

**REGENERATION AND TRANSPORT SELECT COMMITTEE**

**HIGHWAYS NETWORK SCRUTINY REVIEW - CAPITAL EXPENDITURE DETAILS**

	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>	<b>2007/08</b>	<b>2008/09</b>
	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Estimate</b>
	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>
Bridge Strengthening	204,528	188,038	187,464	205,742	145,000
Bridge Assessments	54,671	5,648	104,754	49,690	55,000
Non Principal Roads	444,267	696,858	726,300	479,053	401,554
Principal Roads	526,494	245,719	407,752	354,493	721,000
MORI Funding				506,133	500,000
<b>Total Capital Expenditure</b>	<b>1,229,960</b>	<b>1,136,263</b>	<b>1,426,270</b>	<b>1,595,111</b>	<b>1,822,554</b>

## Appendix 7C

### REGENERATION AND TRANSPORT SELECT COMMITTEE

#### HIGHWAYS NETWORK SCRUTINY REVIEW - REVENUE EXPENDITURE DETAILS

	2004/05 Actual £	2005/06 Actual £	2006/07 Actual £	2007/08 Actual £	2008/09 Estimate £
<u>Structural Maintenance</u>					
Unscheduled Maintenance (Reactive)	581,418	586,816	592,942	595,801	605,714
Programmed Maintenance (Planned)	1,420,843	1,461,926	1,321,005	1,442,294	1,510,594
Other Scheduled Maintenance	40,872	14,035	68,364	74,680	70,660
Insurance Charges	1,050,911	1,083,805	1,052,748	1,039,746	1,176,330
HM Rating	38,252	32,909	41,547	42,218	42,460
Material Testing	66,359	40,093	63,264	65,034	65,656
<b>Total Structural Maintenance</b>	<b>3,198,655</b>	<b>3,219,584</b>	<b>3,139,870</b>	<b>3,259,773</b>	<b>3,471,414</b>
<u>General Maintenance</u>					
General Maintenance	95,613	94,061	88,723	81,893	82,116
<u>Bridges and Structures</u>					
Bridges and Structures	107,044	149,763	123,610	125,764	115,162
Newport Bridge	4,447	19,374	28,938	9,423	18,567
Transporter Bridge	130,375	125,968	151,206	132,044	150,000
<b>Total Bridges and Structures</b>	<b>241,866</b>	<b>295,105</b>	<b>303,754</b>	<b>267,231</b>	<b>283,729</b>
<u>Winter Maintenance</u>					
Winter Maintenance (Technical)	27,141	27,391	39,515	54,627	51,642
Winter Maintenance (Direct)	464,524	469,060	473,203	478,602	483,388
<b>Total Winter Maintenance</b>	<b>491,665</b>	<b>496,451</b>	<b>512,718</b>	<b>533,229</b>	<b>535,030</b>
<u>Highways Client Works (Direct Services)</u>					
Gully Emptying & Maintenance	208,151	208,481	212,065	231,894	234,056
Becks and Watercourses	8,928	18,546	5,818	18,918	19,107
Accident Damage	7,574	7,650	7,727	7,804	7,882
Street Name Plates	37,811	28,296	32,484	29,055	29,346
Safety Fences	9,667	4,920	895	14,432	14,576
Fences and Guardrails	24,779	28,657	38,349	19,819	20,017
Seats	2,762	2,716	12,160	2,770	2,798
Safety Signs	19,236	22,637	16,255	23,092	23,323
Grounds Inspections	128,202	129,860	131,272	132,585	133,911
Material Testing	6,592	6,658	6,725	6,792	6,860
<b>Total Highways Client Works</b>	<b>453,702</b>	<b>458,421</b>	<b>463,750</b>	<b>487,161</b>	<b>491,876</b>
<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURE HIGHWAY NETWORK</b>	<b>4,481,501</b>	<b>4,563,622</b>	<b>4,508,815</b>	<b>4,629,287</b>	<b>4,864,165</b>

#### Note

Please note that these figures exclude all charges for asset rentals and central departmental and technical support (CDT's)

## Appendix 8

### Road Lengths Data: Principal and Non Principal roads

	Network length (km) at 31 March each year
<b>Road Classification</b>	<b>2007</b>
<b>Total Expenditure (exclude Insurance)</b>	
Principal non-built up A roads	31.623
Principal built up A roads	41.489
Classified numbered non-built up B roads	1.631
Classified numbered built up B roads	11.506
Classified un-numbered non-built up C roads	58.489
Classified un-numbered built up C roads	43.337
Unclassified non-built up	33.553
Unclassified built up	580.895
<b>Total</b>	<b>802.523</b>

<b>TOTAL PRINCIPAL</b>	<b>73.112</b>
<b>TOTAL NON PRINCIPAL</b>	<b>729.411</b>
<b>TOTAL ROAD NETWORK</b>	<b>802.523</b>

Revenue Expenditure	Revenue Expenditure	Revenue Expenditure	Revenue Expenditure	Revenue Expenditure
<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>	<b>2007/08</b>	<b>2008/09</b>
<b>3,430,590</b>	<b>3,479,817</b>	<b>3,456,067</b>	<b>3,589,541</b>	<b>3,687,835</b>
135,181	137,120	136,185	141,444	145,317
177,355	179,900	178,672	185,573	190,654
6,972	7,072	7,024	7,295	7,495
49,185	49,891	49,551	51,464	52,874
250,026	253,614	251,883	261,611	268,775
185,255	187,913	186,631	193,839	199,147
143,431	145,489	144,496	150,077	154,186
2,483,184	2,518,817	2,501,626	2,598,239	2,669,388
<b>3,430,590</b>	<b>3,479,817</b>	<b>3,456,067</b>	<b>3,589,541</b>	<b>3,687,835</b>

<b>312,536</b>	<b>317,021</b>	<b>314,857</b>	<b>327,017</b>	<b>335,972</b>
<b>3,118,054</b>	<b>3,162,796</b>	<b>3,141,210</b>	<b>3,262,524</b>	<b>3,351,863</b>
<b>3,430,590</b>	<b>3,479,817</b>	<b>3,456,067</b>	<b>3,589,541</b>	<b>3,687,835</b>

**Appendix 9 – Members’ questionnaire**

**The sample**

The questionnaire was sent out to all Members of the Council as well as Parish and Town Councils.

**Response rates**

A response rate of 27% was achieved. The total number returned was 15.

**Questions and results.**

**Condition of the carriageways**

**1. How satisfied are you with the condition of carriageways in the Borough?**

Response	Number	Percentage
Very satisfied	1	6.7%
Fairly satisfied	8	53.3%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	1	6.7%
Fairly dissatisfied	5	33.3%
Very dissatisfied	0	0%
Don’t know / no opinion	0	0%

**Please explain why you think this below.**

- Some residents who have the skill to complain until something is done have an advantage over those who rarely complain officially.
- (Very satisfied) compared to other towns/cities visited.
- There are still many areas requiring attention which have been left for some time across the Borough.
- Many roads have been neglected over the years of shortage of funding. Where patched, the ride in driving can be bumpy and the roads look bad.
- The main roads round the Borough are in reasonable condition, it is the minor roads which concern me.
- Overall I am satisfied with the condition of the carriageways but I think there is room for improvement.
- There needs to be more emphasis on quality repairs and maintenance rather than quantity.
- Carriageways in Fairfield are generally quite good although residents’ perceptions seem to differ.
- On the whole they are OK, but the criteria for filling shallow potholes means that a lot are left unattended.
- The number of repairs and utility backfills of many roads gives them a poor appearance.
- There’s a very big range of condition across the Borough.
- Too many potholes and rough areas.
- Very bad for cyclists.
- Generally roads are well maintained and we don’t receive too many complaints about poor road surfacing.
- There are many roads with potholes which will get worse if repairs are not maintained.
- There is a lot of patching of damage to the road surfaces.

