A meeting of the above Board will be held on

**Tuesday 22 June 2010**

at 7.00pm at the Civic Centre, Dartford
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JOINT TRANSPORTATION BOARD
AGENDA

Tuesday 22 June 2010

1. Apologies for Absence.

2. Declarations of Interest
   To receive any declarations of interest Members may wish to make including the term(s) of the Grant of Dispensation(s) by the Standards Committee.

3. To confirm the Minutes of the meeting of the Dartford Joint Transportation Board held on 9 March 2010. (Pages 1 - 12)

4. Urgent Items
   The Chairman will announce his decision as to whether there are any urgent items and their position on the agenda.

5. References from other Committees (if any)

6. Matters Arising (Pages 13 - 20)
   DBC / KCC
   This report advises Members on the progress of matters arising at previous meetings of the Board.

7. Chairman’s Update (Pages 21 - 24)
   A verbal update will be provided, at the Chairman’s request, on the following items: -
   - Thames Water – Victorian Mains Replacement
   - Pedestrian Zone: High Street, Dartford
   - Potholes
   - A206 Bob Dunn Way/Marsh Street Roundabout improvements.
8. **Petition: Heather Drive Traffic impact**

A 66 signature petition was received from residents in Heather Drive requesting various measures which include additional traffic calming, no entry into Heather Drive from Shepherds Lane and measures to reduce traffic volume including heavy commercial vehicles. An automatic speed survey was carried out in December.

This report gives details of the survey results and the response from the Kent Police Traffic Management Unit.

9. **Possible Extension of Double Yellow Lines on Shepherds Lane - Results of Consultation**

This report informs Members of the results of consultation about possible extension of double yellow line parking restrictions on the south side of Shepherds Lane. Seventeen residents have also signed a petition and this is attached to the report.

10. **Winter service Consultation 2009/10**

The Chairman of the JTB will facilitate a discussion of the winter service at this meeting using a range of questions and the responses will be recorded by the clerk to the board. All the comments will feed into the overall report that will be presented to the EH&W POSC on 25 July 2010.

11. **On Street Parking Enforcement - Operational Review**

To advise of a new parking operational protocol which has been agreed and passed by the Kent Chief Executives for use by Kent County Council and the 12 District Authorities from 1 April 2010.

12. **Programmed Highway Improvements**

This report advises Members on the progress of highway improvement schemes in the Borough of Dartford scheduled to be completed during 2010-11.

13. **Proposed Cycle-Path from Princes Road to Green Street Green Road**

To inform Members and request endorsement of a proposal to permit cycling on the widened footway between Princes Road and Green Street Green Road, as shown in Appendix A to the report.
14. **Proposed Cycle-Paths from Central park to Darenth Rd and on Princes Road at the junction with North Road**

To inform Members and request endorsement of proposals to create two short lengths of shared-use cycle paths in Dartford.

15. **Proposed Cycle-path on Shepherds Lane from Princes Road to Heathclose Road**

To inform Members and request endorsement of a proposal to permit cycling on the widened footway on the south side of Shepherds Lane between Princes Road and Heathclose Road.

16. **Stone Place Road/London Road/Hedge Place Road Crossroads signalisation Crash Remedial Measure Scheme - Consultation Response**

To advise Members of the Board of the comments and formal objections received in response to public consultation which took place in February and March 2010 for the Stone Place Crossroads signalisation scheme.

17. **Objections to Formal Proposals for Yellow Lines Various Locations**

To advise Members of the Board of the comments and formal objections received in response to the waiting restrictions proposed at various locations. Members agreed at the September 2008 meeting of this Board that these restrictions should be formally advertised.

18. **Installations of Yellow Line Waiting Restrictions**

This report details the locations in Dartford where yellow line waiting restrictions are required to deter obstruction and improve safety for road users. It also details the locations in Dartford where alterations are required on existing waiting restrictions. The report seeks approval to proceed to statutory consultation on the installation of these yellow lines.

19. **Short Burst Items**

Members of the Board are given the opportunity to highlight issues to Kent Highways Services.

**ITEMS FOR INFORMATION**
20. **Road Works in the Borough of Dartford**

Members will be advised of the roadworks which were currently being undertaken or expected within the Borough.

21. **KCC - Environment, Highways and Waste Policy Overview Committee**

For Members information the following has been attached for information: -

- Environment, Highways and Waste Policy Overview Committee – Minutes 22 January 2010
- Environment, Highways and Waste Policy Overview Committee – Minutes 25 March 2010
- Environment, Highways and Waste Policy Overview Committee Update from the meeting on 25 March 2010

NB: If a Member wishes to discuss any of these items at the meeting, please advise the Member Services Section (01322) 343251 prior to the meeting.
DARTFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL

JOINT TRANSPORTATION BOARD

MINUTES of the meeting of the Joint Transportation Board held on Tuesday 9 March 2010 at 7.00 pm

PRESENT:  Councillor A R Martin (Chairman)
Mrs A Allen
Councillor A Bardoe
Councillor D A Hammock
Councillor J A Hayes
Councillor E J Lampkin
Mr R J Lees
Councillor J I Muckle
Mr J Ozog
Mr A S Sandhu

ABSENT:  Mrs P Cole
Mr J Kite
Councillor N Pearson-Coffey

(DBC)  Alec Lauder  –  Development Control Manager
Alfredo Mendes  –  Project Delivery Manager
Lewis Boudville  –  Transport Engineer

(KCC)  David Aspinall  –  Community Delivery Manager
Mr Ray Dines  –  Transport and Development Manager
Andrew Burton  –  Highway Scheme Manager
Peter Slaughter  –  Transport Engineer
Kirstie Norton  –  Kent Highway Services
Jacqui Norwood  –  Community Liaison Officer

56. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Mrs P Cole and Councillor N Pearson-Coffey.

57. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor E J Lampkin declared a general personal interest as Ringway were a client of his employer.

Councillor J A Hayes and Mr R Lees declared a personal interest in agenda items 13 and 14 as they were members for Swanscombe and Greenhithe Town Council.
58. TO CONFIRM THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE DARTFORD JOINT TRANSPORTATION BOARD HELD ON 8 DECEMBER 2009.

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meetings of the Joint Transportation Board held on 8 December 2009 be confirmed.

59. URGENT ITEMS

There were no urgent items.

60. CHANGE OF AGENDA ORDER

RESOLVED:

The Chairman advised that agenda item 8 – Presentation – Speed Limit Review, would be taken as the next item of business.

61. PRESENTATION - SPEED LIMIT REVIEW

Ms K Horton, Kent Highway Services, gave a presentation on the Speed Limit Review. She advised all Local Authorities were required to review all A and B roads by 2011.

She explained what speed limits should be and the key stages of the process for the review, which would be subject to funding.

Members questioned when they would become involved in this review. They were advised that due to amount of work involved it was not expected that anything would be ready to put to the Board for at least twelve months.

Members were concerned that their involvement seemed to be very late in the process and that they were not given much time to consult.

Ms Horton assured Members that their contribution and local knowledge was important, as experienced with other local authorities, where Member views had changed the recommendations to some roads.

The Chairman commented on the involvement of the Parish Representative in the process. He advised that Dartford had a very good Parish Association who he was sure would be interested in participating in this review. He suggested that it be asked to add this issue to their Work Plan for the next municipal year.

RESOLVED:
(1) That the information be noted.

(2) That the Dartford Association of Parish and Town Councils be asked to add the Speed Limit Review to its work plan for the next municipal year.

62. MATTERS ARISING

Hook Green Lane – cutting of vegetation
Councillor E J Lampkin sought clarification if Kent Highway Services or the Parish Council should be writing to the farmer to request that this vegetation be cut back.

Darenth Road – Flooding
Councillor E J Lampkin, supported by Mr A Sandu, felt that the issue of flooding on Darenth Road had not been resolved. The pavement and road still flooded and drains were blocked.

The Community Development Manager advised that he had checked with the Drainage Officers and they had only received one complaint on flooding in this area. He asked that the Members email him with the details and he will ask that it be investigated.

Wilmington Boys Grammar Entrance
Following enquiry it was confirmed that any improvements for the entrance for the school would need to be sought by the school to the education department.

Dartford Road – Yellow Lines
Mr J Ozog advised that he was happy to hold a site meeting with Officers to explain the problems. This suggestion was supported by the Chairman.

Highway Network Congestion
The Chairman requested an update on this issue as it was originally discussed by the Board in December 2008.

The Transport and Development Manager advised that this area was being monitored and a meeting was scheduled with the Highway Agency to monitor the situation on close circuit cameras.

The Chairman requested an update to the next Board meeting.

Temple Hill Estate – yellow lines proposals
Councillor J I Muckle expressed disappointment that there was not a report on this item.

The Transport and Development Manager drew Members attention to the plan attached in the agenda which showed the area which was subject to
consultation. He advised that any objections would be reported to the June meeting.

**Broad Lane Flooding**
The Community Delivery Manager apologised for the misinformation that had been provided in the past for this issue. Officers were now not sure if a camera investigation was ever carried out.

He advised that the Drainage Team had revisited the site and located some old soakaways and will carry out a full survey. A meeting has been scheduled with the residents and an update will be brought to the next meeting.

---

63. REFERENCES FROM OTHER COMMITTEES (IF ANY)

There were no references from other committees.

64. CHAIRMAN'S UPDATE

**Winter Service**
The Community Delivery Manager advised that Mr N Chard, KCC Cabinet Member for Environment, Highways and Waste, will report to the Policy Overview Committee on 23 March 2010 on this issue. He advised that he had instructed that a consultation be sent out to County, Borough and Parish Members, which would include an opportunity to make suggestions on improvements.

He advised that all Members of the JTB would receive an electronic copy of the Winter Policy and local plans.

The Board welcomed receiving the consultation and discussed the issue of people clearing snow from pavements outside their houses. At the time, unclear legal advice was given for clearing snow, which was common practice in other countries.

The Community Delivery Manager advised that other countries had laws which meant that people had to clear snow from outside their properties. He advised that there were myths circulated regarding snow clearance, but a person would not be liable if it was cleared sensibly.

**Pot Holes**
The Community Delivery Manager advised that all Members should have received a letter advising how Kent Highway Services (KHS) were dealing with pot holes. Due to the recent weather conditions, KHS had dealt with 30,000 potholes since January, in comparison to 9,000 for the same period in 2009. Additional funding had been found for pot holing, and until this issue had been remedied, other projects would be put on hold.
East Hill, Dartford – Roadworks
The Chairman requested an update on this item following concerns raised by the Executive Director. Thames Water were scheduled to carry out works which overrun and unfortunately the temporary traffic lights were not removed following completion of the works, which had added to the disruption on this route.

He was reassured that the company responsible were putting procedures in place to prevent this from happening again and hoped that the use of the permit scheme would help prevent issues like this in the future. Thames Water were also being fined for this overrun.

Thames Water – Victorian Mains Replacement
The Development Control Manager advised that meetings were still being held. Unfortunately these recently had been cancelled due to the company restructuring and they were now dealing with different officers. The works on Oakfield Lane had now been completed. However there was still some reinstatement works to be carried out in the Town Centre.

Members asked Officers to seek and provide advice on what action could be taken if the reinstatement work was not to standard.

Oakfield Lane – Safer Road Crossings
The Transport and Development Manager updated Members following the discussion at the last meeting. Officers were currently reviewing this area and if prioritised it would be included on the Highway Improvement Schemes for 2011-2012. It was expected that the progress for schemes for 2010/2011 would be presented at the next meeting of the Board.

Maintenance of Fastrack Routes
The Chairman updated the Board following consideration of this item by the Cabinet at Dartford. He advised that there was shared frustration. This was a flagship scheme which was an exemplar for other schemes in the country.

Cabinet thanked the Board for highlighting these issues and believed that the County Council should provide appropriate resources to ensure that maintenance and management/enforcement activities are carried out to a standard to reflect the national flagship status of Fastrack. They asked that the Board continue to monitor as part of its work plan.

PROSPECT PLACE
The Development Control Manager introduced the report and advised that following the publication of this report he had been contacted by Mr J Albany-Ward from the Management Company, Munroe K Asset Management.

Mr Lauder advised of the details which were approved as part of the planning application, and outlined that a no entry restriction on the main east west
corridor within the car park where its meets the main access had not been implemented.

With a complete restriction on the right hand turn as you enter the car park, and the approved ‘no entry’ at the eastern end, a circuitous route to exit and enter the car park would reduce conflict and hopefully reduce the traffic issues which overflow into the Town Centre.

Mr Lauder advised that these issues have been drawn to Mr Albany-Ward’s attention. He has advised that the landlord is keen to address the traffic issues.

In regards to the right hand turn he has advised that some measures to prevent vehicles from doing this were to be introduced within a few weeks which they would monitor.

The Chairman expressed his disappointment and frustration in the progress of this problem. Following the positive meeting with the management company he thought that they were willing to review the situation and assist with the problems caused within the Town Centre by this car park.

The Board supported any improvements that would help the problem this retail park caused the town centre. The traffic situation caused by people accessing Prospect Place was detrimental to the Town Centre, and the Board supported any action taken by Officers so that the original approved plans were applied with.

RESOLVED:

(1) That the traffic problems caused by Prospect Place be monitored and remain on the Board’s Matters Arising.

(2) That the Management Company be advised that the Board welcomes the changes to the car park at Prospect Place being implemented.

66. PEDESTRIAN ZONE: HIGH STREET, DARTFORD

The report advised the Board on the progress on the Traffic Regulation Order to remove general motor traffic from the ‘pedestrianised’ area of the town and to stop car parking on this part of the High Street.

The Chairman advised that the statutory consultation closed on the 8 March 2010 and only one response was received from the Police. He was disappointed with their response, although they had not objected to the Traffic Regulation Order, they had advised that it would be a low priority for enforcement. This differed greatly from the views provided by Chief Inspector Painter when this issue was raised with him by The Leader.
Officers advised that enforcement of the Traffic Regulation Order would be investigated and that this may include use of the static CCTV equipment if Secretary of State approval was sought and granted.

Following enquiry, Members were advised that there would be warning period for offenders prior to full enforcement so that people were made aware of the changes.

RESOLVED

That following no objections being raised, the Traffic Regulation Order to remove general motor traffic from the ‘pedestrianised’ area of the town and to stop car parking on this part of the High Street be endorsed by the Board and the necessary action be taken for its introduction.

67. VARIOUS ROADS, DARTFORD - DISABLED PERSONS PARKING PLACES (NO.1) 2010

The report advised the Board of the Objections to Disabled Persons Parking Bay Orders which had been advertised in January 2010.

RESOLVED:

(1) That the following Traffic Regulation Orders for Disabled Persons Parking Bays, as details within the report and advertised, be confirmed:

30 Little Queen Street Dartford (Waid Close)
116 Charles Street Greenhithe
84 Keary Road Swanscombe
36 Keary Road Swanscombe
95 Fulwich Road Dartford

(2) That that the objectors to the Traffic Regulation Orders for Disabled Persons Parking Bays be advised accordingly.

(2) That the Disabled Persons Parking Bay Orders be removed from: -

118 Littlebrook Manorway Dartford Kent
52 Attlee Drive Dartford Kent
86 High Road Dartford Kent
45 Alamein Road Swanscombe Kent
34 Perry Grove Dartford Kent
26 Essex Road Longfield Kent
177 Fulwich Road Dartford Kent
28 Osterberg Road Dartford Kent
5 Alamein Gardens Dartford Kent
24 London Road Stone Kent
79 Manor Road Swanscombe Kent
30 Fawkham Road Longfield Kent
68. NEW BARN ROAD / RED STREET, SOUTHFLEET JUNCTION MODIFICATION

The report sought Members' endorsement for proposed modifications to the junction of New Barn and Red Street in Southfleet.

The Chairman advised that a copy of the report had been circulated to Local Ward Members who had raised no objections.

