

## **Meeting notes from Tinkers Bridge Site visit, 24 May 2016**

**Re: State of highways**

Attendees: Kim Hill (Senior Highways Manager, MKC),  
Rob Ward (Business and Liaison Manager, MKC),  
David Lee (TBRA)  
Apologies John Orr (TBRA)

(These TBRA notes were not prepared until 4 June, so accuracy may have suffered)

### **Background:**

Tinkers Bridge Residents Association (TBRA) has an ongoing concern about the pavements and roads in the Tinkers Bridge estate. They undertook a photographic survey over the Easter weekend in 2016, and submitted it to Milton Keynes Council on 17 April. Email replies were received from Andrew Dickinson on 18 April, Peter Geary on 19 April, and Hannah O'Neil on 20 April. The site visit was proposed on 9 May, and details confirmed on 23 May, gathering at the home of John Orr (Chair of TBRA), 49 Brent.

### **Notes:**

David Lee emphasised the main concern of TBRA was safety of residents, and although many of the defects were below the limits for intervention, the number and size of them were sufficient to create a safety hazard. Kim and Rob accepted that the surfaces were showing their age. The difficulty of planning scheduled maintenance with the uncertainties of RegenerationMK were discussed, it being agreed that maintenance should not be on hold until the regeneration programme was complete, that both sides needed scheduling information on RegenerationMK, and that it would be useful to share any such information.

A walk round parts of the estate allowed Kim to take photos of various defects and note their location. At least one, near 44 Colne (#081 in the TBRA report), is the responsibility of the water board, and Kim took the action to contact them about it. The area around the shop and meeting place was noted as a heavily used area, and the responsibilities for this area were not clearly marked on the hard copy plan that Rob had with him. This was to be further investigated and better information sent to TBRA. There was a possibility that the resurfacing of the shop goods-in area was a technical infringement of highways regulations, but it was clearly a useful improvement. The normal route for pedestrians round the side of the shop was not originally designed as a path, which is why it is not a hard surface, and an improvement in this area was agreed as being useful.

Some walkways are overgrown at the edges, and the cutting back of this growth, which is the responsibility of WCC, would be useful. In some areas, soil and other material is on the footpaths, and it may be possible to use the community payback scheme to get these cleared. This possibility will be checked by MKC and TBRA informed.

Very few defects were seen that met the intervention criteria, and the resurfacing done some years ago on some paths was generally in good condition, but the overall standard of other paths was tired.

David Lee, 4 June 2016