2. Are there any carriageways in your ward which you feel are in particularly poor condition? (Please name these below)

Carriageway	Ward
Some of the older roads in the Glebe Estate (e.g. Measham Road, which also needs different sloping kerbs for vehicle access).	Norton West
Would be reported to the CFYA team. Recently accompanied an asset technician on six-monthly ward inspection.	
Leeholme Road	Billingham East
Ramsay Road (concrete surface with some tarmac patches)	Roseworth
Fern Park Estate (needs total resurfacing)	
Comondale Avenue	Newtown
Glaisdale Avenue	
Westerdale Avenue	
Lingdale Avenue	
Bilsdale Avenue	
Newham Grange Avenue	
Delstrother Avenue	
Patterdale Avenue	
Kirkdale Avenue	Eaglescliffe
Burnmoor Drive and the roads off it Seymour Grove	
Parkwood Drive (needs resurfacing as a priority)	Hartburn
Kenville Grove (there are a few other areas with pot holes which need to be repaired, which are in hand)	Fairfield
Seymour Grove	Eaglescliffe
Aislaby Road from Trafford Hill to Low Middleton	
Seymour Grove	Eaglescliffe
Some on the Council estate that were owned by Housing.	Bishopsgarth & Elm Tree
Elm Tree Avenue in parts	
Linton Close – unadopted road	
Darlington Road – recorded problem where road resurfaced from Birkdale Road up to A66 roundabout (several areas of surface have lifted and contractor has not returned to resurface)	Hartburn
Tunstall Avenue	Billingham North

## Condition of the footways

### 3. How satisfied are you with the condition of footways in the Borough?

Response	Number	Percentage
Very satisfied	0	0%
Fairly satisfied	6	40%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	2	13.3%
Fairly dissatisfied	6	40%
Very dissatisfied	1	6.7%
Don't know / no opinion	0	0%

Please explain why you think this below.

- The flagstone footways suffer a deal of cracking caused by parking on the pavement. The 'cosmetic' cracking isn't dealt with and residents get upset.
- Footway condition in ward (Norton West) better than the average; poor pavement condition in Stockton High Street.
- Many areas appear neglected particularly in poorer areas of the Borough.
- Many cracked pavings from vehicular abuse and utilities companies' inadequate mending.
- The main areas are OK; it is off main areas that concern me.
- I would suggest that most areas in Fairfield Ward with paving slabs have a greater percentage which are cracked or broken – mostly damaged by parking and driving of cars, vans, lorries, especially refuse collection wagons.
- On the whole they are OK, but the criteria for filling shallow potholes means that a lot are left unmended.
- The number of repairs and utility backfills of many roads gives them a poor appearance.
- There's a very big range of condition across the Borough.
- Too many are rough, cracked – even if they are not deemed not bad enough to be mended.
- Ongoing problems with many pavements – mainly footpaths where the original paving stones have not been replaced by tarmac. Broken and cracked paving stones, although within tolerance, look unsightly and pose a danger to elderly and disabled people. Damage by heavy vehicles parking on pavements and many resident complaints about inconsiderate parking.
- Many footpaths and 'cut-throughs' in my ward have recently been re-tarmaced and are in better condition than they have been for a long time.
- Damage to paving and uneven paving.

4. Are there any footways in your ward which you feel are in particularly poor condition? (Please name these below)

Footway	Ward
Greenwood Road; part of Cowpen Lane	Billingham East
Fern Park	Roseworth
Commondale Avenue	Newtown
Glaisdale Avenue	
Westerdale Avenue	
Lingdale Avenue	
Bilsdale Avenue	
Newham Grange Avenue	
Delstrother Avenue	
Patterdale Avenue	
Kirkdale Avenue	Eaglescliffe
All the footways that are still paved. All the tarmac footways that have not been repaired.	
Arden Grove	Fairfield
Upsall Grove	
Cornfield Road	
Brookfield Road	
Dale Grove	
Kenville Grove	Eaglescliffe
Wells Cottages (adopted length)	
Yarm Road (parts)	
Lichfield Avenue	Bishopsgarth & Elm Tree
Felton Lane	
Marske Lane	
Part of Whitehouse Farm estate	
Most of Council Estate	
Bellerby Road	Hartburn
Christchurch Drive	
Ainderby Grove	
Masham Grove	Billingham North
Marsh House Avenue north of Merlin public house	

**Maintenance of carriageways and footpaths**

5. How satisfied are you with the time taken to repair defects on the roads (both carriageway and footways)?

Response	Number	Percentage
Very satisfied	1	6.7%
Fairly satisfied	10	66.7%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	3	20%
Fairly dissatisfied	1	6.7%
Very dissatisfied	0	0%
Don't know / no opinion	0	0%



**Please explain why you think this below.**

- Dangerous holes are repaired quickly once notified.
- Fairly satisfied with patching up; very dissatisfied for resurfacing.
- It takes too long to do repairs; it is not responsive enough.
- They are usually repaired within one week.
- When requested for general maintenance repairs they have been completed in a short period of time for carriageways and footpaths to a lesser extent.
- Usually OK, but sometimes white marks appear but aren't repaired.
- The time taken varies hugely. Some are completed very quickly while others take weeks.
- When it is good it is good.
- Sometimes potholes are marked for repairs and not done until chased.
- Reasonable response to requests.
- It took a few weeks to do the work in my ward. Residents and myself were not happy with leaving the work unfinished for long periods of time and leaving red/white barriers up for too long.
- The white marks appear around holes and sometimes these have worn away before the holes are repaired.

**6. How satisfied are you with the quality of repairs on roads?**

Response	Number	Percentage
Very satisfied	2	13.3%
Fairly satisfied	6	40%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	5	33.3%
Fairly dissatisfied	2	13.3%
Very dissatisfied	0	0%
Don't know / no opinion	0	0%

**Please explain why you think this below.**

- We have had occasions when the workmen repairing holes have left a mess of dried on cement on the tarmac footpath. Should clear up at the end.
- Small repairs often break down i.e. junction of Low Grange Avenue and Newham Avenue.
- Patching is ok for a while but complete resurfacing of worst areas is preferential.
- The quality seems fine, just length of time waiting.
- Usually a good job.
- There needs to be more emphasis on quality repairs and maintenance rather than quantity.
- The majority of road repairs have lasted for a good period of time. I have had no feedback from residents of poor quality of repairs to date.
- Don't get many complaints.
- Patching produces a poor result whereas total resurfacing produces a very high quality result.
- As above, repairs with white lines do not always get done.
- OK with roads except for specific areas mentioned previously. With footpaths, not too sure that temporary repairs are of good quality. Receive frequent reports from a particular resident highlighting areas of poor repair. Possible case for reviewing our performance and cost effectiveness in this area.
- I believe they have improved the time taken to do the work – just an observation on some of the busier routes.
- Again just patching that doesn't last very long.

**7. How satisfied are you with the quality of notification and information received in advance of works to roads being undertaken in your ward?**

Response	Number	Percentage
Very satisfied	2	13.3%
Fairly satisfied	5	33.3%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	3	20%
Fairly dissatisfied	4	26.7%
Very dissatisfied	1	6.7%
Don't know / no opinion	0	0%

**Please explain why you think this below.**

- At start of the Municipal year the work was begun before we were notified – need the list in advance.
- Usually timely and accurate.
- No schedule of times to start and finish work.
- Ward Councillors are still not being notified when schemes or projects are about to start.
- Received notification of works in advance of roads being undertaken. This is a good system, could be extended to a wider resident area.
- Often arrives after work starts.
- Press releases on road works don't always relate to reality (e.g. 'off-peak only' in reality 24/24) and sometimes inaccurate (e.g. Durham Lane confused with Durham Road).
- Sometimes don't get the information until the work has been started.
- We sometimes only get information as the work actually starts.
- Don't always receive advance notice. More often it's don't rather than do. We have reported this as a problem.
- Did not get to know about maintenance on 'cut-through' pathways near where I live until I made an enquiry as to why the red/white barriers and were up near one of these – we should have been notified at the start.
- Quite often we do not receive any notification.

**8. How satisfied are you with the feedback received after defects have been reported?**

Response	Number	Percentage
Very satisfied	2	13.3%
Fairly satisfied	5	33.3%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	2	13.3%
Fairly dissatisfied	3	20%
Very dissatisfied	3	20%
Don't know / no opinion	0	0

**Please explain why you think this below.**

- I don't think I receive any feedback; I have to rely on personal inspection.
- Feedback of some officers does not happen.
- Usually notified the same day.
- We do get a lot of feedback when defects are reported but not all. This could be improved on a weekly basis with a schedule of reported defects.
- Prompt Flare, but that's the last I hear.
- We get a very good response when we report a defect, and are given a FLARE number. However, we are not told when the work is actually done, which is how they slip through the net unless we keep going and looking for ourselves.
- The system of logging is good in that in the majority of cases we receive a reference number particularly if it is logged via our online forms system, which I think is good. What is not so good is not knowing if the work is completed. We never receive notification when the work is completed. This increases our work files is that unless we constantly follow up or visit the reported faults? This increases the workload of councillors and officers, as follow up can be time consuming. If we were able to log into the flare system to see the job status this may help.
- I have not been notified about any defects reported – no feedback.
- Quite often we do not receive any notification.