As advised in the report, the Highway Scheme Manager provided an update on funding. He advised that it was expected that the scheme would qualify for funding under the Local Transport Plan 2006-11. This had been discussed with the relevant Cabinet Member and it was awaiting sign off.

RESOLVED:

That the proposed illustration for modifications to the junction of New Barn Road and Red Street in Southfleet, as set out within the report, be endorsed.

69. NORTHFLEET - EBBSFLEET STATION PEDESTRIAN LINKS

The report informed Members about plans to improve pedestrian links to Ebbsfleet station from Northfleet station and the surrounding community.

RESOLVED:

That the information be noted.

70. CYCLE ROUTE TO EBBSFLEET STATION

The report advised Members and sought endorsement of a proposal to permit cycling on the footway on the northwest side of the Thames Way roundabout at the entrance to Ebbsfleet station.

RESOLVED:

That the proposal to redesignate 83 metres of footway as a shared-use ‘cycle Track’ on the northwest side of Thames Way, between the entrance to Ebbsfleet station and the nearby path to Swanscombe be endorsed.
71. PROGRAMMED HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENTS

The report advised on the progress of highway improvement schemes in the Borough of Dartford scheduled to be completed during 2009-10 and which roads are scheduled to be resurfaced in 2010-11.

RESOLVED:

That the information be noted.

72. BUDGET 2010/11 AND MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN 2010/11 TO 2012/12

The Chairman advised that he had asked that this report, which was considered by the KCC Environment, Highway and Waste Policy Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 10 November 2009 be included for information.

RESOLVED:

That the information be noted.

73. SHORT BURST ITEMS

The Chairman asked if any Members of the Board had any issues that they would like to be raised. He reminded the Board that these should not be issues that should be reported through the Kent Highway Services Customer Services.

Littlebrook Manorway
Councillor J I Muckle requested if the whole of Littlebrook Manor Way could be reviewed for resurfacing.

Princes Road
Councillor A Bardoe asked if the traffic lights on Princes Road where it meets Shepherds Lane could be examined. Currently there was a filter lane to turn left into Shepherds Lane. However people at this junction often looked at the wrong set of traffic lights. This resulted in people who were travelling along Princes Road (North west bound) using the filter lane traffic light. He asked if this could this be fitted with a hood to prevent this from happening.

Bean Junction improvements
Mr A Sandu requested to receive an update on the progress for improvements to this junction. This was supported by Councillor D A Hammock who had also requested prior to the meeting.

The Transport and Development Manager advised that an update will be provided in due course.
Hesketh Park
Mr J Ozog asked if brown directional signs could be put in place for the park. He was advised that there were certain requirements which need to be met for these signs and he should place this enquiry via the KHS Customer Services.

Southfleet Drive – Flooding
Councillor J Hayes advised that the drains had been cleared within this area, however there was still flooding.

The Highway Scheme Manager advised that there was significant problem identified in this area. This was currently a high priority and officers were investigating to try and resolve.

Gerdview Drive
Councillor E J Lampkin raised the issue regarding potholes on behalf of Wilmington Parish Council. This issue had been logged with KHS in January 2010 and the last tracked response was that the road was to be inspected in February. He asked officers to note that since then there has been no further updates.

Common Lane
Councillor E J Lampkin asked to be advised on progress following the previous overwhelming response to yellow lines in this area. Officers advised that the scheme was out to consultation and would be reported back to the next meeting.

Street Lighting
Mrs A Allen asked how street lighting was monitored and there seemed to be a number of complaints. She asked that this be discussed at a future meeting of the Board.

Bob Dunn Way
Members discussed the condition of the lay by area and were advised that any concerns should be logged via KHS Customer Services.

Clarification was provided on the hard-standing area, following the recent incident involving a HGV. Members were advised that these areas were not lay-bys but a hard-standing areas used by National Power and unrestricted access was required.
The Chairman advised that he had requested that the Board be advised of the roadworks which were currently being undertaken or expected within the Borough.

Following enquiry, Members were advised that if they required any further information on this works they should log it with KHS Customer Services and request a call back.

Members of the Board advised that they found this frustrating. Unlike the Parish Councils, they did not have access to the information that had been logged and subsequent updates which were posted.

RESOLVED:

That the information be noted.

75. KCC - ENVIRONMENT, HIGHWAYS AND WASTE POLICY OVERVIEW COMMITTEE

RESOLVED:

That the information be noted.

The meeting closed at 9.26 pm

Councillor A R Martin
CHAIRMAN
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MATTERS ARISING

1. Summary

1.1 This report advises Members on the progress of matters arising at previous meetings of the Board.

2. RECOMMENDATION

2.1 That Members note the comments in the “Update/Outcome” column of the Appendix A to this report.

3. Background and Discussion

3.1 Previously, the Joint Transportation Board requested that a report on matters arising be placed on future agendas of this Board.

3.2 The matters arising are as detailed in the Appendix A to this report.

3.3 A verbal update, where applicable, will be given at the meeting of this Board.

4. Details of Exempt Information Category

Not applicable

5. Appendices

Appendix A: Matters Arising

BACKGROUND PAPERS:

None

Contact Officers: As detailed in the Appendix to this report

Contact Number:

Kent Highway Services 08458 247 800
Dartford Borough Council 01322 343251
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Update / Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>44, 62</td>
<td>KCC</td>
<td>East –West movements across A282 (Junctions 1A and 1B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There was a meeting between the Highways Agency, Dartford Borough Council and Kent Highway Services on the 24 March 2010 where CCTV footage of the operation of junction 1A was reviewed. The conclusion of the meeting was that the main problems related to the PM peak and that the key cause of the congestion was conflict of turning traffic at the western roundabout and the restricted capacity of the on slip road towards the Dartford Tunnel toll booths.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It was not considered that the introduction of additional yellow box or “keep clear” markings would be effective in isolation and it was also noted that powers for CCTV enforcement of yellow box marking were not in place outside of London.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It was further agreed that the design and cost of signals control at the top of the above mentioned slip road should be considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Further meetings also including consideration of junction 1B are proposed during the early summer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>Update / Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2 Broad Lane - Flooding - Officers to write to Transco and provide the results of camera investigate | 9, 27, 62 | KCC | Various investigation works have taken place to identify the existing drainage assets in the area and check the drainage lines to ensure they are in good condition. We last attended site on the 7th May 2010 with one of our CCTV crews and found the following:  
The Soakaway that is situated in the front garden of No.19 Broad Lane has an overflow pipe that runs to a secondary private soakaway/catch pit at the bottom of the garden of No.19. Our CCTV investigations have identified another hidden chamber that is next to the private soakaway/catch pit which is connected by an opening in the chamber (Not Piped), this appears to be of a masonry construction with various timber support work. We have been unable to access this additional chamber to date as there are no clear openings in the area we had permission to enter. We are currently in the process of contacting the surrounding properties to seek permission to search for an access point for the hidden chamber. We are hoping that upon accessing this chamber it may give clearer indications to possible discharge points that will help improve the drainage from Broad Lane.  
During another stage in our CCTV investigations we identified another area outside the church which is a short distance from No.19 Broad Lane that may benefit from drainage improvement works. This will be subject to permission from local land owners and ground investigation works. This is ongoing.  
Following recent discussions with residents it appears that there may be a further issue of surface water runoff from a nearby farmers field. This in more heavy rainfall situations would have the capacity to overload highway drainage assets and reduce the effectiveness of them through the quantities of silt travelling with the surface water. The land owner will be contacted to discuss possible improvement works to the land drainage at this location. |
<p>| 3 Prospect Place | 65 | DBC | Traffic problems to be kept under review. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Update / Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>27, 39</td>
<td>DBC</td>
<td>Investigation works have been ongoing over the past 2 months – soakways on the Viridor land have been re-cleaned, and are now working correctly. Additionally, a number of other soakaways have been discovered which have also been cleaned, and soakage tests have been undergone with our consultants. An additional soakaway is proposed on the recreation ground near the highway, and this will involve land easements in the near future. At present, the system should cope with heavy rainfall, but will be monitored prior to these additional works. Mapping investigations of the system will continue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9, 27, 62</td>
<td>KCC</td>
<td>The Highway Inspector is pursuing the issue with a view to encouraging the landowner to carry out appropriate cutback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>KCC</td>
<td>A section of Littlebrook Manor way between Henderson Drive and Farnol Road was resurfaced during April. For the remaining length of the road works orders have been placed for patch repairs to be carried out by the external contractor Conway. Some work has already been carried out by Conway in the Temple Hill area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>KCC</td>
<td><strong>UPDATE AT MEETING</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>KCC</td>
<td>The Highways Agency together with The Department for Transport are currently considering inclusion of these schemes in their “Options Pool”. It is anticipated that a decision will be made this summer on the programming of further design work in the light of current spending reviews. Therefore, it is likely to be 2011 at the earliest before there is public consultation on scheme options for the two junctions. This would subsequently be followed an announcement of “Preferred Route Status”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>Update / Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>KCC</td>
<td>KHS Drainage Team have visited this site on numerous occasions to clear flood water and cleanse the soakaways that are at the bottom of the hill near to the local school. A recent CCTV investigation has identified five existing soakaway pits that have been heavily silted every time they are cleansed. This quantity of silt accumulating in the soakaways in such a short space of time is considered as quite extreme and has severely compromised the effectiveness of them. As a result of this we have been investigating the cause of this issue and have identified where this large quantity of surface water and silt is coming from, which is the proposed development land owned by Land Securities. This additional quantity of surface water alone would potentially overload our highway drainage assets, and with the addition of silt this has caused Southfleet Road to flood. We have been in contact and held a meeting with Lee Pegram of Land Securities who has agreed that there is a large area of the proposed development that has not yet had the benefit of the land drainage features that currently exist on the rest of the site. This is currently being looked at by a design team working for Land Securities, who are hoping to install attenuation/settlement ponds to capture the surface water and silt runoff. Lee Pegram will be keeping us informed of any progress in this regard. Lee Pegram has revealed plans to upgrade Southfleet Road as part of the main development works which would incorporate highway drainage works, although this is a long way from being done the attenuation/settlement ponds are hoped to contain the problem until these proposals are put into development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>KCC</td>
<td>The performance is measured by KPI - which is 28 days from receipt of enquiry to its resolution. Figures show for the last month we have achieved successful resolution in 23 days, well within the KPI measure. Typical information on performance and achievements below: January 1st to date: 479 enquiries received for Dartford Borough via WAMS 80 still outstanding, being dealt with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>Update / Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 High Street, Parking - review the parking on the High Street, Dartford</td>
<td>33, 66</td>
<td>KCC/DBC</td>
<td>Reported in Chairman’s Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Oakfield Lane and Old Bexley Lane - possibility of lighting on the footpath</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>KCC</td>
<td>UPDATE AT MEETING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Petition: Heather Drive Traffic Impact</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>KCC</td>
<td>REPORT on Agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Fastrack Maintenance</td>
<td>50, 64</td>
<td>KCC / DCB</td>
<td>To be kept under review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Dartford Road, Yellow Lines</td>
<td>54, 62</td>
<td>KCC</td>
<td>Site meeting to be held with Mr J Ozog - update to be provided at the meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Darenth Road - flooding and detritus</td>
<td>54, 62</td>
<td>KCC</td>
<td>There has been only one flooding event reported to the KHS Drainage Team on the WAMS system regarding the flooding of Darenth Road, Dartford. This was reported by one of the district Highways Inspectors, and we have since attended site on the 22nd January 2010 with a 3 in 1 Gully Cleansing machine which appears to have resolved the problem according to the reactive works report. If this is not the case we would welcome any further information relating to this site to enable a more thorough investigation. A system search was also carried out on the WAMS system with regard to Darenth Road, Darenth, but there were no issues reported at this location.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chairman’s Update

A206 Bob Dunn Way/Marsh Street Roundabout improvements.

A potential improvement scheme for this junction has been identified as part of the £200m infrastructure package of 11 schemes supporting regeneration in Kent Thameside through to 2025. This package is part funded by government grants and development funding. No detailed design work has been undertaken for this roundabout at this stage but a notional cost of £3m has been identified.

The overall package and programming of individual schemes will be subject to an annual view of the partners (DBC, GBC, KCC, HA and HCA) and it is possible that this scheme will be a relatively low priority when compared to the other schemes included on the list. The full list of schemes is shown on the attached as annex 1 to this item.
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The schemes currently included in the Kent Thameside Strategic Transport Programme are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Brief Description of Works</th>
<th>Estimated Cost (2009 Q1 prices)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A2 Ebbsfleet Junction</td>
<td>Modification of access junctions and changes to merge and diverge lanes.</td>
<td>£29.8m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 Bean Junction</td>
<td>Signalising of access junctions, changes to merge and diverge lanes, improved lane separation. Possible new bridge.</td>
<td>£48.5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 Demand Management</td>
<td>Introduction of controlled motorway standards (including variable speed limits), vehicle priority lanes, access management, variable message signs and other driver information systems.</td>
<td>£30.7m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B262 Hall Road Junction</td>
<td>Junction capacity improvements and traffic calming on Springhead Road.</td>
<td>£3.0m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A226 London Road/St Clements Way Junction</td>
<td>Junction capacity improvements through the provision of an underpass.</td>
<td>£7.5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A226 Thames Way (STDR4) Dualling</td>
<td>Upgrade of existing single carriageway to provide additional capacity.</td>
<td>£12.6m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Traffic Management &amp; Control (UTMC)</td>
<td>Provision of various intelligent traffic management systems including coordination of signal; junctions, CCTV and real time information.</td>
<td>£7.1m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dartford Town Centre Improvements</td>
<td>Revised traffic circulation on ring road and improved access for development.</td>
<td>£10.1m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rathmore Road Link, Gravesend</td>
<td>Provision of a new link road between Stone Street and Darnley Road to improve traffic circulation in Gravesend town centre.</td>
<td>£10.1m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A206 Marsh Street Junction, Dartford</td>
<td>Replacement of roundabout with signal controlled junction.</td>
<td>£3.0m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fastrack – Northfleet to Garrick Street</td>
<td>Provision of a dedicated public transport link between major development sites on the Thames riverside and Gravesend town centre.</td>
<td>£12.6m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td></td>
<td>£23.1m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td>£2.1m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Estimated Cost of Programme</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>£200.2m</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PETITION : HEATHER DRIVE TRAFFIC IMPACT

Dartford

1. Summary
A 66 signature petition was received from residents in Heather Drive requesting various measures which include additional traffic calming, no entry into Heather Drive from Shepherds Lane and measures to reduce traffic volume including heavy commercial vehicles. An automatic speed survey was carried out in December.

1.1 This report gives details of the survey results and the response from the Kent Police Traffic Management Unit.

2. RECOMMENDATION(S)

2.1 Members note the report and the undertaking from the Police to monitor any contraventions of the existing 7.5 tonne weight restriction (except for access).

2.2 The petitioners be advised that there is insufficient justification for any changes to the traffic calming measures of Traffic Regulation Orders relating to Heather Drive at this time.

3. Background

3.1. As discussed in the December Joint Transport Board 2009 report, the supporting letter from the organiser of the 2009 petition calls for additional traffic calming measures to be introduced and states the feeling from residents is that existing measures are not adequate to prevent heavy traffic from using Heather Drive. It also requests the right turn into Heather Drive be closed permanently.

3.2. An automatic speed and class survey was ordered by Kent Highway Services to assess the speeds and class of vehicle using Heather Drive. The safety record of Shepherds Lane junction with Heather Drive was examined to determine whether there was sufficient evidence to suggest a problem with right turn manoeuvres.

3.3. The relevant County and Borough Members have been consulted in order to determine their view and establish if there is overall community support for the resident’s requests.

4. Discussion

4.1 An automatic speed survey was carried out in December to verify speeds and classes of vehicles. The average speed for northbound traffic was 23.1 mph and the average southbound speed was 22.9 mph. The 85% speed (the speed which 85% of drivers do not exceed)
northbound was 26.4 mph and the southbound 85% speed was 27.3 mph.

