

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL****LOCAL COMMITTEE (ELMBRIDGE)****DATE: 24<sup>th</sup> FEBRUARY 2014****LEAD OFFICER: NICK HEALEY, AREA TEAM MANAGER****SUBJECT: PETITION RESPONSE – POUND CLOSE BLOCK PAVING****DIVISION: THE DITTONS****SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

This report updates Members following a petition presented by Mr Chris Collins objecting to a suggestion to replace the red brick paving in Pound Close, Long Ditton with asphalt.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

**For information only.**

**REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Officers have reviewed the situation with the Divisional Member, and will be arranging repairs to defects in the existing block paved footway surface. There is no need for further consideration by the Local Committee at the present time.

**1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND:**

- 1.1 A Petition was received by Committee November 2013, objecting to a suggestion to replace the red brick paving in Pound Close, Long Ditton with asphalt and asking Surrey County Council, where necessary, to repair/replace any red bricks which have become loose or damaged.
- 1.2 Mr Chris Collins spoke in support of the petition objecting to the proposal to replace the red brick paving in Pound Close, Long Ditton with asphalt and asking the Council to repair or replace any loose or damaged bricks. He described how over the years various utility and cable TV companies had taken up parts of the pavement and not replaced it properly and in some cases have patched it with asphalt rather than reinstating with blocks. Mr Collins suggested that this has led to large parts sinking and some bricks coming loose.
- 1.3 Mr Collins suggested that the Council wished to resurface the entire footway with asphalt. He asserted that 80% of the footway is in a satisfactory condition and could not understand how it would not be cheaper to repair the 20% requiring work. In addition he suggested that as 90% of the damage is due to utility contractors the Council should be following this up with the companies.

- 1.4 Mr Collins summarised by saying two thirds of the households in the close had signed the petition and requested that SCC carry out the necessary repairs to defects, seeking financial compensation from the responsible utility contractors not the residents.

## **2. ANALYSIS:**

- 2.1 There was never a firm proposal to resurface the footways in Pound Close. Concerns had previously been raised over the condition of the footway in Pound Close, and there were discussions ongoing as to what options were available to address this. No decision had been made.
- 2.2 Officers have discussed the petitioners' concerns with the Divisional Member. As a result in the next Financial Year 2014-15 repairs will be made to areas where blocks have become loose or damaged.
- 2.3 All footways require resurfacing eventually. To resurface and then maintain a footway with new slabs or block paving is substantially more expensive than resurfacing and then maintaining with asphalt. In the current constrained fiscal environment, for residential roads where the footways do need to be resurfaced, the Council is resurfacing with asphalt rather than with new block paving or slabs. If residents preferred their footways to be resurfaced with blocks or slabs, there would be opportunity for residents to contribute the funding, but the full value of the additional costs would need to be contributed.
- 2.4 Utility contractors are bound by the DfT document Specification for Reinstatement of Openings in the Highway, which states that "Surfacing layers, shall be reinstated, as far as reasonably practicable, to match the existing construction".
- 2.5 With appropriate resource, every reinstatement could be inspected. The Council is able to charge utility companies to inspect 10% of their reinstatements at the completion of works and 10% of reinstatements at the end of the guarantee period. Any inspections above this level would be at the Council's cost.
- 2.6 If at any time during a guarantee period, (normally two years) the reinstatement fails the relevant performance requirements of the Specification, the utility contractor is obliged to carry out remedial action to restore the reinstatement to a compliant condition. Interim reinstatements are permitted under the Specification and should normally be made permanent within six months.

## **3. OPTIONS:**

- 3.1 None.

## **4. CONSULTATIONS:**

- 4.1 The Divisional Member was consulted following receipt of the petition.

## **5. FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS:**

5.1 None.

## **6. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS:**

6.1 It is an objective of Surrey Highways to treat all users of the public highway equally and with understanding.

## **7. LOCALISM:**

7.1 The Local Committee is able to prioritise its budgets according to local priorities.

## **8. OTHER IMPLICATIONS:**

8.1 A well-managed highway network can contribute to reduction in crime and disorder as well as improve people's perception of crime.

## **9. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:**

9.1 Next Financial Year 2014-15 repairs will be made to areas of the footways in Pound Close where blocks have become loose or damaged.

## **10. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:**

10.1 Next Financial Year 2014-15 repairs will be made to areas of the footways in Pound Close where blocks have become loose or damaged.

- 
- **Contact Officer:** Nick Healey, Area Team Manager (NE)
  - **Consulted:** Divisional Member.
  - **Annexes:** None
  - **Sources/background papers:** None.
-

This page is intentionally left blank