**Works undertaken by utilities companies**

**9. How satisfied are you with the frequency and coordination of excavations and reinstatements undertaken for utilities companies' works?**

Response	Number	Percentage
Very satisfied	0	0%
Fairly satisfied	3	20%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	5	33.3%
Fairly dissatisfied	3	20%
Very dissatisfied	2	13.3%
Don't know / no opinion	2	13.3%

**Please explain why you think this below.**

- It's a nuisance but it has to be done. I have queried some of the work being carried out but received a satisfactory reply.
- There appears a mixed bag here – it seems the more deprived an area is the less care taken.
- They seem to battle with SBC (a blame culture).
- There are still instances where work is carried out following a reinstatement or resurfacing work.
- This has been fairly good for those that we know of. Again it would be beneficial if there was a schedule of works undertaken by the utilities companies, including progress of works and completion of works. Also signed off as accepted.
- Without asking in specific cases, it's difficult to know which are planned (and therefore could be co-ordinated).
- Apart from emergency work there hasn't been anything needing co-ordination in recent times.
- Is there any co-ordination?
- We are not usually told if any excavations which I assume means that the Council has not been told.
- They are not good at maintaining proper security around an excavation.
- Not too much experience but in the case of electric faults remedial action seems to take an eternity. In my early days as a councillor we did have problems co-ordination with Utility companies as there are examples of the council replacing footpath and roads to be quickly followed by utility companies "digging up" surfaces for installation or service repairs. I have to say this does not seem to happen more recently.
- We do not get told what is about to happen – I asked workmen in my street (Water board) what they were doing and was it affecting the residents. They were most indignant and I was told 'no' and we did not need to know. I asked a resident if they had called them out and was told he was also concerned what was happening and had not called them.
- There doesn't seem to be any co-ordination.

**10. How satisfied are you with the quality of excavations and reinstatements to roads by utilities companies' works?**

Response	Number	Percentage
Very satisfied	1	6.7%
Fairly satisfied	4	26.7%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	1	6.7%
Fairly dissatisfied	5	33.3%
Very dissatisfied	2	13.3%
Don't know / no opinion	2	13.3%

**Please explain why you think this below.**

- The footpaths after excavations are not always reinstated properly and the flagstones drop leaving inspection hatches standing proud.
- Residents have complained about the standard of workmanship of some of the work carried out. Officers have had to bring back the utility contractors to carry out remedial work.
- Coloured markings remain for years. Reinstatement does not always match original so pavements can have a patchwork look.
- When done and complete not a problem; it is a question of doing.
- When work is undertaken on footpaths the whole pavement area should be resurfaced not just the trench.
- Have no complaints – quality seems to be good. Probably due to the vigilance of our highway officers auditing the utility companies' works.
- Too many reinstatements near boxes on footway sink.
- Standard of re-instatement appalling.
- In the main the work seems to be completed effectively.
- Too many contractors involved who are not interested in residents – they 'prepare' a job then no-one is on site for a few days leaving a mess for people to 'avoid' and problems with barriers being knocked over.
- They are usually ok.

**Residents' views**

**11. How far do you agree or disagree with the following statement:**

**The condition of roads is of concern to local residents**

Response	Number	Percentage
Strongly agree	9	60%
Agree	6	40%
Neither agree nor disagree	0	0%
Disagree	0	0%
Strongly disagree	0	0%
Don't know / no opinion	0	0%

**Please explain why you think this below.**

- Residents want ‘cosmetic’ defects dealt with.
- Our ward is populated by elderly people who are constantly worried about falling. Only one fall in the past year where an elderly lady fell over a utilities safety warning sign that had blown over.
- Not consulted.
- We are regularly informed of defects by residents.
- Many residents complain regarding the surface conditions.
- The perception of residents’ views on the condition of roadways has always been ‘that the roadways are in poor condition throughout the Borough.’ I tend to disagree with this since the majority of roadways in Fairfield are in reasonable condition.
- Number of reports received.
- They complain regularly.
- Feedback and complaints from residents.
- Ticked agree because we continue to get a number of complaints from residents. I guess if you were to measure the number against population then the % is small. It may well be that residents can’t be bothered to complain unless they suffer a bad experience.
- Because they are the ones who complain and use these all the time. Paths and roads.
- Especially car driving residents.

**12. How frequently do you receive complaints from residents concerning the condition of roads?**

Response	Number	Percentage
Almost every day	0	0%
At least once a week	7	46.7%
About once a month	5	33.3%
Within the last six months	2	13.3%
Within the last year	0	0%
Longer ago	1	6.7%
Never	0	0%

**13. What, in your experience, are the key concerns of residents in relation to the maintenance and condition of roads?**

Residents’ key concern	Frequency
Not inspected often enough (but many residents take on the task of reporting defects themselves)	1
Our ward is populated by elderly people who are constantly worried about falling.	1
Potholes and irregular surfacing	1
Deteriorating condition generally	1
They feel the area is forgotten.	1
Unightly condition caused by frequent patching.	1
Too many potholes in the road	1

Most pavements damaged and broken – condition of footpaths	1
More regular inspections	1
Quicker response to repairs	1
Parking on pavements – the big issue	1
They need mending	1
Failure to diagnose cause or find cure for subsidence and break-up of Seymour Grove carriageway.	1
Potholes on the roads making driving uncomfortable and the roads looking uncared for.	1
Trip hazards on pavements and weeds making the area look unkempt.	1
Potholes	1
Falls from cycles	1
Damage to car	1
Quality of pavements, particularly those damaged by heavy vehicles	1
Tarmac surfaces in bad repair, often due to regular disturbance by utility companies	1
Roads left in poor condition can cause accidents. Paths – especially for mothers etc with prams, buggies on the school run at least twice a day – some paths not much good for families in a 'hurry'.	1
Holes being satisfactorily repaired	1

**14. Overall do you receive positive or negative feedback from residents following works undertaken to improve roads?**

Response	Number	Percentage
Positive	3	20%
Negative	3	20%
Mixed	6	40%
Don't know / no opinion	3	20%



**Please explain why you think this below.**

- Complain about the mess left behind.
- Residents complain about the length of time it takes for newly laid bitmac to weather to the same colour as its surroundings.
- Residents Association often remarks on how newly resurfaced areas etc. look good and make a difference.
- Only the worst bits are addressed and then just patched up.
- Sometimes they think the work could have been extended further.
- Don't usually receive any feedback.
- We have had positive feedback from residents after repairs completed – possible relief that the work is completed.
- People get in touch to complain I'm afraid.
- Never receive any positive comments. Residents only contact me in the event of problems.
- If we are notified by the public of any problems and it is (eventually) dealt with, we do get positive feedback.
- Usually complaints about improvements that don't satisfy them.

**The criteria used to determine carriageway and footway maintenance**

15. How satisfied are you with access to information concerning maintenance and works undertaken on roads?

Response	Number	Percentage
Very satisfied	0	0%
Fairly satisfied	5	33.3%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	6	40%
Fairly dissatisfied	1	6.7%
Very dissatisfied	2	13.3%
Don't know / no opinion	1	6.7%

**Please explain why you think this below.**

- Appreciated 'walking the ward' with the Highways Engineer to spot defects.
- Is there any information given on maintenance work?
- None done, just patching.
- We get a good response from the highway dept. on works to be undertaken on roads. This could be improved with a schedule of works on a regular basis, including completion and signing off of works.
- Can't get criteria for resurfacing (rather than patching).
- I wasn't aware I could.
- Reasonably happy with communication process although I believe there is room for improvement.
- Sometimes work goes on in the Ward but if it is not near where I live, I don't always know. I can get some information on SBC website.