4.2 The Class Data showed 41 vehicles over Class 5 northbound (Class 5 vehicles may exceed the 7.5 tonne weight restriction dependant on their cargo) and 24 vehicles over Class 5 southbound during the one week period.

4.3 The reported personal injury accident data for the last three years showed only one accident near Heather Drive junction with Shepherds Lane. The accident involved a driver who swerved to avoid a fox and lost control. There were two casualties and only one car involved.

4.4 A meeting was organised with Kent Police but it transpires that they would not support additional traffic calming measures or the right turn ban from Shepherds Lane into Heather Drive and would formally object if proposed. The letter from Kent Police is shown in Appendix A to this report.

Recommendations

1. Members note the report and the undertaking from the Police to monitor any contraventions of the existing 7.5 tonne weight restriction (except for access).

2. The petitioners be advised that there is insufficient justification for any changes to the traffic calming measures or Traffic Regulation Orders relating to Heather Drive at this time.

That the Lead Petitioner be advised accordingly.

5. Details of Exempt Information Category
Not applicable

6. Appendices

Appendix A – Letter from P.C. Paul Cave  Traffic Management Unit

BACKGROUND PAPERS:

The background papers pertaining to this report are held on KHS file.

Contact Officers : Rebecca Scott-Beaulieu
Contact Number: 01622 798433
Kent County Council
Ms Rebecca Scott-Beaulieu  
Kent Highway Services  
Doubleday House  
St Michael’s Close  
Aylesford  
Kent ME20 7BU  

Your Ref:  
Our Ref:  74/PT/10885/10  
Date  25th May 2010  

Heather Drive Dartford – No Entry from Shepherds Lane

Dear Ms Scott-Beaulieu

Thank you for your e-mail dated 18th May 2010 concerning the proposed restriction at the above location.

I am unsure whether the residents of Heather Drive are asking for the junction with Shepherds Lane to be made a ‘No Entry’ or are requesting that right turns into Heather Drive are prohibited. Having looked at the accident statistics for the area, which you kindly provided, neither proposal would achieve any reduction in the number of collisions or the severity of the collisions. This proposal would not achieve any collision benefits, and must therefore be considered on environmental reasons alone.

Kent Police would not support the introduction of ‘No Entry’ at Heather Drive junction with Shepherds Lane and would formally object if this were proposed. The experience of Kent Police in other locations is that short sections of no entry are often ignored, particularly when drivers can see the full extent of the restrictions. This results in repeated requests to Kent Police to carry out enforcement, the resources and demands placed upon Kent Police are such that constant enforcement demands cannot be met resulting a situation where regulations are regularly ignored by some drivers increasing the risk of crashes.

Kent Police would not support a prohibition of right turn from Shepherds Lane into Heather Drive. The current right turn facility into Heather Drive is provided by a dedicated right turn lane on Shepherds Lane, visibility for drivers turning right is good and there are no recorded injury collisions at this location as a result of a right turn manoeuvre. In order to achieve compliance with any proposed restriction Kent Highway Services would have to physically close the right turn facility, so forcing drivers to continue to the next roundabout where they would have to turn. The roundabout is already heavily used and placing extra demands upon its capacity...
could result in an increase in collisions. Kent Police would ask that a full traffic study be completed before they would agree to any prohibition.

The results of the speed survey show that the current traffic calming measures are effective and that mean and 85th percentile speeds are below the current speed limit. There is no evidence that the existing traffic calming measures need upgrading.

Heather Drive is subject to a 7.5 tonne weight restriction and there is no other suitable weight restriction that could be implemented. The weight restriction covers a wide area and is accompanied by a plate as per sign diagram 620 Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2002 ‘Except for access’ so there will be a number of larger vehicles that can legitimately use the road however if there is any evidence that the weight restriction is being ignored then I will ask the local police area to take action.

I hope these preliminary views are of assistance to you

Yours sincerely

Paul Cave
Police Constable 7981
Traffic Management Unit
PETITION : HEATHER DRIVE TRAFFIC IMPACT
SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION : RESPONSES

The relevant County and Borough Members have been consulted in order to
determine their view and establish if there is overall community support for the
resident’s requests. The comments received are as follows:

| Councillor Andy Lloyd | • Is disappointed at the outcome and would like to know who controls the decision making process.  
| | • Suggests 15% of vehicles speed over the ineffective speed bumps.  
| | • Is concerned that a high volume of heavy lorries bouncing over the bumps cause damage to residential properties.  
| | • Would like the removal of the ineffective speed bumps in Heather Drive  
| | • Would like to ban vehicles using the road to access Crayford  
| | • Would like us to consider removing the traffic calming on Swan lane which has diverted traffic through the residential estate  
| | • Congestion at the Shepherds Lane/Princes Road causes traffic to divert through Heather Drive  
| | • Vehicles bounce over the humps and try to get as close to the kerb as possible to avoid the steepest parts  
| | • The KHS approach and consequences of the Swan Lane work do not recognise the real issues that are being represented.  

| Councillor Patsy Thurlow | • Agrees with Councillor Lloyd’s comments and thinks the only way to eliminate the rat run of heavy vehicles is to take away the traffic calming in Swan Lane or alternatively use the same traffic calming measures used in Miskin Road.  
| | Councillor Thurlow states although she does not like this method, it would perhaps stop the lorries.  

Heath

1. **Summary**

1. This report informs Members of the results of consultation about possible extension of double yellow line parking restrictions on the south side of Shepherds Lane. Seventeen residents have also signed a petition and this is attached to the report.

2. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

2.1 This report is for information only.

3. **Introduction**

3.1. At its meeting on 8th December 2009, the Board considered a report on the Shepherds Lane cycle path and the parking problems reported by residents along this section of road, i.e. between Princes Road to Dartford Grammar School for Girls.

3.2. The Board approved a proposal from Kent Highway Services that residents should be consulted about the possibility of extending the double yellow lines on the south side of Shepherds Lane. The extension of the double yellow lines was considered a possible means of deterring parking on the adjacent footway.

3.3. The consultation was delivered on 23rd March to residents at 107 – 155 Shepherds Lane (odd numbers) and 60 – 122 Shepherds Lane (even numbers). It was also delivered to all properties in Gloucester Road, Bath Road and Somerset Road.

3.4. The consultation letter stated:

“Kent Highway Services have received a number of complaints from members of the public about cars and vans parked on the footway of Shepherds Lane. Some of these complaints are from pedestrians who use the footway, others are from residents who find that parked cars block their view of oncoming traffic when they drive out of their driveways.

Kent Highway Services have been asked to find an effective way of removing the parking problem and are investigating the possibility of extending the double yellow line parking restrictions along the entire length of the south side of Shepherds Lane as far as the junction with Princes Road”.

3.5. The letter invited residents to tick one of three options, namely:

- extending the double yellow lines on the south side of Shepherds Lane from house 107 as far as the junction with Princes Road
- extending the double yellow lines from house 107 to house 123 and no further
- Not extending the double yellow lines.

4. Consultation Results

4.1. Twelve residents voted in favour of extending the double yellow lines along the south side of Shepherds Lane as far as Princes Road.

4.2. Five residents voted in favour of extending the double yellow lines only as far as house 123.

4.3. Thirty-seven residents voted in favour of no change to the double yellow lines.

4.4. Seventeen residents (some of them included in the above total) signed a petition objecting to the extension of double yellow lines and requesting that “as the cycle path is not being used by the local school children as intended, it should be removed from the footway”. The petition is included in Appendix A.

4.5. Residents raised a number of issues which are being investigated and will be discussed with officers at Dartford Borough Council. These issues will be reported to the next meeting of the Board.

5. Details of Exempt Information Category

5.1 Not applicable

6. Appendices

Appendix A - Map showing area of possible extension of double yellow lines.

BACKGROUND PAPERS: None

Contact Officers: Peter Slaughter
Contact Number: 08458 247 800
Kent County Council
Map showing area under discussion for possible extension of double yellow lines
JOINT TRANSPORTATION BOARD  
22 June 2010

WINTER SERVICE CONSULTATION 2009/10

1. Summary

1.1 The Chairman of the JTB will facilitate a discussion of the winter service at this meeting using a range of questions and the responses will be recorded by the clerk to the board. All the comments will feed into the overall report that will be presented to the EH&W POSC on 25 July 2010.

2. RECOMMENDATION

2.1 Members of the JTB contribute toward the discussion on the winter service provided by Kent Highway Services last winter (December 2009 to February 2010)

2.2 The results of these comments are collated and submitted to KHS within a week of the meeting for inclusion in its report and recommendations to the EH&W POSC meeting in July 2010.

3. Background and Discussion

3.1 At the Environment Highways & Waste (EH&W) Policy Overview and Scrutiny Committee (POSC) on 23 March 2010, it was reported that a consultation process on the winter service for 2009/10 would be taking place commencing April 2010. An update was made to the POSC on 25 May 2010. The results of the consultation will be used to inform and improve the winter service policy and plan for 2010/11. The consultation involves the following:

- Chief Executives of district councils
- Structured interviews will be undertaken by IPSOS MORI with Chief Executives or their nominated representatives
- Elected members – telephone interviews by Community Liaison Team Leaders and Officers
- District Members – on line survey
- Parish councils – on line survey
- Joint Transportation Boards- Winter service will be an item on the agenda and JTB members will have the opportunity to discuss and make recommendations to the EH&W POSC

3.2 The independent polling organisation IPSOS MORI has been commissioned to conduct the in depth interviews with Chief Executives and assess the results of the on line surveys.
3.3 The Chairman of the JTB will facilitate a discussion of the winter service at this meeting using a range of questions and the responses will be recorded by the clerk to the board. All the comments will feed into the overall report that will be presented to the EH&W POSC on 25 July 2010.

3. Details of Exempt Information Category
   Not applicable

5. Appendices

   Appendix A - Winter Service Questions

BACKGROUND PAPERS: Winter Service Policy Statement for 2009/10

Contact Officers: Carol Valentine, Kent Highway Services Community Delivery Manager
Contact Number: Tel 08458 247800
Kent County Council
APPENDIX A

Winter Service Questions

- What do you think went well in December 2009 – February 2010?
- What do you think could have been done better?
- What improvements should be made for the future?
- Were any areas, that you consider to be priorities, neglected?
- Did your constituents raise any particular issues with you about ice and snow on the roads and pavements?
- IF YES: What were these?
- Did they refer to roads and pavements or just one of these?
- IF NO: Do you think that’s because they were satisfied with the work of the authority?

The Winter Service policy statement sets out the means by which the Council carries out its duty and it is essential in aiding the safe movement of highway users, maintaining communications, reducing delays and enabling everyday life to continue. Kent Highway Service (KHS) delivers the winter service on Kent County Council maintained highways.

- When you read the Winter Service Policy statement for 2009/10
- Did you find it useful?
- In what way?
- Was it written in an accessible way?
- YES: can you think of any examples
- NO: can you think of anything that stood out as being difficult to interpret
- Was there enough detail, or perhaps too much?
- What are the key things you’re looking for from such a document?
- Do you have enough information on the way KHS treats roads?
- In what ways are elected members involved in the development of the priorities of the winter service?
- Is this sufficient?
- Are there other ways that elected members might be able to get involved, that are currently available?
  - IF YES: What are these?
  - IF NO: Why not?
- Is there anything in particular that you might like to see added to the Winter Service Policy?
  - What is this?
  - What benefit would it bring?
- Is there anything that should be removed?
  - What is this?
  - What benefit would it bring?
1. Summary

1.1 A new parking operational protocol (Appendix 1) has been agreed and passed by the Kent Chief Executives for use by Kent County Council and the 12 District Authorities from 1 April 2010.

2. FOR MEMBERS INFORMATION

1.1 Introduction and Background

The introduction of the Traffic Management Act 2004 and the associated Civil Parking Enforcement have required an update to the existing parking protocol which sets out a framework of common principles for parking policy and management that is not currently covered by the legal Agency Agreements that are in place between the 12 district councils and Kent County Council.

1.2 A working party consisting of representatives from the Parking Managers group, Kent Technical Officers’ Association, Kent County Council and the district authorities was formed to write the new parking protocol.

2.1 Consultation

Consultation was undertaken with all interested parties including all districts and Kent County Council with a positive response and helpful feedback being received.

2.2 The draft protocol has been reported to the Kent Leaders and Chief Executives at regular intervals, culminating in the final document being presented to Kent Chief Executives on 15 March where it was approved for adoption by all 12 district authorities and KCC on 1st April 2010.

3.0 Conclusion

The Parking Operational Protocol has been agreed and passed by the Kent Chief Executives for use by Kent County Council and the 12 District Authorities from 1 April 2010.

4. Details of Exempt Information Category

Not applicable
5. **Appendices**

Appendix A - PARKING OPERATIONAL PROTOCOL

**Contact Officers:** Lorna Day - Kent Parking Manager  
**Contact Number:** 08458 247800  
Kent County Council
Appendix 1

PARKING OPERATIONAL PROTOCOL

In Kent the district councils are responsible for the practical application of parking enforcement under Agency Agreements between the County Council and each district authority. The Agency Agreements provide for parking enforcement of all Controlled Parking within the Civil Enforcement Area and Special Enforcement Area covering district boundaries. The agreements cover all aspects of enforcement related administration and also include requirements to maintain on-street parking signs and lines. However, the agreements do not cover the wider aspects of on-street parking policy and management undertaken by districts.

In setting up these Agreements, the County and District Councils recognised how essential it was to integrate off and on street enforcement within the Decriminalised Parking Enforcement (DPE) regime. It made it easier for the public to understand local parking management arrangements and provided a single point of contact for parking activity. It also had efficiency benefits and it built on existing parking operations at District level.

When the County Council and the Districts set up DPE between 1998 and 2001, it worked alongside a parallel agreement for traffic and network management (the Kent Highways Partnership - KHP). This provided a seamless operation across the whole range of parking and traffic management. However, in 2005 the KHP was dissolved and it became necessary to introduce a protocol to clarify the continuing District Council role in parking management on-street.

More recently, the government introduced the Traffic Management Act (TMA) and this replaced DPE with a new system of Civil Parking Enforcement (CPE). The Agency Agreements have been varied to incorporate the new provisions. Crucially, the statutory guidance accompanying the Act places significant emphasis on District involvement in parking enforcement activity in two tier areas and effectively endorses the type of arrangement currently operated in Kent.

Practical support and best practice has been shared and promoted through the South East Parking Managers Group (SEPMG). Consistent operational practices have been fostered while the differences in ethos and character between the parking services in each district have been respected. A consistent approach to enforcement is provided through the adoption by districts of a SEPMG developed award winning Decriminalised Parking Enforcement Manual.

The original protocol worked well for a number of years but it merits an update in the light of the TMA. This protocol sets out a framework of common principles for parking policy and management that is not directly covered in the Agency Agreements. It also clarifies the division of responsibility between County and Districts for the delivery of parking related functions. The Agency Agreement contains formal delegation and that this protocol will operate under the cover of the Agency Agreement. Therefore if there is any conflict it will be the Agency Agreement that prevails.
1. Policy / Strategy

1.1 A balanced integrated transport system, with good quality travel options for all is essential to counter the negative impacts of traffic growth. Effective management of parking is central to this and the wider district council polices in support of economic development and the commercial viability of town centres.

1.2 These objectives, and measures to achieve them, broadly comprise:

- implementation of Local Parking Plans (LPP) and
- promotion of best practice through the SEPMG.

2. Local Parking Plans

2.1 A Local Parking Plan or Strategy is the best way of developing effective local parking systems and ensuring that they are fully integrated with transport (LTP/ District Transport Strategy) and planning (Local Plan/ Local Development Framework) objectives and policies. A number of districts have developed a LPP or strategy and others have action plans covering policies and delivery. All LPP/ action plans should be regularly reviewed and updated.

