



## **SCC LOCAL COMMITTEE IN ELMBRIDGE – 11 March 2019**

### **AGENDA ITEM 04**

#### **WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND STATEMENTS**

**Question 1: Jane Bathurst (represented by Lucy Lanigan at the meeting)**

**Re: Road safety on Hare Lane, Claygate**

Is the Committee aware of the proposed development of Claygate House on Littleworth Road?

This development will result in at least 58 new dwellings, potentially many more, and will bring a considerable number of new residents to the area, all of whom are likely to have cars and many of whom are likely to be commuters using Claygate railway station. We are very concerned that the development will have a significant impact on the flow of vehicles and pedestrians on Hare Lane. We believe the increase in traffic, both vehicular and pedestrian, will significantly increase the risk of accidents and injury to life on Hare Lane. Importantly, we believe this is most relevant to the section of Hare Lane between The Swan and the railway bridge, the section on which we are campaigning for improved road safety and a reduction in the speed limit to 20mph. The junction of Hare Lane, Arbrook Lane and Littleworth Road outside The Swan is already chaotic and dangerous, particularly at school drop off and pick up times, so the increase in cars associated with the development will only exacerbate this. Also, commuters walking to Claygate station via the rear exit of the Claygate House development will increase the number of pedestrians crossing Hare Lane at the Loseberry Road junction, a blind and very treacherous crossing point. We are in contact with our representatives on the Planning Committee but, in addition, we would like the Local Committee to put pressure on the developer, the Luminous Property Group, to contribute to road safety measures in the wider area, particularly the stretch of Hare Lane between The Swan and the railway bridge. Will the Committee commit to doing so?

#### **Officer Response:**

As part of the CHA (County Highway Authority) assessment of the planning application, the likely impact of the development was considered in detail by the Applicant in the submitted Transport Statement. This covered the expected trips generated by the dwellings and compared them to the present use of the site – offices.

Typically, office trip rates per sq metre, are far higher than residential trip rates, the Applicant utilised the TRICS database to demonstrate this and the CHA raises no objection to this methodology. The results indicated the proposed use would generate fewer trips than the present use, therefore in effect a reduced impact on the local highway network (LHN).

The Planning System only allows for contributions or improvements to mitigate any additional impact a development has on the LHN, as the proposal would result in a

## ITEM 4

reduced impact, no mitigation was considered appropriate and it would've been unreasonable to request improvements to tackle existing highway issues.

Most developments have to contribute to the provision of local infrastructure via the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), collected by the Borough Council. Should any improvements be proposed on Hare Lane as a result of the current feasibility study, they are likely to be subject to a bid to the Borough Council for CIL funding.

### **Question 2: Friends of Hurst Park – Jill Sanders Re: Thames Riverbank**

After years and years of seeing riverbanks through Molesey appropriated and damaged by unauthorised mooring, please tell us what our two local authorities will do to work together and effectively with the Environment Agency to confront this growing problem? We now have not only slum-boats, tramp-boats and abandoned boats, but also land-grabbing of our public realm along the Thames Path, with fences, barricades, keep out notices, and stripping away of vegetation. This will continue to proliferate and worsen right through the reach unless our authorities get on with it and put a stop to it. Can we have a schedule please for meaningful action?

### **Officer response:**

The County Council's Countryside Access Team have inspected the site and found the towpath itself to be unobstructed and available for public use. The team have agreed to carry out further investigations to establish whether public rights extend beyond the width of the used towpath and include any of the areas either side, as described in the question from The Friends of Hurst Park. The Council has legal powers under the Highways Act 1980 to seek the removal of any unlawful obstructions, should they be found to be within the extent of a public path, but while the route itself remains open and available for the public to use, any possible enforcement action would be likely to be of a lower priority.