**16. How far do you agree with the following statement:**

**I feel I have a good awareness of the criteria used to determine repairs to roads and the priorities for repair.**

Response	Number	Percentage
Strongly agree	1	6.7%
Agree	8	53.3%
Neither agree nor disagree	1	6.7%
Disagree	2	13.3%
Strongly disagree	3	20%
Don't know / no opinion	0	0%

**Please explain why you think this below.**

- Seen it for myself.
- I have discussed this topic many times with highways officers.
- I have just found out in the last two weeks you have a points system; the quality of my area is 3 and almost a 4.
- I am aware of the criteria i.e. depth of a hole etc.
- This has been explained to the review committee – Regeneration and Transport on this issue, therefore have a good awareness of determination of priorities. Again this could be explained more to other councillors who are not on the committee.
- Can't get criteria for resurfacing (rather than patching).
- I don't know what criteria are overall – and would I understand it? Would lay person understand it?
- Understand the criteria we currently use for footpath repair although I don't necessarily agree with the limits. In a number of instances we have reported falls from elderly residents that would suggest our tolerances are set too high.
- I am not sure that I have – what I may think is a 'priority' may take months to be dealt with – probably 'funding' has something to do with it.

**17. How satisfied are you with the current criteria used to determine repairs to roads and the prioritising of works to roads and footpaths?**

Response	Number	Percentage
Very satisfied	0	0%
Fairly satisfied	7	46.7%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	1	6.7%
Fairly dissatisfied	5	33.3%
Very dissatisfied	1	6.7%
Don't know / no opinion	1	6.7%

**Please explain why you think this below.**

- I'm satisfied, my residents aren't. They want billiard table smooth surfaces maintained on all pathways all of the time.
- Don't know what the criteria are. Would like to know.
- I think the criteria are too tight.
- Have a good awareness of current criteria and its operation.
- Can't get criteria for resurfacing (rather than patching).
- By the time a defect reaches actionable state residents feel that the area is looking unkempt/ there are trip hazards.
- I feel the level of time needed for a repair is too high. Same for mending a pothole in a road.
- What are the current criteria?
- Repairs take too long.

**18. How far do you agree with the following statement:**

**I feel I am able to provide highways officers with feedback on works undertaken in my ward.**

Response	Number	Percentage
Strongly agree	5	33.3%
Agree	6	40%
Neither agree nor disagree	0	0%
Disagree	3	20%
Strongly disagree	0	0%
Don't know / no opinion	1	6.7%

**Please explain why you think this below.**

- But local residents are often dissatisfied with the outcome – someone comes to look at the problem but often no action is taken.
- We have an officer dedicated to our ward.
- Residents do tend to comment.
- Don't always know who to contact with this.
- Highways and pavements are just patched or small repairs.
- We have a good relationship with our highways officers and can discuss any topic of the works undertaken including feedback from residents. Our views are generally taken into consideration for acceptable outcomes, after considering all objectives to further the works.
- I report what isn't done/ done ok.
- They always listen. Not the same as getting the result I want of course!
- No problems in this area but don't always feel that the officers are able to react and correct particularly to hold contractors to account.
- I/ we can always give officers feedback if appropriate. That is not a problem, providing I know about it. Sometimes we do not get to know and have to ask the officers what is happening!
- Quite often we don't know works have been done.

## Pavement parking

The Council operates a pragmatic approach and tolerates pavement parking where it allows reasonable pedestrian passage along the footpath, in order to keep residential streets unobstructed for emergency vehicles and public transport.

### 19. How far do you agree with the following statement:

**Parking on pavements is a problem in the Borough.**

Response	Number	Percentage
Strongly agree	6	40%
Agree	5	33.3%
Neither agree nor disagree	1	6.7%
Disagree	0	0%
Strongly disagree	2	13.3%
Don't know / no opinion	1	6.7%

### Please explain why you think this below.

- Road looks untidy, impedes pedestrians, cracks flagstones and ruins grass verges.
- Many roads in our ward predate the internal combustion engine.
- Pavement and verge parking is a very regular complaint.
- Roseworth ward was never built for level of car ownership.
- Where and how are pedestrians/ disabled supposed to access/ egress?
- Residents' inability to understand that they should inconvenience other road users rather than pedestrians.
- I am not in favour with this pragmatic approach. It gives drivers the right to park their vehicle anywhere they wish on pavements without regard to safety of pedestrians and disregard the requirement for emergency vehicle access.
- Helpful with some narrow carriageways but many footways obstructed by parked vehicles for wheelchairs etc.
- Subsidence of pavements due to parking of vehicles.
- Almost every estate road has pavements damaged by pavement parking. People pushing wheelchairs and prams or using mobility scooters sometimes have to cross the road or even go on the road in order to pass parked vehicles. Sometimes drivers of council vehicles and Tristar vehicles are the culprits.
- Far too many pavements and verges are in a bad state because of pavement parking.
- Access on footpaths denied to pushchairs/ wheelchairs and even to pedestrians at times.
- Even allowing for the Councils pragmatic approach there are numerous cases of irresponsible car owners that make life difficult for the pedestrian, fellow care owners and councillors!!
- When development has taken place they have not given sufficient width on roads for parking. It is safer to park partly on pavements – for traffic to keep moving safely. We do not have many problems or complaints about it.
- Cars parked on pavement to the inconvenience of pedestrians.

**20. How far would you agree with the following statement:**

**I have a clear understanding of the rules governing parking on pavements.**

Response	Number	Percentage
Strongly agree	2	13.3%
Agree	1	6.7%
Neither agree nor disagree	4	26.7%
Disagree	6	40%
Strongly disagree	2	13.3%
Don't know / no opinion	0	0%

**Please explain why you think this below.**

- Seems to vary on a case by case basis.
- Never really thought about this but I don't know the rules.
- Documents and legislation from Council and police.
- Inconsistent interpretation.
- In my opinion there is no clear understanding of the rules governing parking on pavements. Without exception I have asked many people in the Council, councillors and police and they can't give a true definition on the rules or legality on this issue. This should form a wider/ global debate on the parking on pavements and its legality from Council to government.
- Unclear what is an obstruction.
- I think I understand but unless someone tests me on them I shan't know for certain!
- I understand about rules on obstruction.
- I have some knowledge that gets me by but an update would not go amiss.
- I have some understanding e.g. obstruction for pedestrian use of footpaths – I am unsure of the 'legal' aspects – or rules.

**21. What measures would you like to see implemented in order to reduce parking on pavements.**

- When there are more cars in a household than available parking within the curtilage of the property there will always be a problem.
- Impossible without causing a riot. The financial downturn coupled with increased fuel costs will make an impact – more than anything SBC can do.
- More parking bays in neglected roads; free drop kerbs to get vehicles within people's properties; more hard standing areas off road.
- More lay-bys and verge treatment – not just dependent on our small environmental improvements budget – or make it much bigger.
- Enforcement to be active.
- Residents/ tenants to know to park.
- Council to enhance parking schemes.
- Dropped kerbs initiatives (disabled and elderly free).
- Strict enforcement.
- Remove pavement parking to (reduce cost of repairs), provide more parking bays at every road location. Enforce the restrictions of pavement parking by police and enforcement officers.
- Article in 'Stockton News' on do's and don'ts.
- Warnings followed by ticketing by police where it is obstructive.
- Education and enforcement.
- 'Advisory' notices to put on car windscreens saying something like 'People could not get past your car because .....' and 'the reason why this pavement is eroded is because.....'
- More lay-bys for parking need to be provided in some areas and these are too expensive to come out of our SEIB.
- Difficult to say, particularly when we have families with more than one vehicle to house. There are many cases however where owners do not make full use of the drive, perhaps through the inconvenience of moving vehicles to keep them off the road. Don't have a ready-made answer but perhaps we should be less tolerant in areas where residents constantly park at an inconvenience to others. Concern for others is not high on people's agenda perhaps we should use more enforcement to offset this intolerance.
- Where possible make 'lay by' parking outside people's homes – where there is a path, some grass, then the road. It would also help CFYA with grass cutting on these narrow strips. Some residents need drop-down kerbs for access to their drives – we have requested this in the past!
- Getting residents to use their garage or driveways.