2.2 Policies for future development of parking (assessing parking need, park & ride, business parking etc…) should be jointly agreed through a Local Parking Plan or Parking Strategy.

2.3 The LPP/ action plan process should be led by the district and supported by the County.

3. Joint Working

3.1 Close liaison between County and District officers is essential in order to ensure that parking restrictions and schemes are developed effectively and to avoid public confusion. Also the management of parking systems is closely related to the management traffic systems and visa versa. It is therefore critical that close links are maintained at officer level to develop integrated programmes and for there to be a common member reporting process for their approval.

- Officer level liaison to be formalised by way of regular meetings (discussions to cover future plans, identifying possible conflicts, availability of resources, liaison with emergency services, agreeing time scales, consultation requirements etc…). Districts and County to nominate responsible officers to represent the respective authorities on parking and transportation issues.
- Member approval to be sought through Joint Transportation Boards
4. Activities

4.1 For clarity it is essential that the division of activity be maintained as closely as possible between parking demand management (District) and moving (County). The following functions have been identified as being primarily undertaken either by a District or the County Council. However, by agreement through the officer liaison group functions could be carried out by either authority. Whenever these functions are carried out, they should be undertaken as complete end to end services by the respective authority:

DISTRICT ACTIVITY

- Parking related Traffic Regulation Orders
- Residents’ Parking Schemes
- Controlled Parking Zones
- Disabled persons’ parking bays
- Limited waiting bays
- Loading bays
- Other specified bays (e.g. Coastguard, Doctor, Motorcycle, Police, Taxi etc.)
- Maintenance of lines and signs
- Performance reporting

COUNTY RESPONSIBILITY

- Access highlight markings (Dog Bones)
- Bus stop clearways
- Bus Lane enforcement
- Yellow Box Markings
- Moving Traffic
- Safety Related TROs
4.2 For clarity Safety Related TROs are considered to include maintaining vehicle movements and driver visibility at road junctions and similar locations, maintaining road width to prevent obstruction or hazards to road traffic and prevention of footway obstruction to maintain pedestrian safety, including school keep clear zones.

4.3 For requests where responsibility is not immediately clear it is essential to say this will be considered with a response to follow shortly. The regular officer liaison meeting will review these and agree response from the lead authority.

5. Traffic Regulation Orders

5.1 The Agency Agreement for Parking Enforcement does not contain formal powers for the making of Traffic Regulation Orders and the County Council retains responsibility for the sealing of all TROs.

5.2 However, a district must be able to promote and develop parking related TROs in order to deliver the district functions identified in 4.1 above. The procedure to be followed for the development of TRO’s is summarised as follows:

1. Undertake programme development work including new requests
2. Review schemes at regular joint liaison meeting
3. Regular review and consolidation of orders as appropriate
4. Report and recommend programme to Joint Transportation Board (JTB)
5. JTB to approve programme to consult/ advertise(*)
6. Develop scheme considering representations
   a. If no objections proceed with scheme as advertised
   b. If objections report to JTB with recommendation to proceed, amend or abandon scheme.
7. Final approval by District Executive or County Council committee or cabinet member (or delegated authority) as appropriate.
8. Drafting of the order

(*) Some schemes may require more than one stage of public consultation prior to advertising and approval.

Approval of TROs or consideration of objections may also be dealt with by the chair/ vice chair of the JTB in liaison with relevant ward members.

5.3 All County Council promoted parking restrictions requiring a TRO will follow the procedure set out above and will be undertaken in close consultation at an early stage with a District to ensure that they are appropriate for enforcement, can be incorporated in any existing consolidated traffic orders and to avoid public confusion. Funding to be provided to the district as appropriate should it carry out such TRO
administrative work on behalf of the County Council. Such work and funding should be agreed in writing prior to commencing any such works.

6. Development of Schemes

6.1 The lead authority promoting a scheme is responsible for ensuring its’ development whether in house or via consultants. A district would be able to commission design work from the County Council’s retained consultant if it so wished at its own cost.

6.2 In principle the lead authority promoting a scheme is responsible for all costs associated with the scheme, including development, implementation and administration.

6.3 Subject to agreement with the other authority, either party may include TRO’s that are normally undertaken by the other Authority, when undertaking a scheme - e.g A Residents Parking Scheme may include areas of KCC responsibly and district activities could be incorporated into a KCC highway scheme.

7. Maintenance

7.1 Renewal of existing signs and lines needed for effective enforcement can be undertaken directly by the district or by a contractor approved by the County.

7.2 The County Council will be responsible for ensuring that unsatisfactory works carried out by Statutory Undertakers are promptly reinstated to enable continued enforcement to be undertaken.

8. Public Contact

8.1 Where responsibility is not that of the Authority receiving a request it is essential to record the details of the request and say this will be considered with a response to follow shortly. Where the responsibility for a function is clear the request should be passed to the appropriate authority to respond. If time does not permit an issue to be considered at the next liaison meeting then responsibility for dealing with the request should be agreed through the designated liaison contacts.

9. Benchmarking

9.1 KCC will coordinate the collection and publication of detailed benchmarking information from the Districts in an agreed format established through the South East Parking Managers’ Group.
10. **Reporting procedures**

10.1 KCC, as Highway Authority, will submit an annual report to the Home Office and the Districts will provide detailed information required for this purpose in an agreed format established through the South East Parking Managers’ Group to meet Kent County Council requirements and guidance laid down by current legislation.

11. **Moving traffic enforcement**

11.1 The TMA makes provision for certain moving traffic enforcement, in bus lanes and other specified locations. This is a County Council function but through the current agency agreement this could be delegated to a District where a District may have the appropriate infrastructure available.

12. **Review**

12.1 The protocol will be reviewed at least annually or at any other time as circumstances demand. A Working Group of District and County Officers established through the Kent Technical Officers Network will carry out the review.

12.2 Policy development will by undertaken through the South East Parking Managers’ Group and District Engineers Group with final sign off by the Kent Technical Officers Group.
JOINT TRANSPORTATION BOARD
22 JUNE 2010

PROGRAMMED HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENTS

1. Summary

1 This report advises Members on the progress of highway improvement schemes in the Borough of Dartford scheduled to be completed during 2010-11.

2. RECOMMENDATION

2.1 This report is for Members’ information.

3. Background and Discussion

3.1 On 27 March 2010, Kent County Council’s Cabinet Member for Environment, Highways and Waste agreed the programme of integrated transport schemes that are to be funded by the Highway Authority in 2010-11 as part of the Kent Local Transport Plan 2006-11. In light of Dartford having received funding approval for the greatest number of schemes in Kent, Kent Highway Services have already delivered a sizeable proportion of the programme. A summary of these, and of all schemes in this year’s programme, is listed in Appendix A of this report.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS: The background papers pertaining to this report are held on the Kent Highway Service’s files.

Kent County Council Local Transport Plan 2006-11: (www.kent.gov.uk/static/local-transport-plan)

4. Details of Exempt Information Category
Not applicable

5. Appendices

Appendix A – Monitoring Report of 2010-11 Highway Schemes

Department: Highway Schemes Manager – Andrew Burton
Contact Number: 08458 247 800
Kent County Council
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KCC Ref</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description of Works</th>
<th>Progress to Date</th>
<th>Expected Actions in Next Three Months</th>
<th>Forecast Spend 2010/11</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08-ITS-DA-13</td>
<td>Priory Place Dartford</td>
<td>Bollards to prevent driving on the pavement (2009-10 scheme not completed by 31 March 2010)</td>
<td>COMPLETED May 2010</td>
<td>None – this scheme will no longer be reported to this Board</td>
<td>£3,200</td>
<td>Andy Padgham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09-ITS-DA-02</td>
<td>Bean Lane, Bean</td>
<td>New Footway opposite Hope Cottages</td>
<td>COMPLETED May 2010</td>
<td>None – this scheme will no longer be reported to this Board</td>
<td>£13,000</td>
<td>Simon Allsopp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09-ITS-DA-03</td>
<td>Rochester Way, Dartford</td>
<td>Shared-use cycle/footpath on north side of Rochester Way between Old Bexley Lane and Swan Lane and mandatory cycle lanes between Swan Lane and Denton Rd</td>
<td>COMPLETED May 2010</td>
<td>KCC and DBC officers to agree any additional anti-traveller measures</td>
<td>£45,000</td>
<td>Simon Allsopp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09-ITS-DA-09</td>
<td>Temple Hill Estate, Dartford</td>
<td>modifications to existing traffic calming and bus-stops in Littlebrook Manorway</td>
<td>ON SITE - Scheduled to be COMPLETED 11 June 2010</td>
<td>None – this scheme will no longer be reported to this Board</td>
<td>£10,000</td>
<td>Helen Cobby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09-ITS-DA-11</td>
<td>Hawley Road / Parsonage Lane, Hawley</td>
<td>Crash Reduction Measure – modification to traffic signs and road markings at mini-roundabout</td>
<td>ON SITE - Scheduled to be COMPLETED 18 June 2010</td>
<td>None – this scheme will no longer be reported to this Board</td>
<td>£16,000</td>
<td>Simon Allsopp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09-S106-DA-01</td>
<td>Main Road, Sutton at</td>
<td>Pedestrian refuge near Cedar Drive – funded from Section 106 receipts from Horton Kirby Paper Mill</td>
<td>COMPLETED May 2010</td>
<td>None – this scheme will no longer be reported to this Board</td>
<td>£22,000</td>
<td>Andy Padgham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCC Ref</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Description of Works</td>
<td>Progress to Date</td>
<td>Expected Actions in Next Three Months</td>
<td>Forecast Spend 2010/11</td>
<td>Contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09-S106-DA-02</td>
<td>Devon Road, South Darenth</td>
<td>new footway over River Darent – 50% funded from Section 106 receipts from Horton Kirby Paper Mill development, remainder from KCC LTP</td>
<td>Planned utility works in South Darenth prevent the Devon Road scheme from starting until 2011</td>
<td>Design work will now commence in June 2010</td>
<td>£51,000</td>
<td>Andy Padgham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MY 1401 TD</td>
<td>London Rd / Stone Place Rd / Hedge Place Rd, Stone</td>
<td>Change cross-roads to traffic-signal control, incorporating pedestrian &amp; cycle crossings</td>
<td>Detailed design underway and consultation on associated waiting restrictions complete</td>
<td>Date for start of construction to be decided in light of other major roadworks in Dartford and Gravesend</td>
<td>£173K</td>
<td>Rebecca Scott-Beaulieu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MY 1402 TD</td>
<td>New Barn Rd, Southfleet</td>
<td>relocate bus stop and realign southern side of Red Street junction</td>
<td>ON SITE - Scheduled to be COMPLETED 18 June 2010</td>
<td>None – this scheme will no longer be reported to this Board</td>
<td>£12K</td>
<td>Helen Cobby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MY 1404 TD</td>
<td>Princes Rd, Dartford</td>
<td>Convert eastern footway to shared-use cycle Path between Crayford Rd and Shepherds Lane</td>
<td>Design complete and works ordered</td>
<td>Works scheduled to start 11 August 2010</td>
<td>£127K</td>
<td>Julian Cook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MY 1405 TD</td>
<td>Princes Rd, Dartford</td>
<td>Convert northern footway to shared-use cycle Path between Heath La and Olive Rd</td>
<td>ON SITE 18 May 2010</td>
<td>Scheduled to be COMPLETED 11 August 2010</td>
<td>£266K</td>
<td>Julian Cook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MY 1407 TD</td>
<td>St Clements Way, Bluewater</td>
<td>change traffic signs and road markings to reduce risk of crashes</td>
<td>Detailed design complete</td>
<td>Date for start of construction to be decided in partnership with Bluewater</td>
<td>£17K</td>
<td>Simon Allsopp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCC Ref</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Description of Works</td>
<td>Progress to Date</td>
<td>Expected Actions in Next Three Months</td>
<td>Forecast Spend 2010/11</td>
<td>Contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0845 8247 800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROPOSED CYCLE-PATH FROM PRINCES RD TO GREEN STREET GREEN ROAD

Brent

1. **Summary**

1. To inform Members and request endorsement of a proposal to permit cycling on the widened footway between Princes Road and Green Street Green Road, as shown in Appendix A.

2. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

2.1 Members are recommended to endorse the proposal to redesignate approximately 410 metres of widened footway as a shared-use “Cycle Track” between Princes Road and Green Street Green Road, as shown in Appendix A.

3. **Introduction**

3.1 This scheme is intended to provide a safe route for cyclists to avoid the difficult right turn at the roundabout junction of Princes Road and Green Street Green Road.

3.2 The scheme comprises three parts:

- A widened footway on the south side of Princes Road from the Park Road roundabout to the pedestrian crossing near the northern entrance Leigh Technology Academy;

- A widened footway on the west side of Green Street Green Road from the Park Road roundabout to the south entrance of Leigh Technology Academy;

- Conversion of the Princes Road pelican crossing to a Toucan crossing, so that cyclists can cross legally without being required to dismount and walk their bicycles across the road.

3.3 An additional benefit of the proposal is that it provides a link between the Princes Road cycle path and the main and south entrances to Leigh Technology Academy. Although the Academy has a northern entrance onto Princes Road, this is not open in the evenings when the college hires out its sport facilities.

3.4 This scheme was proposed by a Dartford resident and is supported by Kent police
JOINT TRANSPORTATION BOARD  
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4. Crash Data

4.1. The Kent Highways Services database of vehicle crashes shows eight accidents on the Park Road roundabout of Princes Road in the last five years. Three of these involved cyclists. The circumstances of the crashes are not clear in every case, but one accident which is well documented involved a cyclist trying to turn right from Princes Road into Green Street Green Road. This took place on Thursday 26th October 2006 at approximately 6pm.

4.2. The proposed scheme is intended to allow cyclists to make this manoeuvre without using the roundabout and to allow them to cross Princes Road by means of a Toucan crossing (to be converted from the existing Pelican crossing).

5. Details of proposal and additional information

5.1. Before permitting cycling on the footway on the south side of Prince’s Road and on the west side of Green Street Green Road, it is proposed to widen these paths to 2.5 metres.

5.2. There will be locations where the footway will be wider than 2.5 metres (e.g. at the bus stop) and there may locations where the usable path width has to be limited to about 2 metres due to the presence of pedestrian guard railings, trees or other immovable features.

5.3. It is worth noting that the Department for Transport’s publication LTN2/08 “Cycle Infrastructure Design” acknowledges that widths of cycle paths may be made less than the standard of 3 metres, in areas with fewer cyclists and pedestrians. In fact this is quite commonplace, for example on other parts of Princes Road.

5.4. Surveys have been made of the number of people using the existing Princes Road footway and the Pelican Crossing, and the results are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number of people</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrians and cyclists using the south footway of Princes Road between</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the roundabout and the bus stop. (Measured Fri 14th May 2010, 8am - 9am)</td>
<td>On foot: 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cycles 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrians and cyclists using the south footway of Princes Road between</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the bus stop and the pelican crossing. (Measured Fri 14th May 2010, 8am</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 9am)</td>
<td>On foot: 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cycles 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrians and cyclists crossing Princes Road at the pelican crossing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Measured on Thurs 29th April between 7:50 and 8:50am)</td>
<td>On foot: 144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cycles 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wheelchairs 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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5.5. The scheme is awaiting confirmation that it can be funded as part of the 2011/12 Local Transport Programme.

6. Legal issues

6.1. “Cycle track” is the legal term used to describe a way (constituting or comprised in a Highway) over which the public have rights of way on pedal cycles. The legal basis for redesignation of all or part of a footway to a cycle track is sections 65 and 66 of the Highways Act 1980.

6.2. Section 66 of the Act is used to remove the designation of footway and Section 65 is used to formally create the Cycle Track. There needs to be clear evidence that the local highway authority has exercised its powers, and this can be provided by a resolution of this Board.

