FOI CSM: 15818309

The attached reports include the information you have requested between the dates you have specified. The first and last dates shown on the reports are the first and last dates we have either received customer calls, inspected or raised jobs. There may be instances where you have requested information for a date range but we have no information in our records for all or part of that period.

Dates of all safety inspections undertaken on the carriageway in the period 22 February 2018 to 22 March 2019

Please see the attached FOI Inspection Batch Report.

Please note the date range on the records is from the first to the last inspection carried out within the 2 years requested.

Please see the attached FOI Report Explanation Sheet as a guide to the information contained within the reports.

Details of all carriageway defects identified during inspections in the period 22 February 2018 to 22 March 2019

Details of defects identified during inspections can be found on the attached FOI Maintenance Management Report.

The attached reports include the information you have requested between the dates you have specified. The first and last dates shown on the reports are the first and last dates we have either received customer calls, inspected or raised jobs. There may be instances where you have requested information for a date range but we have no information in our records for all or part of that period.

Details of how carriageway safety inspections are undertaken

Carriageway inspections are driven, at an approximate speed of 20-30 miles per hour. There is a driver and a Highway Inspector in the vehicle.

Footway inspections are walked by a Highway Inspector

The intended frequency of carriageway safety inspections.

Monthly

Details of all complaints and/or enquiries relating to the carriageway, received in the two years preceding 22 February 2018 to 22 March 2019

Please see the attached FOI Customer Services Report. The date range on the records is from the first to the last enquiry received within the 1-year time frame requested. Please note that any complaints, petitions or letters written by members of the public to the Leader of the Council,

Cabinet Member, Corporate Director or Director of Highways, Transportation and Waste that were received by Kent County Council after the 1st April 2018 will not appear on this report. This is because on the 1st April 2018 we commenced using a new customer service system to log this type of correspondence and this system does not allow us to search by location, so we are unable to provide the data that you have requested past 1st April 2018.

The hierarchy classification.

The hierarchy is Other Strategic Route

The road/section number.

The road number is C482

The defect intervention criteria adopted in relation to the identification of all categories of carriageway potholes.

There is a defect intervention level of 50mm depth for carriageway potholes. Guidance for Highway Inspections is set out in the Safety Inspection & Condition Survey Manual. The attached Appendix 1 sets out the relevant extracts from the Manual outlining how staff assess risks and assess intervention and prioritise repairs times. Intervention levels referred to are not to be considered conclusive as a direct measure of how hazardous the defect may be; they are investigatory standards used as a trigger point for maintenance.

The time period(s) adopted between identification and repair (temporary and permanent) of all categories of carriageway defects.

Time periods adopted are detailed below and depend on the priority of the defect as assessed by the inspector.

Defect Type and Description	**Response Time**
P1 defect. **A defect which is likely to cause immediate and significant harm to pedestrian/road user**	2 hour response.
P2 defect **A defect which is not an immediate high risk but likely to cause significant harm to pedestrian/ road user or short term deterioration.**	By end of next working day. However a higher Priority response may be considered for jobs raised on a Friday
P 3 defect **A defect which is deemed not to present an immediate or imminent hazard or risk of short term deterioration.** **Such defects have safety implications although of a lesser significance than P1 & P2.**	7 day response
P 4 defect	28 day or programmed works

A defect of a minor nature that might deteriorate before the next inspection but is not considered an immediate hazard.	
P5 defect **None safety critical condition**	Programmed works

Whether or not the authority has formally adopted all or part of the standards contained within the national code of practice for highways maintenance management.

The Authority has adopted part of the guidance in the Code of Practice Well-maintained Highways dated 2005. This forms the basis of the Safety Inspection & Condition Survey Manual which was reviewed in detail in 2011 and is reviewed regularly.

Appendix 1 – Extract from KCC Safety Inspection & Condition Survey Manual

HOW CAN WE MEASURE RISK?

Risk is often assigned a numerical or rating value (high, medium or low) and is generally shown in a matrix, the principles of which are shown below:

The likelihood range in the example given below, spans from highly unlikely to virtually certain (0-100%). Consequences span from minor injury (cuts/bruise or minor damage) to serious injury or even a fatality.