**22. If you have any other comments or suggestions you would like to make about any of the topics covered in this questionnaire, please give them below.**

- Grass verges could have been included in this survey.
- We need parking – (see 21 re parking bays) – no good saying such budgets are with members. It needs a huge initiative to clear highway by getting cars off them.
- The roads and paths mentioned in Q2 I would consider a health and safety issue.
- I would like to have a chance to input into the decision as to which footpaths are to be re-laid rather than just be given the list for the year.
- There needs to be a bigger budget for repairs to pavements.
- Points in 21 crucial:-  
'Advisory' notices to put on car windscreens saying something like 'People could not get past your car because .....' and 'the reason why this pavement is eroded is because.....'  
More lay-bys for parking need to be provided in some areas and these are too expensive to come out of our SEIB.  
Clamp down harder on public utilities that do not do adequate reinstatements. If necessary, involve Councillors/ public in inspection before the time is up.
- I would like more communication with the departments if there is work about to start – residents ask and I do not know what is being done so usually try to find out after something has begun. We are not always consulted.

## Appendix 10 – Parish and Town Council questionnaire

### The sample

The questionnaire was sent out to all Members of the Council as well as Parish and Town Councils.

### Response rates

A response rate of 58.8% was achieved. The total number returned was 10.

### Questions and results.

#### Condition of the carriageways

##### 1. How satisfied are you with the condition of carriageways in the Borough?

Response	Number	Percentage
Very satisfied	0	0%
Fairly satisfied	2	20%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	4	40%
Fairly dissatisfied	3	30%
Very dissatisfied	1	10%
Don't know / no opinion	0	0%

##### Please explain why you think this below.

- Many road/ footpath surfaces are not up to the standard of the best – one example of the best being the recently resurfaced sections of Thorntree Road, Thornaby, but the remaining unresurfaced sections remain below this standard. Such areas show the uneven finish left by roadworks and cable laying. However, such potholes as have appeared (e.g. Redcar Road 7 Northumberland Road) have been patched in good time recently.
- Members feel that conditions vary across the Borough.
- The policy of only filling potholes deeper than 40mm has resulted in large numbers of areas where the road surface is dangerous especially to cyclists and motorcyclists.
- I am not aware of any defects (apart from those in 2 below).
- Damage to lanes because of increased lorry traffic, causing rapid deterioration of verges and road edges.
- Some roads are OK, some need attention.
- Forest Lane, Kirklevington, is currently a messy, uneven patchwork of surfacing, especially the western end of from the A67 to Braeside. It has been in this state for over a year now.



2. Are there any carriageways in your ward which you feel are in particularly poor condition? (Please name these below)

Carriageway	Parish Council
Oxford Road - despite recent remedial patching	Thornaby
Thornaby Road - uneven surface & sunken covers etc along line cyclists expected to take esp. at narrow points where traffic islands are sited	
Derwent Road - despite recent remedial patching	
Cuthbert Close - despite recent remedial patching	
Peel Street - despite recent remedial patching	
Park Terrace - despite recent remedial patching	
Bassleton Lane -marked for repairs near jcn. With Upper Green Lane	
White House Road - near jcn. with Bassleton Lane	
Chesterton Ave. - near jcn. with Bassleton Lane	
Falcon Walk (1-16)	
Fir Tree Close (concrete)	
New road surface to Fox Covert beginning to break up	
Drainage not maintained	Yarm
No	
Whitton – road surface poor when carriageway has been dug up and repaired	Stillington & Whitton
Redmarshall Street – many potholes/ repaired potholes	
South Avenue entrance poor	
Park Crescent/ Whitton Grove - many potholes/ repaired potholes	
Drovers Lane to Fairfield (being resurfaced this year)	Redmarshall
Queen Elizabeth Way, which has some potholes	Ingleby Barwick
Junction Beckfields Avenue/ Thorington Gardens (near shops) potholes in road	
Chestnut Road – back lane – patched up several times and then sunk 3-4 weeks later	Preston-on-Tees
Lane between Redmarshall and Darlington Back Lane	Carlton
Thorpe Lane between Carlton and Thorpe Thewles	
The Causeway	Billingham Town Council
Marsh House Avenue	
Cambrian Road	
Low Grange Avenue	

Forest Lane	Kirklevington & Castle Leavington
-------------	--------------------------------------

**Condition of the footways**

**3. How satisfied are you with the condition of footways in the Borough?**

Response	Number	Percentage
Very satisfied	1	10%
Fairly satisfied	2	20%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	4	40%
Fairly dissatisfied	2	20%
Very dissatisfied	1	10%
Don't know / no opinion	0	0%

**Please explain why you think this below.**

- Recent improvements in repair and design (e.g. dropped kerbs). Also good response turnaround to notified problem areas such as sunken/ cracked paving or potholed tarmac footpaths. However, some verges and kerbs suffer from vehicle incursion.
- Members feel that conditions vary across the Borough.
- Footpaths in Redmarshall have been deteriorating over the years, but over the past 12 months this has been corrected.
- Cracks appear – tree roots disrupt.
- Shrubs are not always cut back.
- Each footpath that is tarmac stands in water after rain.
- Pavements in towns are adequate but I don't walk from Carlton to anywhere – we tend to go out of the village by car. The pavements within Carlton Village itself are adequate at present.
- Paving stones of different height.

**4. Are there any footways in your ward which you feel are in particularly poor condition? (Please name these below)**

Footway	Parish Council
Barkston Avenue	Thornaby
Between Lockerby Walk & Master Road (Tarmac)	
Richardson Road	
Between entrance to Health Centre & wooden fence	
Alongside Village School (Orchard Road)	
Greenville Road/ Forest Mews	Yarm
No	
West Street – broken paving slabs; tarmac footways are in much better condition	Stillington & Whitton
None	Redmarshall

Many footpaths in Lowfields and Beckfields villages are cracked. A complete inspection of the area is called for.	Ingleby Barwick
Not really	Carlton
Cambrian Road	Billingham Town Centre
Low Grange Avenue (Telstar end)	
Station Road/ Chapel Road	
Footpath around the lower part of Spring Bank has received many complaints & the PC has sent photos of the damage. The path has now disintegrated for much of its length and is covered in grass/ weeds.	Kirklevington & Castle Levington

### Maintenance of carriageways and footpaths

#### 5. How satisfied are you with the time taken to repair defects on the roads (both carriageway and footways)?

Response	Number	Percentage
Very satisfied	1	10%
Fairly satisfied	4	40%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	2	20%
Fairly dissatisfied	3	30%
Very dissatisfied	0	0%
Don't know / no opinion	0	0%

#### Please explain why you think this below.

- Recent improvements in repair and design (e.g. dropped kerbs). Also good response turnaround to notified problem areas such as sunken/ cracked paving or potholed tarmac footpaths. However, some verges and kerbs suffer from vehicle incursion.
- When problems are reported they are attended to quickly – routine inspection by SBC pick up most problems.
- Minor repairs seem not to be undertaken until resurfacing is required.
- Sometimes it takes quite a while for work to be done.
- Holes at the end of Green Leas have now been mended, though I did think it might have happened a bit sooner.
- Length of time too long to complete works.
- See previous comments on Forest Lane and Spring Bank.

#### 6. How satisfied are you with the quality of repairs on roads?

Response	Number	Percentage
Very satisfied	0	0%
Fairly satisfied	4	40%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	2	20%

Fairly dissatisfied	4	40%
Very dissatisfied	0	0%
Don't know / no opinion	0	0%

**Please explain why you think this below.**

- Recent improvements in repair and design (e.g. dropped kerbs). Also good response turnaround to notified problem areas such as sunken/ cracked paving or potholed tarmac footpaths. However, some verges and kerbs suffer from vehicle incursion.
- In many cases repairs don't seem to last very long. Often the same pothole etc. needs repairing again after a relatively short time span.
- Resurfacing very good, repairs not very good.
- In most cases if problems they are rectified reasonably quickly.
- Time will tell – see how long the patches hold.
- Some OK, some not.
- See previous comments on Forest Lane.

**7. How satisfied are you with the quality of notification and information received in advance of works to roads being undertaken in your ward?**

Response	Number	Percentage
Very satisfied	3	30%
Fairly satisfied	3	30%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	2	20%
Fairly dissatisfied	1	10%
Very dissatisfied	0	0%
Don't know / no opinion	1	10%

**Please explain why you think this below.**

- Has improved.
- There is good communication between SBC and the Parish Council.
- Drovers Lane and the footpaths inside Redmarshall are the first major schemes to be done for years and notification good.
- We received our first notification of work to be carried out, to be done in June. When this did not happen, the Parish Council had to make its own enquiries as to why this had not happened.
- No notification received, as far as I am aware.
- Always receive correspondence in advance.