7. Equal Opportunities Implications (including DDA)

7.1 A Disability Equality Impact Assessment has been carried out and the findings used in the design of the footway to be converted. As a result there are no residual concerns.

8. Human Rights Act implications

8.1 None as a result of this report

9. Crime and Disorder implications

9.1 None as a result of this report

10. Details of Exempt Information Category

10.1 Not applicable

11. Appendices

Appendix A –
Map showing location of footway proposed for conversion to cycle track.

BACKGROUND PAPERS: None

Contact Officers: Peter Slaughter
Contact Number: 08458 247 800
Kent County Council
APPENDIX A

Map showing location of footway proposed for conversion to cycle track
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PROPOSED CYCLE-PATHS FROM CENTRAL PARK TO DARENTH RD
AND ON PRINCES ROAD AT THE JUNCTION WITH NORTH ROAD

Brent & Heath

1. Summary

1. To inform Members and request endorsement of proposals to create two short lengths of shared-use cycle paths in Dartford.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1 Members are recommended to endorse the proposal to redesignate approximately 28 metres of footway as a shared-use “Cycle Track” between Central Park and Darenth Road as shown in Appendix A.

2.2 Members are recommended to endorse the proposal to redesignate approximately 18 metres of widened footway as a shared-use “Cycle Track” on the west side of Prince’s Road adjacent the junction with North Road as shown in Appendix B.

3. Introduction

3.1. These two schemes are modifications to existing cycle path projects that have already been authorised.

4. Path from Central Park to Darenth Road

4.1. Dartford Borough Council have recently constructed a path to link from Central Park to Darenth Road. To be precise, the eastern end of the newly constructed path is at the Fastrack bus-stops near the end of Brent Lane. The final 28 metres of the route to Darenth Road is via the existing footway built to link the Fastrack bus stops to Darenth Road, as shown in the drawing in Appendix A.

4.2. This final 28 metres of existing footway are two metres wide, though closest to the Fastrack route there are pedestrian guard rails that narrow the effective width of the path to 1.5 metres.

4.3. In order to legally allow cycling on the existing footway, it is necessary to redesignate the footway to become a “cycle track”. The footway would be widened to be 2.5 metres wide, (effective width 2 metres where there are pedestrian guard rails).

4.4. At present the footway is lightly used, though clearly more people are likely to use the path when the route through the park is opened. The zig-zag shape of the path will keep cyclists to a low speed.
5. Path on Princes Road adjacent North Road

5.1. At the Board meeting on 8th December 2009, Members were briefed on the plan to redesignate the footway on the north side of Princes Road as a “cycle track”. Members approved the plans, and this will provide a useful extension to Dartford’s cycle network and safe routes to school.

5.2. The new proposal is to link the above cycle route to North Road, and comprises an improved pedestrian island in Princes Road and 18 metres of shared-use footway / “cycle track” from the island to North Road. This is shown in Appendix B. The existing footway here would be widened to be at least 3 metres width, by correspondingly reducing the area of grass verge.

6. Legal issues

6.1. “Cycle track” is the legal term used to describe a way (constituting or comprised in a Highway) over which the public have rights of way on pedal cycles. The legal basis for redesignation of all or part of a footway to a cycle track is sections 65 and 66 of the Highways Act 1980.

6.2. Section 66 of the Act is used to remove the designation of footway and Section 65 is used to formally create the Cycle Track. There needs to be clear evidence that the local highway authority has exercised its powers, and this can be provided by a resolution of this Board.

7. Equal Opportunities Implications (including DDA)

6.1 A Disability Equality Impact Assessment has been carried out and the findings used in the design of the footway to be converted. As a result there are no residual concerns.

8. Human Rights Act implications

7.1 None as a result of this report

9. Crime and Disorder implications

8.1 None as a result of this report

10. Details of Exempt Information Category

9.1 Not applicable
11. Appendices

Appendix A –
Map showing location of footway proposed for conversion to cycle track.

BACKGROUND PAPERS: None

Contact Officers : Peter Slaughter
Contact Number: 08458 247 800
Kent County Council
APPENDIX A

Map showing location of footway proposed for conversion to cycle track
APPENDIX B

Map showing location of footway proposed for conversion to cycle track
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PROPOSED CYCLE-PATH ON SHEPHERDS LANE FROM PRINCES RD TO HEATHCLOSE ROAD

1. Summary

1. To inform Members and request endorsement of a proposal to permit cycling on the widened footway on the south side of Shepherds Lane between Princes Road and Heathclose Road.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1 Members are recommended to endorse the proposal to redesignate 355 metres of footway as a shared-use “Cycle Track” on the south side of Shepherds Lane, between the junction with Princes Road and the junction with Heathclose Road.

3. Background and Discussion

3.1. The footway of Shepherds Lane between Princes Road and Heathclose Road is a well-used route to school.

3.2. On a survey on 11th May 2010, the footway was used by 72 pupils walking to school and 3 pupils cycling, in addition to 14 adults on foot and two on bicycles.

3.3. The scheme under consideration is part of a proposal to create a cycle route from Common Lane (and its schools) in Wilmington to the cycle path along Princes Road. This will enable the new route to be connected to the rest of the Dartford cycle network.

4. Existing and Proposed Provision in Shepherds Lane

4.1. The section of Shepherds Lane under consideration is a dual carriageway provided with a cycle lane on both carriageways. Although the cycle lanes are used by adults, they are not well used by children cycling to and from school.

4.2. For the purposes of travelling home from school, the main difficulty with the cycle lanes is that children would have to cross Shepherds Lane to use the eastbound cycle lane. This is clearly unsatisfactory if a safer route can be provided.

4.3. The existing south footway of Shepherds Lane varies in width between 5.44 metres (near the northern end) and 2.37 metres (near Heathview Crescent).
4.4. It is proposed that wherever the footway is currently narrower than approximately 2.8 metres it should be widened to 3 metres.

4.5. Along this section of Shepherds Lane the outermost part of the carriageway (i.e., furthest from the kerbline) is marked by hatched white lines, and it is proposed that the hatched area will be reduced where necessary to allow for the footway widening.

5. Consultation

5.1. Information about the proposals was distributed in April to houses adjacent the proposed route, i.e., 157 to 213 Shepherds Lane, a total of 30 properties. This resulted in four responses from local residents.

5.2. The first respondent was against the proposals on the following grounds: “the danger of accidents that might occur between cyclists and when cars are attempting to back in or out of driveways on to the very busy dual carriageway. At the moment we have to be very aware of pedestrians, but with the faster cycles I think that it is courting disaster.”

5.3. The second respondent said that the proposal was ill-conceived and unacceptable. “Residents already have great difficulty in entering and leaving the road at peak periods…. The window of time available to complete either of these manoeuvres is minimal, with no pause in the flow of traffic travelling westwards. If your proposal is implemented we will have the addition of cyclists travelling in both directions at up to 20mph… With pedestrians, two-way cycling, the constant traffic flow in peak periods and no sight lines, this stretch of road will become very dangerous.”

5.4. The third respondent telephoned to express concern about problems involving cars entering or leaving driveways, but this resident was not against the principle of the proposals, and queried whether “SLOW” could be painted on the pavement on the bend at the junction with Heathclose Road.

5.5. The fourth resident phoned to ask if the footway would be widened outside his property, and when told that this would not be the case he appeared to be satisfied.

5.6. The designer’s response to the residents’ concerns expressed above is that the proposed design for the cycle path outside their properties is low risk and complies with guidelines. Cycle paths are known to operate successfully even when they are narrower than the proposed scheme and have more restricted visibility at driveways.
5.7. Kent Police have been consulted, and they have no objections to the proposal although they point out that vegetation overhanging the footway will need to be cut back.

5.8. Wilmington Grammar School for Boys fully supports the scheme.

6. **Legal issues**

6.1. “Cycle track” is the legal term used to describe a way (constituting or comprised in a Highway) over which the public have rights of way on pedal cycles. The legal basis for redesignation of all or part of a footway to a cycle track is sections 65 and 66 of the Highways Act 1980.

6.2. Section 66 of the Act is used to remove the designation of footway and Section 65 is used to formally create the Cycle Track. There needs to be clear evidence that the local highway authority has exercised its powers, and this can be provided by a resolution of this Board.

7. **Equal Opportunities Implications (including DDA)**

6.1 A Disability Equality Impact Assessment has been carried out and the findings incorporated into the design of the footway to be converted. As a result there are no residual concerns.

8. **Human Rights Act implications**

7.1 None as a result of this report

9. **Crime and Disorder implications**

8.1 None as a result of this report

10. **Details of Exempt Information Category**

9.1 Not applicable

11. **Appendices**

Appendix A –
Map showing location of footway proposed for conversion to cycle track.
BACKGROUND PAPERS:  None

Contact Officers : Peter Slaughter
Contact Number: 08458 247 800
Kent County Council
JOINT TRANSPORTATION BOARD
22nd June 2010

APPENDIX A
Map showing location of footway proposed for conversion to cycle track
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STONE PLACE ROAD/LONDON ROAD/HEDGE PLACE ROAD CROSSROADS SIGNALISATION CRASH REMEDIAL MEASURE SCHEME - CONSULTATION RESPONSES

1. Summary

To advise Members of the Board of the comments and formal objections received in response to public consultation which took place in February and March 2010 for the Stone Place Crossroads signalisation scheme.

2. RECOMMENDATION(S)

2.1 It is recommended that Members a) note the outcome of the consultation, b) set aside the objections received on the grounds stated in this report and c) endorse the crash remedial measure proposal for the signalisation of Stone Place/London Road/Hedge Place Road illustrated in Appendix B to this report.

3. Background

3.1. At the meeting of this Board held on 8 December 2009 Members agreed to proceed to non-statutory consultation by public notice for the Stone Place Crossroads signalisation.

3.2. Objections were received from three businesses based on London Road and reservations regarding the shared use facility were received from Kent Association for the Blind as detailed in Appendix A to this report. The tabulation also includes recommendations for each objection. Two responses in support of the proposal are also included in Appendix A to this report.

4. Discussion

4.1 Although there are no mandatory consultation requirements prior to carrying out these works, the following were consulted:

Kent Police: P.C. Paul Cave Traffic Management

Local Member: Councillor Derek E Lawson, Councillor Ms Christine Angell, Councillor Rosie Bryant, County Councillor Penny Cole

Parish Council: Stone Parish Council

Disabled Access Group: Kent Association for the Blind, Gravesham Access Group have been asked for comments as Dartford do not have an access group.

Properties along the length were consulted [by way of an on-site notice and letter drop].
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Legal Implications:
None as a result of this report

Human Rights Act Implications:
None as a result of this report

Crime and Disorder Implications:
None as a result of this report

Equal Opportunities Implications (including DDA)
None as a result of this report

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that Members support the implementation of the proposed Crash Remedial scheme and endorse the Crash Remedial Measure proposal for the signalisation of Stone Place Road/London Road/Hedge Place Road and that the objections on the grounds of inconvenience or additional difficulty to park be considered against the safety benefits to all road users (including pedestrians).

5. Appendices

Appendix A – Responses to the statutory consultation.
Appendix B – Plan showing where the parking is displaced.

Background Papers
None
### Appendix A

#### Objections and support received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms Anne-Marie Northcott</td>
<td>Taking away the current parking with the implementation of the signals will affect the hairdressing business</td>
<td>Ms Northcott has expressed concern over pre-existing parking issues and what effect the removal of an additional 6 bays would have. Ms Northcott has permission to park at the rear of her premises, however the car sales company normally block the entrance to the rear of her property. Implementation of the signals are for safety and must be considered a priority at this location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hairlite Express</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Smoker</td>
<td>The proposal would affect his business due to lack of parking and will make it difficult for loading and unloading. Mr Smoker is also concerned that the customers for the car show room will park in front of his premises.</td>
<td>Loading and unloading will be permitted, however as stated previously, the implementation of the signals are for safety and must be considered a priority at this location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve’s Carpets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Ward</td>
<td>Clients and residents will lose parking facilities due to the parking restrictions associated with the signalisation.</td>
<td>Mr Hanna is concerned that 12 parking spaces will be lost due to the implementation of the proposal. There are currently 6 spaces available for parking on the northern side of London Road outside the hairdressers, carpet shop and car show room and along the points between Stone Place Road and Chichester Road. The southern side is double yellow lined up to the point opposite number 130 London Road. The company have optional parking at the rear of the property. I would recommend as previously that the proposals are implemented in the interests of safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Data Limited – sent on behalf of Bluewater Motor Company Limited, John Hanna.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen Mote - Parish Clerk</td>
<td>In support - on behalf of Stone Parish Council</td>
<td>Members would be in favour of this scheme as it will considerably enhance safety to the proposed area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 December 2009 14:40 via email</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.C Paul Cave – Traffic Management Unit</td>
<td>In principle no objection, with observations.</td>
<td>Kent Police would like to be consulted on the detailed plans once they were available. It was noted on site that a number of vehicles parked by the north kerb of London Road to the east of the junction. These vehicles appeared to belong to the car sales business being run from number 116 London Road. Measures will need to be introduced to prevent parking in the area when the junction is signalised. The shared use facility will need clear and appropriate signing to indicate the change from segregated use to shared use as there are concerns cyclists may mistakenly continue riding on the footway when they should not. There are some issues with vegetation which will need to be addressed when the scheme is implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All the requests will be addressed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The total length of the area of displacement of cars is 26m from the start of the existing no waiting at any time restriction (junction of Stone Place Road/London Road). This has also taken into consideration the 11m area outside the car show room and access to the rear of the properties 118, 120 and 122. Although parking on your own access is still technically considered an obstruction, it has been taken into account as the occupants may consider to do so. These are the minimum requirements to maintain the free flow of all types of vehicles.
Objections on the grounds of inconvenience, or additional difficulty to park, or the adverse effect on house price or ability to sell a house in any part of the area were detailed in Appendix A, the regulations also include recommendations for each location. 

- Swanscombe
  - The Crescent
  - Swanscombe
  - The Crescent
  - Main Road Junction with Gravel Road
  - Swanscombe
  - The Crescent
  - Devon Road Junction with Watemill Way

Objections were received for the walking restrictions proposed at the following locations:

- 3.2. Walking restrictions were proposed at eight locations. No objections were received for the walking restrictions proposed at various locations in the borough.
- 3.1. At the meeting of this Board held on 16th September 2009 Members agreed to proceed to statutory consultation by public notice on yellow lines agreed to proceed to statutory consultation by public notice.

3. Background and Discussion

Receive objection processed with regard to the locations detailed in Item 3.2 that did not meet the conditions set out in Item 2.1 that these restrictions should be formally advertised.

Members agreed that the walking restriction traffic regulation order can be amended back to the board.

The formal objections received to five of the eight proposals are progressed:

2. RECOMMENDATION(S)

- 2.1. To advise Members of the Board of the committee and formal objections received in response to the walking restrictions proposed at various locations.
- 1.1. Summary

VARIOUS LOCATIONS

OBJECTIONS TO FORMAL PROPOSALS FOR YELLOW LINES

June 2009
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Agenda Item 17
Kent County Council

Contract Number: 01622 798433

Contact Officer: Rebecca Scott-Bedellie

This report is held on KHS file.
Copies of letters are available on request. The background papers pertaining

BACKGROUND PAPERS:

Appendix C – Location Plan Showing Proposed Provisions for Sflies in Appendix A
Appendix B – Location Plans Showing Originally Proposed for Sflies in
Appendix A – Summary of Objections to the Proposed Widing Restrictions.

5. Appendices

Not applicable

4. Details of Example Information Category

Should not be overlooked:

the majority of law abiding road users (pedestrians, cyclists and drivers)

improved visibility at a junction may lead to a minority of drivers

when parking is prohibited at junctions.

