

Responses to Recommendations

Recommendation to the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources	Response from Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources
<p>a. The Committee requests that the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources reminds Cabinet colleagues that any unintended consequences are carefully considered when developing savings plans.</p> <p>b. The Committee requests: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. That the decision report contains a list of sites to be included in the joint venture ii. That local Members are kept up to date and consulted iii. The Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources considers whether there are any opportunities to work with other local authorities within West Sussex. 	<p>a. I am happy to reassure the Committee that, when working on savings proposals, both officers and cabinet members do look at the impact those savings might have, including considering, as far as possible, any unintended consequences. However, as per your request, I will ensure that I remind my cabinet colleagues to consider any such consequences when reviewing their savings proposals.</p> <p>b. To take your points in turn:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. It is intended, as mentioned at Committee, that the Cabinet Member decision report would list the sites to be included in the short/medium-term. The Committee can be assured that decision reports are required to contain all the relevant information needed in sufficient detail to enable the decision maker to fully consider the proposed recommendations. ii. It is our practice to consult local members on all property review decisions on sites in their divisions. iii. How we might interact with our District and Borough colleagues is something that we will be considering as we progress our work.

Recommendation to the Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure	Response from Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure
<p>The Committee asks the Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure:</p> <p>a. Whether the extra income included within the Medium-Term Financial Strategy from on-street parking would be dependent on the outcome of the various programme reviews taking place around the county?; and</p> <p>b. Whether any savings resulting from the non-treatment of weeds on pavements could lead to uneven and damaged surfaces and trip hazards which could lead to increased claims and pavement repairs?</p>	<p>a. The extra income is partly conditional on the programme of Road Space Audit (RSA) reviews but not entirely. The extra income from the RSA programme is an estimate of the amount of currently unrestricted kerb space in our towns that may now require positive management. Extra income is also expected from the annual review of existing on-street parking charges required to ensure our traffic management objectives are maintained.</p> <p>In addition, savings are expected via increased operational efficiency as a result of a full review of the parking service and the take up in the district and borough councils of a new and single back office system.</p> <p>Delays in any part of the above programmes of work will result in reduced income / savings and so put greater pressure on other areas of the highways, transport and planning budget.</p> <p>b. Weed growth is being managed within the available budget and prioritises safety. Inevitably, there is an increased risk to users as service levels are reduced but the County Council’s assessment is that the overall risk associated with the current approach is acceptable. The condition of footways is affected by a number of factors and weed growth is just one that needs to be managed.</p> <p>The way the County Council has approached risk assessment with regards to maintenance activities is set out in the document “Highway Infrastructure Maintenance Levels 2019/20” – that can be found on the web site here</p>

(<https://westsussex.moderngov.co.uk/documents/s10759/Appendix - draft Highway Infrastructure Maintenance Plan.pdf>)

Risks are determined using a standard approach that takes into account key factors (safety, traffic, access and damage) as well as the network hierarchy. The full process is set out in the document along with the risk matrices used to determine the risk "scores". Mitigation is then considered for each risk element – including the application of the service itself.

Each service element is assessed independently. The risks will be reviewed on a regular basis and will always be reviewed if there is reason to believe they are not accurately reflecting the conditions on the network.