**8. How satisfied are you with the feedback received after defects have been reported?**

Response	Number	Percentage
Very satisfied	0	0%
Fairly satisfied	3	30%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	2	20%
Fairly dissatisfied	2	20%
Very dissatisfied	2	20%
Don't know / no opinion	1	10%

**Please explain why you think this below.**

- There is good communication between SBC and the Parish Council although sometimes the clerk has to chase up SBC for a response.
- When I have reported potholes they have not been done as they are less than 40mm deep although they are in dangerous positions such as bends.
- I have no knowledge of this process, never having personally reported any defects, nor, therefore, received any feedback.
- BT Council have to chase for this.
- See previous comments on Forest Lane and Spring Bank.

**Works undertaken by utilities companies**

**9. How satisfied are you with the frequency and coordination of excavations and reinstatements undertaken for utilities companies' works?**

Response	Number	Percentage
Very satisfied	0	0%
Fairly satisfied	1	10%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	5	50%
Fairly dissatisfied	2	20%
Very dissatisfied	1	10%
Don't know / no opinion	1	10%

**Please explain why you think this below.**

- Insufficient information on this.
- Communication between utilities and the Parish Council has been fairly good.
- The last utility work in Redmarshall was over 10 years ago, British Gas.
- Rather like 'Curate's egg', good in parts.
- Seems adequate, as far as I am aware.
- Timescales inaccurate, lack of correspondence.
- Better co-ordination would minimise disruption on a narrow road.

**10. How satisfied are you with the quality of excavations and reinstatements to roads by utilities companies' works?**

Response	Number	Percentage
Very satisfied	0	0%
Fairly satisfied	2	20%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	4	40%
Fairly dissatisfied	3	30%
Very dissatisfied	1	10%
Don't know / no opinion	0	0%

**Please explain why you think this below.**

- Past reinstatements have left road surfaces in an unsatisfactory condition to cyclists. However, recent reinstatement of paved footpath and grassed areas of Thornaby road (by the electricity utility) is excellent.
- Areas that have been reinstated seem to require further repairs for potholes at regular intervals.
- Grass verges at the side of roads are not always reinstated to a satisfactory standard e.g. Thornwood Avenue/ Middle Road, Ingleby Barwick.
- In some cases trenches etc. not too well fenced off.
- Seems adequate, as far as I am aware.
- It's never as good once road is repaired.

**Residents' views**

**11. How far do you agree or disagree with the following statement:**

**The condition of roads is of concern to local residents**

Response	Number	Percentage
Strongly agree	3	30%
Agree	4	40%
Neither agree nor disagree	2	20%
Disagree	1	10%
Strongly disagree	0	0%
Don't know / no opinion	0	0%

**Please explain why you think this below.**

- Localised issues have been raised by residents' groups and groups of residents (particularly in relation to access/ parking/ kerbs/ verges).
- The Parish Council receives few comments from residents about the road condition – other than comments re dog fouling on footpaths.
- This is ambiguous – people do care about the condition of roads.
- On the basis of recent conversation with residents, the state of the local roads is indeed a matter for concern.
- On the basis of recent conversation with residents, the state of the local roads is indeed a matter for concern.
- Because we use them every day and we want them to be in good condition.
- Complaints regarding the state of both paths and roads are received from time to time.

**12. How frequently do you receive complaints from residents concerning the condition of roads?**

Response	Number	Percentage
Almost every day	0	0%
At least once a week	1	10%
About once a month	5	50%
Within the last six months	2	20%
Within the last year	1	10%
Longer ago	1	10%
Never	0	0%

**13. What, in your experience, are the key concerns of residents in relation to the maintenance and condition of roads?**

Residents' key concern	Frequency
Damage to verges/ kerbs & vehicle access/ parking. Danger to/ facilitating pedestrian use & cycling.	1
Road flooding, blocked drains.	1
Lack of snow clearing.	1
Repairs (potholes) don't last long.	1
Traffic jams	1
Potholes and tripping hazards and safety and cleanliness.	1
Condition of the road between the model flying club and Fairfield and the number of accidents due to adverse camber.	1
Residents expect the roads to be maintained to a high standard	1

Potholes and dropped manhole covers	1
The increasing use by heavy trucks of sat-nav devices which route lorries through villages – by choosing the most direct/ quickest routes rather than the most suitable route.	1
Timescale	1
Wear and tear of vehicles	1
Potential property price decrease	1
State of tripping hazards due to potholes or disintegrating surfaces.	1

**14. Overall do you receive positive or negative feedback from residents following works undertaken to improve roads?**

Response	Number	Percentage
Positive	2	20%
Negative	0	0%
Mixed	7	70%
Don't know / no opinion	1	10%

**Please explain why you think this below.**

- Concerns relating to revisited reworking of supposedly completed works – e.g. traffic calming, Northumberland Road. Such traffic calming measures as road humps inconvenience the law-abiding majority for the sake of a minority of speeders.
- Some residents value the improvements, others feel that the cost of improvements seems excessive and money could be better used elsewhere.
- Once done people just seem to accept it.
- Some like them, some don't.

**The criteria used to determine carriageway and footway maintenance**

**15. How satisfied are you with access to information concerning maintenance and works undertaken on roads?**

Response	Number	Percentage
Very satisfied	1	10%
Fairly satisfied	3	30%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	2	20%
Fairly dissatisfied	3	30%
Very dissatisfied	0	0%
Don't know / no opinion	1	10%



**Please explain why you think this below.**

- Access has improved.
- SBC officers communicate well with the Parish Council.
- I have only been a parish Councillor for a short while but I am told that recently this has been very good.
- I am not aware of much information.
- Only been advised once.
- I am not aware of being able to access such information.
- We are kept informed.
- Spring Bank – this path has received one more verbal complaints than any others in the parish. Complaints to the Borough Council from the Parish Council have not been acted upon.

**16. How far do you agree with the following statement:**

**I feel I have a good awareness of the criteria used to determine repairs to roads and the priorities for repair.**

Response	Number	Percentage
Strongly agree	1	10%
Agree	1	10%
Neither agree nor disagree	3	30%
Disagree	3	30%
Strongly disagree	2	20%
Don't know / no opinion	0	0%

**Please explain why you think this below.**

- Could be updated.
- Systems and procedures used to determine priorities have been explained to the Parish Council.
- I am a chartered civil engineer and former local authority highway engineer.
- I do not know the criteria.
- We don't have any information regarding criteria.
- Sometimes we are not made aware.

**17. How satisfied are you with the current criteria used to determine repairs to roads and the prioritising of works to roads and footpaths?**

Response	Number	Percentage
Very satisfied	0	0%
Fairly satisfied	1	10%

Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	1	10%
Fairly dissatisfied	2	20%
Very dissatisfied	0	0%
Don't know / no opinion	6	60%

**Please explain why you think this below.**

- Insufficient information.
- The roads and footpaths are generally in a fairly good state of repair in the Parish.
- The size of a pothole should not be the only criteria initiating a repair.
- We don't have any information regarding criteria.
- See previous comments on Forest Lane and Spring Bank.

**18. How far do you agree with the following statement:**

**I feel I am able to provide highways officers with feedback on works undertaken in my ward.**

Response	Number	Percentage
Strongly agree	2	20%
Agree	5	50%
Neither agree nor disagree	1	10%
Disagree	0	0%
Strongly disagree	1	10%
Don't know / no opinion	1	10%

**Please explain why you think this below.**

- SBC officers are always prepared to listen and consider the comments made by members of the Parish Council and provide assistance/ advice when requested.
- Communications via the Town Clerk are good.
- I get feedback from my Councillors and some residents.
- I am not aware of a mechanism for gathering or channelling such feedback.

**Pavement parking**

**The Council operates a pragmatic approach and tolerates pavement parking where it allows reasonable pedestrian passage along the footpath, in order to keep residential streets unobstructed for emergency vehicles and public transport.**

**19. How far do you agree with the following statement:**

**Parking on pavements is a problem in the Borough.**

Response	Number	Percentage
Strongly agree	2	20%
Agree	3	30%
Neither agree nor disagree	2	20%
Disagree	3	30%
Strongly disagree	0	0%
Don't know / no opinion	0	0%

**Please explain why you think this below.**

- Damage to verges/ kerbs & vehicle access/ parking. Danger to/ facilitating pedestrian use & cycling.
- There are problems in small areas at certain times but overall no major problems have been noticed.
- The roads (internal) in Redmarshall are narrow and if the parking was completely on the highway it would make passing difficult.
- This is a cause for concern, especially with the narrow roads. Parking on pavements causes great danger.
- Based on personal observation both as a pedestrian and motorist, I have not noted any problem.
- Need more off road parking. Suggestion grass verges be used for parking bays.