June 2009

JOINT TRANSPORTATION BOARD

Agenda Item 17

Page 74
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item 17</th>
<th>Page 75</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Appendix A  Summary of Objections to Proposed Parking Restrictions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Type of Objections</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dartford Road</td>
<td>No And Location</td>
<td>A 40 signature from residents Sandhu MBE from After junction with A47 Signature board further with a study board covering letter from residents and letter to the school head regarding the lack of parking and the proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensbury Road</td>
<td>One Objection</td>
<td>After junction with a study board covering letter from residents and letter to the school head regarding the lack of parking and the proposal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item 17 Page 76</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4 options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

WILLIAMSON

To negotiate the islands safely, the island would be needed for the bus stop. Consider the entire size of the island. On this basis, in area of 12.5 in. 0.75m. The dimensions of the island are the width of the island is 2.5m. The main problem concerns the parking area. Houston DL proposal will not improve the situation. Proposal is considered to be unacceptable. The proposal does not anticipate any parking area. Houston DL proposal is not considered to be acceptable. Parking will be improved at the island.

Support of 0.30 and 2.30 on Monday to Friday. Buses along Littlebrook from sunrise.

Email from Amn

JULIE

Introduction of a roundabout and removal of the island would affect the removal of the island. DL proposal will affect the removal of the island. The government suggests that the island be removed. The problem is caused by the island. The government suggests the island be removed. The island is not essential.

The proposal emphasizes the need for a roundabout at the island. The proposal also emphasizes the need for a roundabout at the island. No new roundabout at the island. Have a roundabout at the island.
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<th>Page 77</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Highway Code states</strong>:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viewpoint 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The same location</strong>:</td>
<td>5 objections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The restriction remains</strong>:</td>
<td>7 in support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation</strong>:</td>
<td>Deck Huskisson – is concerned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Driveway Drive.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mr. Eastside Resident</strong> – is likely in support of the proposal as people already pass on the junction make it difficult and dangerous to negotiate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12 Woodside Drive – welcome the additional measures.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Silver Birch Close – is likely in support of the proposal.</strong></td>
<td>7 in support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mr. Eastside Resident</strong> – is likely in support of the proposal as people already pass on the junction make it difficult and dangerous to negotiate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Silver Birch Close – is likely in support of the proposal.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Police attention</strong>:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5 Woodside Drive – is concerned</strong>:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10 Woodside Drive – is concerned</strong>:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12 Woodside Drive – is concerned</strong>:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mr. Eastside Resident</strong> – is likely in support of the proposal as people already pass on the junction make it difficult and dangerous to negotiate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Silver Birch Close – is likely in support of the proposal.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The same location</strong>:</td>
<td>5 objections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The restriction remains</strong>:</td>
<td>7 in support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation</strong>:</td>
<td>Deck Huskisson – is concerned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Driveway Drive.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mr. Eastside Resident</strong> – is likely in support of the proposal as people already pass on the junction make it difficult and dangerous to negotiate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12 Woodside Drive – welcome the additional measures.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Silver Birch Close – is likely in support of the proposal.</strong></td>
<td>7 in support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mr. Eastside Resident</strong> – is likely in support of the proposal as people already pass on the junction make it difficult and dangerous to negotiate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Silver Birch Close – is likely in support of the proposal.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Police attention</strong>:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5 Woodside Drive – is concerned</strong>:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10 Woodside Drive – is concerned</strong>:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12 Woodside Drive – is concerned</strong>:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mr. Eastside Resident</strong> – is likely in support of the proposal as people already pass on the junction make it difficult and dangerous to negotiate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Silver Birch Close – is likely in support of the proposal.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The same location</strong>:</td>
<td>5 objections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The restriction remains</strong>:</td>
<td>7 in support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation</strong>:</td>
<td>Deck Huskisson – is concerned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Driveway Drive.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mr. Eastside Resident</strong> – is likely in support of the proposal as people already pass on the junction make it difficult and dangerous to negotiate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12 Woodside Drive – welcome the additional measures.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Silver Birch Close – is likely in support of the proposal.</strong></td>
<td>7 in support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mr. Eastside Resident</strong> – is likely in support of the proposal as people already pass on the junction make it difficult and dangerous to negotiate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Silver Birch Close – is likely in support of the proposal.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Police attention</strong>:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5 Woodside Drive – is concerned</strong>:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10 Woodside Drive – is concerned</strong>:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12 Woodside Drive – is concerned</strong>:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mr. Eastside Resident</strong> – is likely in support of the proposal as people already pass on the junction make it difficult and dangerous to negotiate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Silver Birch Close – is likely in support of the proposal.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The same location</strong>:</td>
<td>5 objections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The restriction remains</strong>:</td>
<td>7 in support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation</strong>:</td>
<td>Deck Huskisson – is concerned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Driveway Drive.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mr. Eastside Resident</strong> – is likely in support of the proposal as people already pass on the junction make it difficult and dangerous to negotiate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12 Woodside Drive – welcome the additional measures.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Silver Birch Close – is likely in support of the proposal.</strong></td>
<td>7 in support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mr. Eastside Resident</strong> – is likely in support of the proposal as people already pass on the junction make it difficult and dangerous to negotiate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Silver Birch Close – is likely in support of the proposal.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Police attention</strong>:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5 Woodside Drive – is concerned</strong>:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10 Woodside Drive – is concerned</strong>:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12 Woodside Drive – is concerned</strong>:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mr. Eastside Resident</strong> – is likely in support of the proposal as people already pass on the junction make it difficult and dangerous to negotiate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Silver Birch Close – is likely in support of the proposal.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The same location</strong>:</td>
<td>5 objections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The restriction remains</strong>:</td>
<td>7 in support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation</strong>:</td>
<td>Deck Huskisson – is concerned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Driveway Drive.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mr. Eastside Resident</strong> – is likely in support of the proposal as people already pass on the junction make it difficult and dangerous to negotiate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12 Woodside Drive – welcome the additional measures.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Silver Birch Close – is likely in support of the proposal.</strong></td>
<td>7 in support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mr. Eastside Resident</strong> – is likely in support of the proposal as people already pass on the junction make it difficult and dangerous to negotiate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Silver Birch Close – is likely in support of the proposal.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Police attention</strong>:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5 Woodside Drive – is concerned</strong>:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10 Woodside Drive – is concerned</strong>:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12 Woodside Drive – is concerned</strong>:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mr. Eastside Resident</strong> – is likely in support of the proposal as people already pass on the junction make it difficult and dangerous to negotiate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Silver Birch Close – is likely in support of the proposal.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**June 2009**

**Joint Transportation Board**

**Agenda Item 17**

**Page 77**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Councilor P. Cooney</th>
<th>In support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair, Kenmore and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heaven, Cotterhall,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton at Hone,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Winchilsea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Agenda Item 17 Page 78**

Due to the extra traffic and additional costs of maintaining a parking area close to the road, it would be necessary to consider the proposal. Mr. Stretton’s support is also welcome. The PCCSO has recommended that parking at the junction of Main Road and Parkside is provided.

**Recommendation:**
- No additional cost to residents.
- No significant impact on traffic.
- The additional cost of maintaining a parking area close to the road would be acceptable.

Mr. Stretton’s support is also welcome. The proposal is supported by the PCCSO, and the Councilor P. Cooney is in support. The Chair, Kenmore and Heaven, Cotterhall, Sutton at Hone, and Winchilsea, is also in support. The proposals are agreed by the PCCSO, and the Councilor P. Cooney is in support. The Chair, Kenmore and Heaven, Cotterhall, Sutton at Hone, and Winchilsea, is also in support.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item 17</th>
<th>Main Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Councilor Coleman's Response:</td>
<td>3 in support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The situation is compounded by Doe's</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>immediately opposes. The</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stop sign exists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parking space is provided</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The same.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parking area is provided</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The restrictions remain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The highway code states</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 in support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17th Street</td>
<td>2 in support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councilor Coleman's Response:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The comment, in fact, is a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parking area is provided</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The restrictions remain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parking area is provided</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The highway code states</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rises 3 at 17th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councilor Coleman's Response:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The comment, in fact, is a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parking area is provided</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The restrictions remain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parking area is provided</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The highway code states</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rises 3 at 17th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The same.

The restrictions remain.

Recommendation: Parking place is provided. Parking spaces are unauthorised except if an authorised vehicle is parked within 15m of a junction where should not park. The highway code states guards will object.

Kemp of driveway.

residents do not object to lower speed limit in the vicinity. They appreciate it will have an affect on the corner and would support the proposal. In petition 26 signatures have been received from residents. A 26 signature report has been received.

A support of the petition.

**The Crescent**

GREENHITHE

AND

SWANSCOMBE

measure.

Mr. David Philpot, owner of the premises, supports this petition. He associates himself fully with the proposal.

Councilor Christiana, response.

Councilor Anthony, Martin - The proposal is needed and long overdue for implementation. The petition is received and passed. Councillor for the borough and parish council for Camberwell, view as a local ward Councillor for Camberwell, it is Councilor a popular toy and model shop. The Agricultural mediation Depot and a
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Proposed 40m sections of

Keep clear markings
opposite existing school
to prevent obstruction of
bus stops.
Background and Discussion

Traffic congestion: Parking may inhibit the free flow of traffic and other road users, and

Visual obstruction: Parking may inhibit a road user's view of

progress along a roadway or across a road or junction,

Physical obstruction: Vehicles may not be able to

take lane for all road users. Specifically, it may cause these problems:

3.7. Inconsiderate parking on the highway compromises road safety and

RECOMMENDATION(S)

2. Installation of yellow line waiting restrictions. The report seeks approval to proceed to installatory consultation on the

2.1. That the board notes the content of this report

2.2. That the board agree to proceed to installary consultation on the installation of yellow line waiting restrictions.

2.3. That the board agree to consider any objections received in response to the

interlocutions of yellow lines at all locations detailed in Appendices A and B.

Installation of yellow line waiting restrictions. The report seeks approval to proceed to installatory consultation on the

1. This report details the locations in Barton where yellow line waiting restrictions

1. Summary

Installation of Yellow Line Waiting Restrictions
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BACKGROUND PAPERS:

Appendix B - Proposed Walling Restriction Details - Borough of Dartford
Appendix A - Proposed Walling Restriction Plans - Borough of Dartford

5. Applicable

Not applicable

4. Details of External Information Category

3.6. The statutory consultation process would allow members of the public to express their views on each of the proposals set out in Appendices A and B to this report. Any objections received would be reported back to this Joint Transportation Board for consideration before progressing with the implementation of any yellow lines.

3.5. The relevant County and Borough Members for each of the proposals have been consulted in order to determine their views and establish if there is community support for the proposed walling restrictions. Although responses to the consultation have not yet been received, these will be included in the report.

3.4. Walling restrictions have been successful in reducing obstructions and improving parking. However, they are also unpopular with motorists as they reduce the available parking space on the highway. This is often problematic for businesses also opposite yellow line restrictions outside their property, businesses also oppose yellow line restrictions.

June 2019
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BAYS
MON - SAT 8 AM - 6PM
2 HOURS NO RETURN
WITHIN 4 HOURS

Extents of proposed DYL in black - the proposal is to completely Double Yellow Line Vaughan Close except for 2 parking bays. One of 16m in length and the other 22m.

It is proposed that Kent Highway Services implement the DYL and parking bay scheme on behalf of Dartford Borough Council due to time constraints and because additional works are being requested in the way of corner protection at Vaughan Close. The project would be funded with developer money.
Extents of proposed reduction of DYL in black


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Obstruction Type/Visibility</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Proposed Waiting Restrictions - Borough of Dartford</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Longfield Parish</td>
<td>Road Closure</td>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>No Traffic Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longfield</td>
<td>Road Closure</td>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>No Traffic Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Road (two locations)</td>
<td>Road Closure</td>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>No Traffic Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winningham</td>
<td>Road Closure</td>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>No Traffic Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winningham</td>
<td>Road Closure</td>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>No Traffic Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winningham</td>
<td>Road Closure</td>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>No Traffic Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolegate Road</td>
<td>Road Closure</td>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>No Traffic Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>Road Closure</td>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>No Traffic Access</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of Request

Appendix B
INFORMATION ITEM

ROADWORKS IN THE DARTFORD AREA

HAWLEY ROAD DARTFORD-THAMES WATER WORKS

There will be Major works being carried out on behalf of Thames Water by Skanska, on Hawley Road Dartford. They will be starting these works on Monday 24th May, working from the junction of Oakfield Lane working towards Churchill. They will be using a temporary traffic-signal head that is wired in to the permanent traffic-signals at the junction of Oakfield Lane. This will enable the signal controlled pedestrian crossing to remain open for a safe crossing point for pedestrians.

The duration of this section of works is two weeks without any unforeseen circumstances, with a completion date of 7th June.

The next section of these works will involve the use of three-way temporary traffic-signals, commencing 7th June for six weeks with a completion date of 19th July. This section is Hawley road junction of Churchill, this is likely to cause delays as this is a very traffic sensitive location. We have insisted on extended working hours to minimise the duration of these works.

The permanent traffic signals at the junction of Oakfield Lane will remain in operation as we need to maintain the light controlled pedestrian crossing. We have requested that the contractor on site provide an extra operative to manually operate the temporary traffic signals and monitor the traffic building up at the signals, this will help to reduce/minimise delays.

INSTONE ROAD-THAMES WATER.

These works currently started on the 11th May-these works if no unforeseen problems occur should be completed by 4th June 2010.

OVERY LIBERTY STREET DARTFORD.

These works currently started on the 12th May,these works if no unforeseen problems occur should be completed by 11th June 2010.

PRINCES ROAD DARTFORD-SHARED CYCLEWAY/FOOTPATH.

This is being carried out by Ringways on behalf of Kent Highways. This starts on Monday 17th May until 15-08-2010.

WESTWOOD ROAD-JOINT WORKING SCHEME.

This involves several Road Closures that follow on one after the other.

Westwood road -From 04-05-2010 to 07-05-2010.
Whitehill Road-From 07-05-2010 to 21-05 2010.
Highcross Road-From 24-05-2010 to 11-06-2010.
There will be two-way temporary traffic-signals in use on the junction of Highcross Road and Betsham Road whilst Highcross Road is closed to enable poling and overhead works to take place.

This is a joint working scheme we have organised to minimise disruption. Murphy's are currently working on behalf of EDF. Freedom are working on behalf of National Grid on overhead electric cables. Ringways are working on behalf of Kent Highways carrying out drainage and carriageway repairs.

**CLEMENT STREET SUTTON-AT-HONE ROAD**
Closure 14th June for five weeks.

This is a joint working scheme we have organised to minimise disruption. Murphy's will be working on behalf of EDF installing a new HV Cable. Cappagh construction will be working on behalf of Thames Water installing a water supply.

Ringways will working on behalf of Kent Highways carrying out drainage and carriageway repairs.
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KENT COUNTY COUNCIL

ENVIRONMENT, HIGHWAYS AND WASTE POLICY OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

MINUTES of a meeting of the Environment, Highways and Waste Policy Overview and Scrutiny Committee held in the Darent Room, Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone on Friday, 22 January 2010.

PRESENT: Mr C Hibberd (Chairman), Mr N J Collor, Mr J Cubitt, Mr D S Daley (Substitute) (Substitute for Mr M Robertson), Mr M J Harrison, Mr J D Kirby, Mr S Manion, Mr R A Pascoe, Mrs P A V Stockell (Substitute) (Substitute for Mr J R Bullock, MBE), Mrs E M Tweed and Mr M Whiting

ALSO PRESENT: Mr N J Chard, Cabinet Member for Environment, Highways & Waste

IN ATTENDANCE: Mr M Austerberry (Executive Director, Environment, Highways and Waste), Dr L Davies (Director, Environment & Waste) and Mr R Hallett (Directorate Finance Manager)

Prior to the commencement of the meeting the Chairman:-

(a) referred to the recent bad weather and informed Members that a final winter service report would be submitted to the Committee in March; and

(b) reminded Members to submit items for the Agenda to Mr Hibberd.

