

HOYLAKE GARDENS, RUISLIP – CONDITION OF CARRIAGEWAY SURFACE

Cabinet Member	Councillor Keith Burrows
Cabinet Portfolio	Cabinet Member for Planning and Transportation
Officer Contact	Stuart Foulstone, Environment and Consumer Protection
Papers with report	Appendices A and B

HEADLINE INFORMATION

Purpose of report	This report has been produced in response to a petition signed by 33 residents of Hoylake Gardens, Ruislip, requesting the resurfacing of the carriageway.
Contribution to our plans and strategies	A safe Borough, a clean and attractive Borough.
Financial Cost	£9,000
Relevant Policy Overview Committee	Residents' and Environmental Services Policy Overview Committee.
Ward(s) affected	Cavendish Ward

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Cabinet Member for Planning and Transportation notes the petition and:

1. Requests that the carriageway in Hoylake Gardens be assessed and prioritised for possible inclusion in a future resurfacing programme when funding priorities allow.

INFORMATION

Reasons for recommendation

The carriageway of Hoylake Gardens can effectively be split into two sections.

The first section from Southbourne Gardens to the boundary of no 11 is older than the remaining section. It is a late 1930's concrete road, which was overlaid with a thin layer of 'tarmac' material 30- 40 years ago. The surface material has since deteriorated to the extent that numerous potholes have appeared. This is evident by the extensive number of irregular sized patches along this first section, which makes it difficult to differentiate between patching and surface.

Extensive trenching has also been carried out, to provide service utilities to the later second section, which serves a small housing development built approximately 20 years ago. Some of these trenches now have joint cracks resulting in surface irregularities and necessary repairs.

Each year, in addition to safety inspections, all of the Borough's carriageways are surveyed and assessed for structural condition in accordance with the rules and parameters of the United Kingdom Pavement Management System (UKPMS), the results of which provide the performance indicators and prioritized listings for structural condition.

The Council also carries out its own routine inspections on 'serviceability' grounds for defects such as potholes and surface deterioration and some of the worst roads are included in the resurfacing programme where they are considered beyond normal patching repair and where treatment can generally enhance the visual aspect of the street as well as reducing any ongoing maintenance liabilities.

Hoylake Gardens does not feature highly on last year's structural condition survey results but would qualify for consideration on 'serviceability' grounds.

Alternative options considered

Officers consider that the carriageway surface is beyond patching, thin surfacing or large permanent repairs and only a 40mm inlay will provide a surface to the road.

Comments of Policy Overview Committee(s)

None at this stage

Supporting Information

- 1 The most recent UKPMS structural condition survey was carried out on all Borough roads between January and March 2009. Hoylake Gardens was placed low on the advised priority list for future structural treatment, however, officers do consider that the section between Southbourne Gardens and the boundary of no 11 is high priority on surface condition and 'Serviceability' criteria such as appearance, ride-quality etc. At the time of the assessment, there were no potholes in evidence greater than 40mm deep, which is the minimum intervention level for immediate repair for dangerous defects.
- 2 Numerous patching operations have been carried out over the years. These have been of a temporary nature as the traditional patching method of cutting out neat rectangles and

compacting in new material is impractical due to the age and brittleness of the surrounding material and the thick concrete slab approximately 25mm below the surface.

Financial Implications

In certain circumstances the Council can incur legal liability, as the Highway Authority, for loss or damages to users of the highway, as a result of not complying with their duties under the Highways Act 1980, which could result in costs being incurred by the Council in settling claims if the work is not carried out.

The indicative cost of these works is £9,000

Legal Implications

The Council has a statutory duty to maintain the highway under section 41 of the Highways Act 1980 (the duty). Each street must be maintained to the standard necessary to allow its ordinary traffic to pass along it. For example, there is a breach of duty in cases where danger is caused by a failure to repair.

A failure to comply with the duty leading to loss or damage to users of the highway creates a risk of legal liability for the Council.

Continued periodic inspection and the making of expeditious repairs, is sufficient to keep the highway in accordance with the necessary standard. The officer's report indicates that although the highways are not dangerous, improved surface longevity and appearance would be facilitated in the longer term by surface treatment rather than a programme of continued patching. In the meantime, continued patching works may be necessary to discharge the duty.

There are competing priorities in any ongoing programme of maintenance. It is a matter for officers to recommend when the planned surface treatment should take place in the programme of highway works having regard to the legal requirement to meet the duty.

EFFECT ON RESIDENTS, SERVICE USERS & COMMUNITIES

Future resurfacing of Hoylake Gardens would contribute to the particular needs of local residents and older people with disabilities to provide a smoother, safer highway surface.

APPENDIX 'A' – LOCATION



PART 1 – MEMBERS, PUBLIC AND PRESS

Cabinet Member meeting with Petitioners -10 March 2010

APPENDIX 'B' – PHOTOGRAPHS OF EXISTING CARRIAGEWAY SURFACE –SEPTEMBER 2009



PART 1 – MEMBERS, PUBLIC AND PRESS

Cabinet Member meeting with Petitioners -10 March 2010



PART 1 – MEMBERS, PUBLIC AND PRESS

Cabinet Member meeting with Petitioners -10 March 2010



PART 1 – MEMBERS, PUBLIC AND PRESS

Cabinet Member meeting with Petitioners -10 March 2010