**20. How far would you agree with the following statement:**

**I have a clear understanding of the rules governing parking on pavements.**

Response	Number	Percentage
Strongly agree	0	0%
Agree	3	30%
Neither agree nor disagree	4	40%
Disagree	0	0%
Strongly disagree	2	20%
Don't know / no opinion	1	10%

**Please explain why you think this below.**

- Information from officers.
- Members feel they are aware of the risks regarding this issue.
- Where do you find out what these rules are?
- I have been given details from the now defunct Stockton South Road Safety Forum.
- We are not aware of this issue.

**21. What measures would you like to see implemented in order to reduce parking on pavements.**

- Parking bays where appropriate and acceptable to residents.
- Mesh reinforcement of grassed areas where appropriate.
- More parking spaces.
- None.
- Members do not see it as a significant problem so would prefer to see resources used elsewhere.
- More off street parking areas, but this would be difficult to provide and owners are also aware of security of vehicles.
- People should be encouraged to park on their own property – even if it means sacrificing their front gardens. This is one reason why Ingleby Barwick Town Council does not support the conversion of garages to habitable rooms.
- We have to rely on the local police officers to deal with our complaints, but, due to this parking taking place in the evening, police cover is restricted.
- I don't see the need to do so.
- More off road parking. Covert grass verges to parking bays.
- Not necessarily yellow lines all over the village, but targeted areas near to awkward junctions (Ash Grove/ Forest Lane) at east of village (Springfield Grove (problem due to pub patrons)/ Forest Lane) at west end of village (Pump Lane/ Forest Lane).

**22. If you have any other comments or suggestions you would like to make about any of the topics covered in this questionnaire, please give them below.**

- Dedicated cycle paths are disconnected and do not yet meet the aspirations of the Council for a proper network.
- There should be a more strict enforcement of rules relating to yellow lines.
- No further comments. I think our main concerns relate to recent increase in heavy goods traffic through villages and down country lanes causing heavy wear and tear on our roads in the area.

## **Appendix 11 – insurance claims questions**

The Committee received responses to a predetermined set of insurance claims questions from Jim Bell, Corporate Risk and Insurance Manager). The questions and responses are set out below.

### **1. Why is money held back for insurance claims – to what extent does the Council self-insure?**

*Following the demise of the Municipal Mutual Insurance Company in 1992 ‘ground up’ insurance cover (i.e. all potential losses being fully covered by insurance) was no longer available to local authorities. Councils were forced to turn to the commercial insurance market, and to accept that future insurance protection for legal liability type risks would invariably be subject to compulsory deductibles/excesses.*

*The payment of claims falling within the amount of the deductible could be made from the revenue budgets of the individual services on a pay-as you-go basis. However, in view of the unpredictability of the number and costs of claims in any one year, Stockton’s robust approach has been to establish a central self-insurance fund for retained legal liability risks, and this has been in place as part its insurance programme strategy since 1992.*

*Although the imposition of an insurance deductible is unavoidable, the level at which this is set to apply in respect of each and every claim is open to negotiation with the insurance company concerned. The decision in this regard is made on economic grounds to achieve an acceptable balance and combination between external insurance and self-insurance coverage suited to the Council’s resources and in-house risk management capability. Also taken into account are the benefits which accrue from self-funding as follows:*

- *Profits are retained and investment income earned on the self funding provision.*
- *Lower administrative expenses than those incurred by the Authority and insurer combined.*
- *Higher self-retention levels reduce external insurance renewal premiums.*
- *Saving on payment of Insurance Premium Tax (currently 5%)*

*Taking all of these factors into account the Council’s self-insures up to a limit of £100,000 for each and every legal liability claim, and the exposure of the self- insurance fund to individual claims is protected by an aggregate monetary limit to ensure that the total payments made by the Authority in any one year do not exceed a predetermined sum. Stockton has just recently undertaken a successful Consortia tender for Insurance, in conjunction with Darlington. The impact of this is being analysed in readiness for the 2009/10 budget cycle and will feed into the overall budget process.*

### **2. Who else retains insurance reserves (e.g. other local authorities/ locally/ regionally) – is it standard practice?**

*For the historic and reasons of economic advantage stated above, to our knowledge all Unitary authorities have some degree of planned and conscious risk retention, and it is usual practice for such exposures to be financed by self-insurance provisions. With the higher risk ratings of some of their broader based areas of service delivery, e.g. social care and education, external insurance premiums would otherwise be prohibitive. In any event, as mentioned earlier, ground up cover is no longer available from the commercial insurance market.*

### **3. Can the Council move away from this practice of holding insurance reserves?**

*Given that a degree of self-retention of risk is unavoidable, the primary objective of the Council's associated self-insurance strategy is to protect services against unexpected and unpredictable demands on their revenue budgets, and which they may not be able to meet from contemporaneous financing. Also, as previously mentioned, there are long-term financial benefits to establishing and maintaining self-funding provision and the Authority has the in-house management capability to handle particular risks more efficiently through self funding than by external insurance placement.*

### **4. What is the minimum amount we could retain?**

*The deductible and aggregate cap levels apply to all legal liability claims (Public Liability, Employers Liability, Professional Indemnity etc) pursued against the Council. The funding provisions for these are based on actuarial projections of expected numbers of claims and ultimate settlement costs to ensure as far as possible that they are adequate to meet the maximum possible losses and take into account reserves in respect of outstanding claims, potential claims yet to be reported and contingent liabilities.*

*The forecasts do not identify and address highway liability cases separately and independently of other types of liability claims. Therefore, it would be necessary to commission a particular actuarial study to obtain projections of future liabilities specifically for roads and footpaths. However, as detailed in the answer to question 9 below, it is felt that a holistic approach to allocation of resources at budget setting time is the correct approach. This approach has led to the Audit Commission ranking Stockton as one of the best councils in the country for its Use of Resources.*

### **5. What would be the implications if we spent this money instead on making improvements to footways rather than holding money in reserve (prevention rather than reaction)?**

*Due to the fact we have not commuted money from the self insurance fund to spend on footpath improvements previously, we can only speculate on the impact of so doing. It would seem logical that prevention will reduce claims. To be beneficial the money spent would need to produce savings at a ratio over and above the funds deployed. Given the varying data for Stockton set out below, it might be difficult to evaluate whether a drop in footway claims is directly due to the works undertaken, or a rise in claims is happening in other highway areas without some detailed analysis. It would seem sensible that if this transition is undertaken, it is for a trial period to allow hard evidence to be gathered to determine the effectiveness of the change. If a recommendation is to come forward that the Council pursues this option, it is suggested this needs to be through the bid process at budget setting for 2009/10 and it is accompanied by some research data from other authorities if possible.*

### **6. Figures for number of insurance claims per annum? Are these rising/ falling/ maintained? (past three years)**

<u>Year</u>	<u>Footways Only</u>	<u>Highways in Total</u>
2005/6	84	181
2006/7	70	166
2007/8	90	148

*It can be seen that there has been a marginal drop in the total highway claims numbers year on year but those for footways continue to fluctuate and there is no discernible trend from which to draw any reliable conclusions.*

**7. Figures for types of insurance claim (e.g. injury to person/ property/ vehicle damage) per annum? (past three years)**

<u>Year</u>	<u>Personal Injury</u>	<u>Vehicle</u>	<u>Property</u>
2005/6	122	35	24
2006/7	76	42	48
2007/8	99	20	29

**8. From information provided previously, insurance reserves for footway claims have increased by £227k between 2006/07 and 2007/08 yet insurance spend on footway claims has decreased by £6.75K – is there a correlation between the two?**

*Yes, to a degree, there is a correlation between the two. Reserves are held in respect of ultimate claim settlement amounts and, as payments are made against a claim, there is a corresponding reduction in the reserves balance. In addition, reserves will also decrease as claims are successfully defended (with nil payments made).*

*Liability related losses are known as long-tail claims because there is usually a significant elapse of time between the loss producing event and the eventual settlement of the claim. This is a notable feature where a claim is notified, quantum and liability are investigated and litigation and appeal processes possibly ensue.*