UNRESTRICTED ITEMS

1. Minutes of the meeting held on 10 November 2009
   (Item A3)

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting held on 10 November 2009 are correctly recorded and that they be signed by the Chairman.

2. Cabinet Member's and Executive Director's Update (Oral report)
   (Item B1)

   (1) Mr Chard gave a verbal report on the following issues:-

   • Winter Service
   • Kent Permit Scheme
   • Freedom Pass
   • East Kent Waste
   • Lower Thames Crossing
   • Rail – Maidstone to Cannon Street

   (2) RESOLVED that the update be noted and a copy circulated to Members of the Committee.
3. **Financial Monitoring 2009/10**  
*(Item B2 – Report by Mr Nick Chard, Cabinet Member for Environment, Highways and Waste; and Mr Mike Austerberry, Executive Director of Environment, Highways and Waste)*

(1) A detailed quarterly budget monitoring report was presented to Cabinet, usually in September, December and March, and a draft final outturn report in June. The reports outlined the full financial position for each portfolio and were reported to POSCs after they had been considered by Cabinet. In the intervening months an exception report was made to Cabinet outlining any significant variations from the quarterly report. The November exception monitoring report for 2009/10 was submitted for the information of POSC members.

(2) **RESOLVED** that the budget variations for the EHW Portfolio for 2009/10 based on the November exception report to Cabinet be noted.

4. **Budget 2010/11 and Medium Term Financial Plan 2010/13**  
*(Item B3 – Report by Mr Nick Chard, Cabinet Member for Environment, Highways and Waste; and Mr Mike Austerberry, Executive Director of Environment, Highways and Waste)*

(1) The Committee considered draft budget proposals for the Environment, Highways and Waste Directorate, with reference to the KCC published budget consultation paper issued on 5 January 2010. The report also provided a response to the issues raised at the Informal Member Group of this Committee, created in November 2009 to discuss detailed budget issues.

(2) Mr Chard and Mr Hallett introduced the draft Budget and Medium Term Financial Plan for the EHW Directorate. The total of the proposed savings and income generation required in order to meet the indicative cash limit for 2010/11 was £3.2m. The majority of the savings would come from improvements in highways procurement. There would also be staffing efficiencies; over £1m savings in Waste; and the ending of the 2010 target for the Clean Kent campaign.

(3) The gross savings were offset by the reversal of the capital/revenue swap on support for socially necessary but uneconomic bus routes. A further £0.04m of net income was to be generated by Country Parks in 2010/11 with additional increases in targets across the following two years. In line with the zero pay award for KCC officers for 2010/11, it was proposed that no inflation was added to highways fees and charges for the new financial year.

(4) There followed a question and answer session which included the following issues:-

(a) support for socially necessary but uneconomic bus routes;

(b) the modernisation and development of waste facilities;

(c) staffing efficiencies in Highways, Resources and Planning through delayering and streamlining processes;

(d) an extension to the Freedom Pass.
(5) During debate certain Members expressed their concern that the relative priorities the IMG placed upon the various services may not be representative of all Members’ views.

(6) RESOLVED that:-

(a) the proposal not to add an inflation increase to highways fees and charges in 2010/11, be noted; and

(b) the revenue and capital budget proposals, along with the responses made to questions from Members be noted.

5. Environment, Highways and Waste Half Year Business Plan Monitoring 2009/10

(Item B4 – Report by Mr Nick Chard, Cabinet Member for Environment, Highways and Waste; and Mr Richard Hallett, Directorate Finance Manager, Environment, Highways and Waste)

(1) The report detailed the directorate’s progress against the Business Plans during the period 1 April to 30 September 2009, covering achievement of performance against activity/projects and targets. Progress was presented to Cabinet on 30 November 2009.

(2) As part of the half-year monitoring, progress was checked against each of the 2009/10 Service Level Business Plans whereby most of the Projects, Developments or Key Actions were identified as ‘on-course’ or ‘done and ongoing’. A copy of the Executive Director’s Statement and half year monitoring report giving a summary of progress was set out in the Appendix to the report. The monitoring showed that 6% of the 2009/10 actions were not ‘on-target’ to complete this financial year and were listed with reasons and proposed actions.

(3) RESOLVED that:-

(a) the progress against Environment, Highways & Waste Service Level Business Plans for the period 1 April to 30 September 2009 be noted; and

(b) a presentation and discussion relating to the freight structure be arranged for a future meeting of the POSC.


(Item B5 – Report by Mr Nick Chard, Cabinet Member for Environment, Highways and Waste; Mr Mike Austerberry, Executive Director (EHW); and Dr Linda Davies, Chair, Equalities Group (EHW))

(1) The report provided an update on progress with Environment, Highways and Waste directorate’s work on Equalities and Diversity, in support of Kent County Council’s ambition to achieve level ‘excellent’ in the Equalities Framework for Local Government (EFLG) by March 2011.

(2) A new Equality Bill, drawing together all previous Equalities and Diversity legislation was expected to receive Royal Assent early in 2010. The Bill aimed to provide straightforward practical guidance for employers, service providers and public
bodies. The EFLG which provided the detailed criteria to explain how local authorities should manage Equalities and Diversity issues had been published.

(3) The EFLG was based on a wider definition of equality that moved away from a purely legalistic interpretation to a concept of equal life chances. It aspired to be simpler, smarter, proportional and more relevant than the previous standard. It was outcome-based, and recognised that:-

- equality was an issue for us all
- we don’t all start from the same place
- to create a fairer society we needed to recognise different needs

Local authorities would be audited on the following five performance areas:

- Knowing your community and equality mapping
- Place shaping, leadership, partnership and organisational commitment
- Community engagement and satisfaction
- Responsive services and customer care
- A modern reflective and diverse workforce

(4) During debate Mrs Tweed referred to the Customer Impact Assessments which replaced Equality Impact Assessments in KCC, and asked how Kent Highway Services engaged with the elderly to meet their needs. This stemmed from concerns about the elderly being trapped in their homes during the recent snow, and although it was agreed that there was a social services aspect to it, the discussion led onto what else Highways did for this part of the community.

(5) RESOLVED that:-

(a) the content of the report be noted; and

(b) the approach for embedding Equalities into the directorate’s business, in support of KCC’s corporate commitment to achieve level ‘Excellent’ in the new Equalities Framework for Local Government be endorsed.

7. Environment, Highways and Waste Risk Register 2010/11

(5) RESOLVED that:-

(a) the content of the report be noted; and

(b) the approach for embedding Equalities into the directorate’s business, in support of KCC’s corporate commitment to achieve level ‘Excellent’ in the new Equalities Framework for Local Government be endorsed.

7. Environment, Highways and Waste Risk Register 2010/11

(Item B6 – Report by Mr Nick Chard, Cabinet Member for Environment, Highways and Waste; and Mr Richard Hallett, Directorate Finance Manager, Environment, Highways and Waste)

(1) The report identified the strategic risks that were managed and controlled within the Environment, Highways & Waste Directorate.

(2) It had been agreed at a meeting of the Governance and Audit Committee on 5 March 2008 that in future years the risk registers would be considered by POSCs in the January cycle before being reported to the Governance and Audit Committee. The requirement to maintain risk registers ensured that potential risks, which might prevent the Authority from achieving its objectives, were identified and controlled.

(3) During 2010/11 the controls in the register would continue to be tested and checked in order of significance, and new actions monitored. Risk Management Plans would be developed for every risk within the Directorate rated as High (i.e. with
a score of 16 and above). The plans were a tool to be used by managers with their Services and Business Units to document and monitor actions for the high risks.

(4) RESOLVED that the Environment, Highways & Waste Directorate Risk Register, updated in September 2009, be noted and supported.

8. Select Committee – update  
(Item C1)

Report by Overview, Scrutiny and Localism Manager)

(1) Further to Minute 9 of 10 November 2009, the Membership of the Select Committee on Renewable Energy was Mr K Ferrin, (Chairman Elect), Mr R King, Mr C Hibberd, Mr C Smith, Mrs E Tweed, Mrs P Stockell, Mr D Hirst and Mr T Prater. It had been agreed that Ms Sue Frampton, the Research Officer supporting the review, would start preparatory work on developing the terms of reference and scope for the review. The Select Committee would start its work in January 2010 and submit its report to County Council on 14 October 2010. Regular update reports would be submitted to the POJC on the progress of the Select Committee.

(2) RESOLVED that the report be noted.
KENT COUNTY COUNCIL

ENVIRONMENT, HIGHWAYS AND WASTE POLICY OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

MINUTES of a meeting of the Environment, Highways and Waste Policy Overview and Scrutiny Committee held in the Darent Room, Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone on Thursday, 25 March 2010.

PRESENT: Mr C Hibberd (Chairman), Mr M Robertson (Vice-Chairman), Mr N J Collor, Mr J Cubitt, Mr J D Kirby, Mr R A Pascoe, Mr R J Parry (Substitute for Mr M J Harrison), Mr K Smith (Substitute for Mr S Manion), Mrs P A V Stockell (Substitute for Mr W Richardson), Mrs E M Tweed and Mr M Whiting

ALSO PRESENT: Mr N J D Chard

IN ATTENDANCE: Mr M Austerberry (Executive Director, Environment, Highways and Waste), Mr S Gasche (Public Transport Team Leader), Mr D Hall (Head of Transport & Development), Mr R Hallett (Directorate Finance Manager), Pierpoint (Public Transport Team Leader), Mr M Sutch (Head of Planning & Transport Strategy) and Mrs C Valentine (Community Delivery Manager) and Mrs K Mannering (Democratic Services Officer).

UNRESTRICTED ITEMS

1. Minutes - 22 January 2010
   (Item A3)

   (1) Mrs Tweed requested the following be added to the final sentence in paragraph 6(4) – Equalities in Environment, Highways and Waste Annual Report:-

   “in particular, repeated complaints by elderly motorists about road safety at road junctions with poor visibility, where near-misses have been encountered.”

   (2) RESOLVED that, subject to the above being included, the Minutes of the meeting held on 22 January 2010 are correctly recorded and that they be signed by the Chairman.

2. Cabinet Member's and Executive Director's Update (Oral report)
   (Item B1)

   (1) Mr Chard gave a verbal report on the following issues:-

   Integrated Strategy & Planning

   DaSTS Study London to Dover/Channel Tunnel; Lower Thames Crossing; Minerals & Waste Development Framework; Rail Summit; Terminal T2, Dover; Olympic Delivery Authority's Transport Plan; A21 Tonbridge - Pemberley
Waste Management

New Romney HWRC – Update – Planning Permission for site had been approved 16 March 2010; North Farm HWRC, Tunbridge Wells – Planning Permission for Site Improvements had been approved 4 March 2010.

Kent Highway Services

Traffic Systems; Business Improvements; Network Performance; Roadworks; Member Highway Fund Seminar; Director of Kent Highway Services; JTB Referrals; Transportation & Safety Package Programme.

Environment

DeCReASE Regional Board

(2) RESOLVED that the update be noted and a copy circulated to Members of the Committee.

3. Financial Monitoring Report

(Item B2 - Report by Mr Nick Chard, Cabinet Member for Environment, Highways and Waste; and Mr Mike Austerberry, Executive Director of Environment, Highways and Waste)

(1) Members were asked to note the March budget monitoring report to be reported to Cabinet on 29 March 2010. There were no significant variances to report on the revenue budget since the report was written. The major elements of the predicted outturn remained a significant underspend on Waste offset by additional spending required on Highways. Since the report was written there had been some slippage on the energy and water investment fund.

(2) RESOLVED that the budget variations for the EHW Portfolio for 2009/10 based on the March report to Cabinet be noted.


(Item B3 - Report by Mr Nick Chard, Cabinet Member for Environment, Highways and Waste)

(1) The past winter was the worst in the UK for over 30 years. This impacted on services and agencies across the country as well as in our region. The report set out how key operators in Kent fared during the severe weather and the lessons learnt that would be used to improve services in the future.

(2) Kent Highway Services had a Winter Service Policy and Plan which was approved by the POSC in September 2009. These set out how KHS dealt with keeping the highway network free from snow and ice. The report included information relating to snow emergencies; salt bins; district council assistance; salt; media; customer contact; staffing; future development of the winter service; Southeastern; Eurostar; Eurotunnel; and the Port of Dover.

2
(3) There followed a question and answer session which included the following issues:-

- The inclusion of small hamlets in future plans
- The employment of District Councils’ workforce to assist with snow clearance
- The gritting of roads not on bus routes and the condition of pavements

(4) RESOLVED that:-

(a) the report be noted;

(b) officers be thanked for the excellent service provided, and for the regular member updates; and

(c) a more detailed report be submitted to the POSC at a meeting to be arranged in May.

5. Public Transport Development

(Item B4 - Report by Mr Nick Chard, Cabinet Member for Environment, Highways and Waste)

(1) The annual report informed members of the principal developments, funding arrangements and initiatives undertaken in the provision of public transport in Kent during 2009/10 and planned for implementation during 2010/11. This year’s report also provided a summary of the principal legislative changes following the Local Transport Act 2008, and the bearing they were having on the delivery of public transport.

(2) Public Transport continued to go from strength to strength in Kent. Principal developments included Quality Bus Partnerships; Bus Stop Improvements; Kent Freedom Pass; KCC Kickstart; DfT Kickstart; Smartcards and Real Time Information (RTI); the Kent & Medway Concessionary Travel Scheme; and Rail Services.

(3) This year’s report provided a summary of the principal legislative changes following the Local Transport Act 2008 and the bearing they were having on the delivery of public transport. The new legislation had developed the original powers contained in the Transport Act 2000, and provided three distinct levels of agreement to facilitate partnership between bus operators, district councils and local transport authorities which were set out in the paper.

(4) KCC had continued to make significant investment, through both funding and personnel, in the creation of good quality public transport services throughout the county. The County Council was committed to attaining modal shift from car to public transport, by enhancing the provision of bus services and by improving access for all. Wherever possible KCC would make use of the new powers contained in the Local Transport Act 2008 to enhance the quality of the partnerships between the County Council and its stakeholders.
(5) There followed a question and answer session which included the following issues:-

- Sittingbourne/Victoria train services
- Progress on DfT Kickstart bids
- Status of QBP in Sevenoaks
- Kent Freedom Pass – working with rail operators
- Withdrawal of Cannon Street train service via Maidstone East

(6) RESOLVED that:-

(a) the report be noted; and

(b) a further report be submitted to the next meeting of the POSC detailing -

(i) data and information on the present timetabled Mainline train services to and from London stations to Kent that had changed after the introduction of the High Speed train service;

(ii) an analysis of those services that were quicker, the same time or slower;

(iii) what KCC could do to influence a change of services and connectivity to allow a much higher percentage of better services; and

(iv) the report to be sent to the Chairman of the RED POSC with a request for it to be included on the agenda for its next meeting.

6. Results from the Highway Tracker Survey 2009

(Item B5 - Report by Mr Nick Chard, Cabinet Member for Environment, Highways and Waste; and Caroline Bruce, Interim Director of Kent Highway Services)

(1) The report informed Members of the key results of the 2009 Resident, County Member, District Member and Parish/Town Council Highway Tracker Survey. The full survey report was over 200 pages long and available on the KCC website. It provided a wide range of information to help shape and improve highway service delivery.

(2) Satisfaction surveys, to gauge perception of the highway service had been carried out since 1987. The 2009 survey was carried out in November and December and included seeking views from residents, County Members, Parish/Town Councils and for the second time, District Members. The survey was conducted by an independent market research company called BMG and a summary of the results were presented in the report. The information would be used by the Director and Senior Management team to identify actions to help improve service delivery.