		LIKELIHOOD		
SEVERITY		*Highly unlikely*	*Likely or possible*	*Virtually certain*
	Low Hazard (Slightly Harmful)	*Minor*	*Acceptable*	*Moderate*
	Medium Hazard (Moderately harmful)	*Acceptable*	*Moderate*	*Substantial*
	High Hazard (Extremely harmful)	*Moderate*	*Substantial*	*UNACCEPTABLE*

For example, in the case of a hole in the ground, the risk should be assessed against how likely (likelihood) it is that someone or something will fall down the hole and what might the consequences and the severity be if this happened.
KCC has adopted a risk assessment matrix based on the principles shown above but using a numerical calculation to decide the level of risk (see below).

The likelihood is multiplied by the severity to give a risk level the scores below denote the overall level of risk and therefore the level of control measure required in order to bring the risk down to an acceptable level.

Severity x Likelihood = **RISK**

		L I K E L I H O O D			
S E V E R I T Y		Very Low (1)	Low (2)	Medium (3)	High (4)
	Negligible (1)	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**
	Low (2)	**2**	**4**	**6**	**8**
	Noticeable (3)	**3**	**6**	**9**	**12**
	High (4)	**4**	**8**	**12**	**16**

Response Category	RISK LEVEL
P1	16
P2	12

P3	6, 8 & 9
P4	3 & 4
Nil Response	1 & 2

INTERVENTION LEVELS

All defects could potentially create a safety issue and the courts accept that it would simply be impossible to repair all defects in the highway. The test of whether or not a defect is dangerous is not simply a question of mechanical measurement; but also whether there is a **RISK** to highway users.

Highways & Transportation has established a set of basic defect intervention criteria for carriageway, footway and sign/vegetation clearance heights to assist Inspectors/Stewards in deciding the response level required.

Although some guidance can be given on the likely risk associated with particular defects, it is essential that Inspectors take account of local circumstances and so must risk assess each defect individually. On-site judgement should consider the circumstances of the defect such as its location, usage and where necessary the Inspector may increase the reaction time as necessary.

Intervention levels referred to are NOT to be considered conclusive as a direct measure of danger; they are INVESTIGATORY STANDARDS used as a trigger point for maintenance.

	INTERVENTION LEVELS
Intervention level for carriageway / cycleway defects	50mm depth
Intervention level for footways	20mm depth
Road markings	Should be arranged when 50% of the material is missing through wear.
Suggested sign/vegetation clearance height on cycleway	2.7m
Suggested sign/vegetation clearance height on main bus routes	5.2m
Suggested sign/vegetation clearance height on footways	2.3m
Drain Covers	Missing/displaced or broken ironwork
Safety Fencing/Pedestrian Guardrail	If damaged or missing safety fencing/pedestrian guard rails found Inspectors to report back to HMC Engineer for further discussion. Significant or major defects (high risk) will by MADE SAFE under the 2 hour response category and urgent repairs programmed to be completed as soon as possible.
Street Lighting	Record defects of visibly damaged lighting columns on WAMS. Where doors are missing or exposed wiring from lighting column this should be reported to HMC who will contact Street Lighting to arrange repairs to be done asap.
Illuminated Bollards	Should be noted on WAMS record and reported to the Street Lighting team immediately

	Missing bollards are considered high risk defect and must be reported to HMC who will contact Street Lighting Team to arrange for repairs to be done asap.

Surface Water Drainage System	Significant amounts of standing water – arrange for investigation. Inspectors to determine whether or not the overall risk factor is sufficient to warrant further interim actions, eg; warning signs, road closures
Road signs	Any damaged signs which cause an obstruction to traffic or pedestrians should be made safe and managed accordingly – depending upon severity Stop, give way & chevron signs that are significantly damaged/missing or illegible such that sign is not effective or presents a hazard to highway users will be temporarily repaired as soon as possible and permanently repaired within 28 days. Mandatory and regulatory warning signs covered by Vegetation/Graffiti – should be dealt with asap
Traffic Lights	Records details of damage and report to HMC