*For these reasons therefore, it is usual for the payments figure to be low and reserves correspondingly high in the most recent insurance years compared to earlier, more established, years. Thus, 2006/7 and 2007/8 are comparatively ‘undeveloped’ years with relatively few payments made to date and little, if any, conclusion can therefore be drawn from the payments figures at this stage.*

*To try to give Members some context in relation to these two years, the latest year in which claims were fully developed and there are no claims outstanding is 2002/03. The total amount paid out for that year for footway claims was £428,287. This is more than the corresponding reserve for 2006/07 but less than the reserve for 2007/08. Again illustrating how difficult it is to plot a trend in this area.*

**9. Is the Council holding back funding for insurance reserves? (Links to current news story regarding allegations that Councils have been holding back funding for insurance reserves).**

*Reserves by their very nature are funds that are ‘held back’ for a particular contingency. Stockton holds reserves on the basis of evidence to justify the amount retained. Given its high rating in Use of Resources by the Audit Commission, this external body clearly believes Stockton has struck the right balance between the deployment of resources on service delivery, and those reserves it retains to cover expected liabilities.*

*In this regard it does need to be borne in mind that as a consequence of the budget process in 2006/7, funds of £500,000 per annum were allocated for each of the next two years to supplement existing highway maintenance budgets. This was a response to areas for improvement identified by residents of the borough in the earlier MORI Poll, although at this point in time the reserve figure for highway claims in 2007/8 would not indicate that this additional spend has proved particularly beneficial.*

*This does not mean of course that there should not be a further review of contingency provisions. Stockton does this in a holistic manner, assessing all requirements across the Council in the annual budget setting process. There is little doubt that with the current economic climate the budget setting for 2009/10 will be difficult. If the Council does have any 'spare' resources, they need to be considered in light of all service requirements and a decision on priorities taken. As mentioned earlier, if a bid is to come forward for extra expenditure on footpath improvements, it would be useful if such a bid were accompanied by hard evidence of its effectiveness.*

draft



## Appendix 12 - Guide to Highway Claims Procedures

All claims are dealt with in accordance with the Civil Procedures Pre-Action Protocols. The protocols impose mandatory time-scales for conduct of claims, notably 21 days in which to acknowledge receipt of a new claim and a further 90 days in which to convey a decision on liability to the claimant. Failure to comply with either of these timescales, and the protocols generally, can result in a variety of punitive measures being imposed including costs penalties and the Courts striking out our Defence altogether.

The principal stages involved in dealing with new highway claims can be summarised as follows:

- New claims can be made either direct by the claimant or by a legal representative on their behalf.**
  - The above new claim is submitted to the Council, either to the Department who then forward to Risk Management & Insurance (RM&I), or claim made directly to RM&I.
- RM&I record claim on electronic claims handling system and forward details to external claims handlers. If claim concerns property damage only i.e. damage to vehicle, clothing etc. then claim may be handled in house by RM&I staff.**
  - RM&I issue acknowledgement to claimant or their legal representative.
- RM&I request report from Highways, to include inspection records, repair documents, street works notices, joint/solo inspection record of defect, photos, plans etc.**
  - Consideration of evidence by claims handlers and / or RM&I & decision as to whether further lines of enquiry are required.
- Once full information to hand consideration of legal position and decision by claims handlers and / or RM&I as to whether to settle claim or to repudiate liability.**
  - If claim to be repudiated then declinature letter issued by claims handlers / RM&I as appropriate, together with supporting documents in accordance with legal protocol.
- File remains open for a period pending possible follow-up by claimant - if none file closed.**
  - If declinature not accepted then consideration of any new allegations or points raised. Review of legal liability position and further decision made as to whether maintain declinature or to make settlement offer.
- Court proceedings may be issued by claimant/legal representative should Council's declinature remain disputed.**
  - Solicitors appointed on Council's behalf to deal with procedural matters arising from Court Proceedings. Solicitors review evidence and provide report and recommendations.
- Ongoing review of legal liability position and decision as to whether to maintain position or enter into settlement negotiations.**
  - If matter continues to be pursued the Court will set a date for a Hearing before a Judge.

- **Prior to this the Council will arrange a conference with a Barrister, RM&I, and witnesses from Highways to discuss and review evidence. Final decision made on tactics.**
- **Matter ultimately proceeds to Court Hearing with claimant, witnesses and RM&I present. After hearing all of the evidence Judge will make decision as to whether claimant's case is successful.**
- **RM&I then consider whether any risk management lessons can be learned from the case.**

draft

## Appendix 13 - Guide to the review of Highway Network Management Inspection and Maintenance Regime

### Review of Highway Network Management Inspection and Maintenance Regime

- Legal

- Highways Act 1980
- Section 41 – statutory duty to maintain (not a power)
- Section 58 – special defence in action against highway authority

The Highways Act 1980 places a statutory duty on the Council, as highway authority, to maintain the highway. Should the Council fail in this duty then it may be subject to claims for damages from third parties arising. The Council may repudiate or defend against a claim should it be of the opinion that it hasn't failed in its duty. As part of the defence, the Council will demonstrate that it has a reasonable system of inspection and repair. Therefore, it is imperative that the Council is able to do so by good management systems and procedures.

- Good Practice

- Well-maintained highways Code of Good Practice for Highway Network Management

Nationally, there is guidance in the form of 'Good Practice' documents for highway authorities to set their standards. For highway maintenance, there is the "Well maintained Highways – A Code of Good Practice for Highway Network Management."

- Section 8 – Strategy and Hierarchy
- Section 9 – Inspection Assessment and Recording

Sections 8 and 9 relate to strategy, hierarchy and inspections.

- Inspection Regime

- Hierarchy of Network – carriageways, footways and cycleways

SBC have established a hierarchy for the carriageways, footways and cycleways as described in the C of GP.

- Recommended frequency for Inspection
- SBC frequency

The Code also gives recommended frequencies for inspection. SBC meets or better these recommended frequencies.

- Network Safety

The first aspect of an inspector's remit is to consider safety. See below.

- Network Serviceability and Sustainability

The second is to consider the overall condition of the highway and recommend sections that may benefit from more significant structural repairs over and above safety repairs. See below.

- Network Safety - Repair

- Risk Assessment basis

A safety inspection is essentially a risk assessment. Should a defect exist, then the inspector will assess the likelihood of an incident occurring and the impact of such an incident.

- Designed to identify all defects likely to create danger or serious inconvenience to users

The safety inspection is designed to identify all defects likely to create danger or serious inconvenience to users, record and arrange for appropriate action and repair.

- Commensurate with Use

The response time and intervention limits may vary. For example, a tripping hazard outside a main retailer on the High Street may generate a different response to a similar defect on, say, a remote, rural footpath.

- Investigation Limits and intervention

The Council has recommended investigation limits and intervention limits for different types of defect. These are only guidance but give the inspector confidence in deciding upon the timescale for repair. As a general rule, the inspector will investigate further defects of 20mm on a footway and 40mm on a carriageway.

- **Network Serviceability and Sustainability**

- More detailed inspections tailored to the requirements of the highway

The inspectors may decide that sections of the highway should be considered for more significant structural maintenance. This would be recorded on the inspection sheet. Schemes would be identified and put into a programme for implementation as funds become available.

There are other types of more technical survey that feed the structural maintenance programme. These include skid resistance surveys, core samples, machine surveys that identify the need for treatment.

Also, as you would expect, the Public have their perception of condition and these are taken into account when reported to the Council quite often via Ward Members.

- Includes regulatory inspections for NRSWA

Inspection of public utility works is covered in the New Roads and Streetworks Act 1991.

SBC fulfil their obligations under this Act by regulating, co-ordinating and inspecting works on the highway.

- **Highway Claims**

- Claim numbers falling every year from 2001/2

- Repudiation rates risen since 2002/3

- 93.4% repudiation rates for 2008/9 to date

All claims received by the Council are managed by the Risk Management and Insurance section.

The Highways section will provide all the appropriate information required to demonstrate that we have discharged our duties under the Highways Act 1980.

- **Opportunities for Improving the Service**

- Integrated Highway Maintenance System

- Computerised System/Map based

- Data Collection Devices

- Resources to Manage Data –Assert Management

There are opportunities to improve service. Advancements in technology give the opportunity for the Council to review its existing systems and produce a business case to invest and improve services.