(3) The key headline from the survey was the continuing improvement in the public’s perception of pavements and streetlights with a slight dip in roads caused primarily by dissatisfaction with the condition of country lanes and residential roads. However for the fourth successive year there were more residents satisfied than dissatisfied.
(4) RESOLVED that:-

(a) the progress being made in public perception of the highway service be noted; and

(b) Members work closely with officers to continue to improve the service as seen through the eyes of Members and Parish/Town Councils.

7. KHS Contracts - A Brief Overview
(Item B6 - Report by Mr Nick Chard, Cabinet Member for Environment, Highways and Waste; and Caroline Bruce, Interim Director, Kent Highway Services)

(1) The KHS Alliance delivered services to the people of Kent through 4 main organisations; Ringway, Jacobs, Kent County Council (KCC) and Telent. Individual contracts existed between KCC and the three private sector organisations. A position statement on the current KHS contracts including current contract remits and relevant timescales was submitted to Members.

(2) Contractor and consultancy contracts were re-tendered in 2006 and although some market testing was currently taking place, highway services were primarily delivered through the three countywide term-service contracts shown in the report. The contracts had an initial 5 year term to 2011 with possible annual extensions to 2016. The contracts did not have any work load guarantees and all had a 12 month termination notice clause.

(3) RESOLVED that the report be noted and further information be provided to Members in due course.

8. Delivering a Sustainable Transport System (DaSTS) - Presentation
(Item B7)

(1) Mr Sutch gave a presentation on the DaSTS Study: London to Dover/Channel Tunnel. There followed a question and answer session which included the following issues:-

- M2 Junction 5/5a
- Local Development Frameworks – schemes/prioritisation
- Ashford Relief Road
- Housing provision
- European funding

(2) Following debate Mr Sutch was thanked for a very informative presentation.

(3) RESOLVED that:-

(a) the current situation be noted; and

(b) copies of the presentation be circulated to Members.
9. Select Committee - update
(Item C1 - Report by Overview, Scrutiny and Localism Manager)

Select Committee: Renewable Energy
(1) Further to Minute 8 of 22 January 2010, the Select Committee held its inaugural meeting in January 2010. The Select Committee was piloting a different style of working and had gathered written evidence prior to agreeing its list of oral witnesses. This mirrored the way that Parliamentary Select Committees carried out their work. Visits had been arranged for the Select Committee and it would be meeting on 31 March 2010 to review the written evidence received and agree a list of witnesses. Hearing sessions would be held during April, May and the first week of June.

Suggestions for Select Committee topic reviews
(2) The Scrutiny Board at its meeting on 24 February 2010 received an update on the current Select Committee topic review programme. It was agreed that Members be asked to consider whether there were any topics that they would like to put forward for consideration for inclusion in the future topic review programme.

(3) RESOLVED that:-

(a) the report be noted; and

(b) Members submit any suggestions for the 2010/11 Select Committee Topic Review Programme to Karen Mannering.
Joint Transportation Board Update

Following a Policy Overview and Scrutiny Committee (POSC) meeting on 25 March 2010, this report has been produced for Joint Transportation Boards (JTBs), to cover highways and transport issues across the County.

Director of Kent Highway Services
John Burr is now the new Director of Kent Highway Services, having taken up the post with KCC on 29 March.

Traffic Systems
Traffic Systems have successfully deployed Urban Traffic Management Control (UTMC) equipment into Canterbury and Gravesham during 2010, which will enable the Traffic Management Centre (TMC) to monitor traffic conditions and collect journey times. The TMC have also been proactive in developing new reporting formats to improve information collation and dissemination to areas such as the Contact Centre, KCC colleagues and the Press Office, which has helped improve the information provided to customers particularly in areas of Winter Maintenance.

Business improvements
The KHS annual tracker survey shows good progress with streetlights and pavements but a drop in roads satisfaction mainly driven by country lanes.

Network Performance
The Network Performance Team has successfully introduced a new Parking Protocol which was passed for adoption by the 12 districts and KCC by the Kent Chief Executives and will commence as from 1st April 2010. This new protocol sets out a framework of common principles for parking policy and management that is not directly covered in the Agency Agreements. It also clarifies the division of responsibility between County and Districts for the delivery of parking related functions.
By: Head of Transport and Development, Kent Highway Services

To: Environment, Highways & Waste – Policy Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Subject: Public Transport Developments, Funding and Initiatives

Classification: Unrestricted

Summary: This annual report informs members of the principal developments, funding arrangements and initiatives undertaken in the provision of public transport in Kent during 2009/10 and planned for implementation during 2010/11. This year’s report also provides a summary of the principal legislative changes following the Local Transport Act 2008, and the bearing they are having on the delivery of public transport.

1. Introduction

(1) Public Transport continues to go from strength to strength in Kent. The County Council has been at the forefront of developing and implementing new initiatives, with new Quality Bus Partnerships (QBPs) signed in Ashford and Dover and similar partnerships planned for Sevenoaks, Shepway and Swale. Passenger numbers have continued to increase year on year. In 2005/06 there were 45.7 million journeys by bus; in 2006/07 48.6 million; in 2007/08 51.7 million; and in 2008/09 55.2 million.

(2) During 2009/10 a number of key initiatives such as Kent County Council (KCC) Kickstart funding have delivered new vehicles and service uplifts for the Ashford A-Line operated by Stagecoach and for some of KCC’s supported bus routes. Further improvements are planned for 2010/11, and this report updates Members on progress.

2. Principal Developments

(1) Quality Bus Partnerships

The Transport Act 2000 and the Local Transport Act 2008 provided for the establishment of Voluntary Partnership Agreements between bus operators, district councils and county councils (see section 4 – Legislation). These are generally known as Quality Bus Partnerships (QBPs), and by the end of 2009 half the districts in Kent had QBPs – Ashford, Canterbury, Dover, Maidstone, Thanet and Tunbridge Wells.

The new QBPs in Ashford and Dover were signed during 2009, each with the district council and Stagecoach in East Kent and the former including Ashford’s Future Partnership Board. It is now intended to develop a Quality Network Partnership with bus and rail operators in Sevenoaks; a QBP in Shepway; and potentially a multi-operator QBP in Swale.
QBPs establish close working relationships between the parties to each agreement, and aim to improve the quality and reliability of bus services through the attainment of targets for punctuality, reliability, bus stop access and other improvements. Kent has been particularly successful at establishing QBPs and encouraging investment in Kent which has brought significant improvements in local bus services.

(2) Bus Stop Improvements

Kent Highway Services, in partnership with Arriva Southern Counties and Stagecoach in East Kent, has continued to implement a programme of improvements to bus stops throughout the county. This will eventually result in every urban bus stop being provided with a 24/7 bus stop clearway (to prevent unlawful parking), a raised barrier (wherever possible) to assist the mobility impaired, a clearly branded bus stop flag, and clear tailored timetable information for the routes serving the stop. It is planned to enter into a new Roadside Infrastructure Unit (RIU) contract to upgrade and maintain timetable information during 2010.

(3) Kent Freedom Pass

The Kent Freedom Pass scheme was rolled out countywide during 2009, and now provides free travel on most bus routes for all young people living in Kent and schooled in Kent in academic years 7-11 for an annual fee of £50. This innovative approach has seen a significant increase in bus passenger journeys by young people. There are currently over 21,000 passes issued and on average some 600,000 trips are made per school term month. It is intended to extend the scheme to pupils resident in Kent but schooled outside the county from April 2010.

(4) KCC Kickstart

The principle of pump-priming existing bus services to improve the quality of service has been adopted by KCC, with over £1.6m of capital funding for the provision of new vehicles in 2009/10. These were provided for the Ashford A-Line operated by Stagecoach, and for some of KCC’s supported bus routes operated by Eastonways Coaches in Thanet, by Kent Coach Tours in Ashford, and on the new E-line route in Ashford.

(5) DfT Kickstart

The Department for Transport (DfT) invited bids from local transport authorities for its new Kickstart funding scheme early in 2009. KCC submitted two bids: one in partnership with Arriva Southern Counties and Maidstone & Tunbridge Wells NHS Trust for West Kent, and one in partnership with Stagecoach for East Kent. The County Council was promised that the result of the submissions would be notified by September 2009, but despite numerous requests no information has been forthcoming. While KCC welcomed the opportunity to bid for Kickstart funding from the Government for significant improvements to inter-urban bus routes in West and East Kent, the delay – and possible cancellation – of this funding by the DfT are regarded as completely unacceptable.

(6) Smartcards and Real Time Information (RTI)
KCC is working in partnership with the Kent bus operators to roll out new Electronic Ticket Machines (ETMs) with Smartcard readers and GPS/GPRS transmitters on all service vehicles. This project will generate significant benefits to passengers and bus operators, including reduced bus stop dwell times, more effective delivery and administration of concessionary travel schemes including those for senior citizens and Freedom Pass holders, and enhanced information on patronage, network performance and the identification of incidents and congestion.

It is hoped that a pilot scheme will be launched in partnership with Stagecoach in 2010 for Freedom Pass holders, subject to roll out of the new ticket machines by operators. An improved system of RTI is replacing existing displays in those parts of the county which have RTI installed at present, and it is planned to expand the RTI coverage as and when resources allow.

(7) The Kent & Medway Concessionary Travel Scheme

KCC has continued to provide additional funding to sustain the Kent & Medway Concessionary Travel scheme for over 60 year olds, as well as for disabled people and their companions. This has enabled pass holders to travel from 9.00 am instead of from 9.30am, on which time the Government’s funding is based. KCC is preparing to take over responsibility for the administration of the scheme from the district councils in Kent with effect from April 2011 following an announcement by Government in December 2009.

(8) Rail Services

Southeastern launched the full timetable for its new High Speed services linking Thant/Canterbury and Dover/Folkestone with Ashford, Ebbsfleet, Stratford and London St Pancras on 13 December 2009. The new High Speed services have been generally well received, with little evidence of resistance to the premium fare and significant loadings on both peak and off-peak services.

In response to the introduction of High Speed services, KCC developed, in partnership with Southeastern and other stakeholders, a Station Travel Plan (STP) for Ashford. This forms part of a National Rail Station Travel Plan Pilot, sponsored by the DfT and ATOC (Association of Train Operating Companies) where Kent were successful in bidding for Ashford to participate as one of 31 stations from across England and Wales. The Travel Plan was launched during summer 2009, and has been held up as a model for promoting sustainable travel to other stations in Kent. KCC received an award for the Ashford STP at the Annual Rail Business Awards ceremony in London as an example of excellence in encouraging modal shift from car to bus and cycle for journeys to and from Ashford station.

In order to improve bus/rail interchange, KCC, in partnership with Southeastern, is delivering bus information display boards at most of the High Speed rail stations in East Kent. These will provide essential information on local bus routes, and direct passengers to the nearest bus stops where bus timetable information will be available.

However, the introduction of High Speed rail services has been very costly in terms of its detrimental effect on the residual timetable for the
Mainline services to and from London Charing Cross and Cannon Street. KCC has received many concerns from MPs, Members, passenger groups and individuals, and these will be raised with Southeastern at their forthcoming stakeholder meeting in March 2010.

The following table lists the principal issues on each rail route and the date on which they were raised:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROUTE</th>
<th>ISSUE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashford-London CX</td>
<td>Reduction of frequency from 4 tph to 2 tph and slower service as now stops all stations Ashford-Tonbridge</td>
<td>13.12.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonbridge-Ashford</td>
<td>Gap in service between 1551 and 1621 resulting in long wait for children returning from Tonbridge schools</td>
<td>06.01.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandwich/Deal/Walmer to Dover/Canterbury</td>
<td>Reduction in CX trains between East Kent stations and Dover and need for easier access to Canterbury</td>
<td>12.01.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashford-Maidstone East</td>
<td>Loss of fast peak-hour trains between Ashford and Bearsted results in missed connections at Ashford and lengthy journey times</td>
<td>05.02.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maidstone East and West Malling-London</td>
<td>Withdrawal of shoulder-peak Cannon Street service results in lengthy journeys to Victoria and inadequate service to Blackfriars</td>
<td>05.02.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medway-London Victoria</td>
<td>Reduction of off-peak service to 1 tph at Sole Street</td>
<td>22.02.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashford-Thanet</td>
<td>Journey speeds on the Ashford - Thanet route, including Manston Parkway Station (KCC working with Network Rail to improve timings)</td>
<td>22.02.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KCC continues to support two Community Rail Partnerships (CRP) which cover rail routes in the county: the Kent CRP which covers the Medway Valley Line between Strood and Paddock Wood and SwaleRail between Sittingbourne and Sheerness; and the Sussex CRP which covers the Marshlink Line between Ashford and Hastings and the Uckfield Line between Uckfield and Oxted. Officers in the Sustainable Transport team attend CRP meetings, and the County Council provides financial support for each partnership.

3. **Sustaining Kent’s Tendered Network**
KCC has a clearly established member approved policy to determine the provision of financial support for socially necessary public transport services. This states that the cost of any such service should not exceed £3 per passenger journey, and that the journey should provide access to one of the following services which could not otherwise be attained: education, employment, health care, or essential food shopping.

About 20% of the scheduled bus routes in the county are provided with revenue support. Tenders for these services are awarded in accordance with Best Value principles. In 2009/10 the revenue support for these services has been provided by a combination of KCC funding (£5.3 million) and the DfT’s Rural Bus Subsidy Grant (RBSG) (£2.2 million), with an estimated 4.9 million passenger journeys being made in the current year. During 2010/11 it is anticipated that the supported bus network will be sustained at the present level. The Competition Commission is currently carrying out an investigation into the local bus industry. In the provisional work of the Office of Fair Trading (OFT), KCC came out very well indeed, with a high level of bids per tender, a very low number of commercial services withdrawn which then required subsidy, and a very low number of tenders with only one bid.

KCC also supports nine Kent Karrier services, which provide a combination of dial-a-ride and fixed routes for disabled people and for those living in rural areas away from bus routes. One of these, operating in North-West Kent, incurred a very high level of subsidy, and from 2010/11 will have its level of service reduced so that it is comparable with the other Kent Karrier services.

4. Legislation

This year’s report provides a summary of the principal legislative changes following the Local Transport Act 2008 and the bearing they are having on the delivery of public transport. This new legislation has developed the original powers contained in the Transport Act 2000, and provides three distinct levels of agreement to facilitate partnership between bus operators, district councils and local transport authorities (LTA) as set out below.

Voluntary Partnership Agreements (VPA)
- removes OFT power to impose fines on bus operators
- encourages agreements with more than one operator (e.g. Swale)
- can now include LTA setting of maximum fares

Quality Partnership Schemes (QPS)
- can now include, in addition to VPAs, LTA setting of frequency, timetable and maximum fares
- determines LTA obligations (e.g. bus stop clearways)

Quality Contracts (QC)
- individual quality contract board determines operator, route, timetable and fares: removal of competition

At present KCC has six Quality Bus Partnerships (QBP) and all of them are VPAs. Details of these, and of plans for new partnerships, are set out in section 2 above. The most likely beneficiaries of the new legislation will be the existing Fastrack service in Dartford and...
Gravesham; the emerging Smartlink bus service in Ashford; and the proposed Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) scheme in Dover. All of these schemes could potentially benefit from a Quality Partnership Scheme (QPS), which would enable KCC, the district council(s) and the chosen bus operator to enter into such a statutory partnership.

(3) A QPS would give KCC the power to set the frequency, route, timetable and maximum fares for the service(s) included in the QPS, although the guidance from the DfT suggests a partnership approach with the chosen bus operator rather than unilateral determination of these by the LTA. KCC would also have statutory obligations, such as the provision of clearly defined infrastructure works such as bus shelters, bus stops, clearways and raised boarders. Each individual QPS could be tailored to the particular needs of each scheme, with for example a requirement for KCC to provide RTI at all bus stops serving the route(s) concerned.

(4) There are no plans to develop Quality Contracts (QC) in Kent, the concept for which is based on the non-competitive regulated bus network in the capital that is determined by Transport for London.

5. Conclusion

(1) KCC has continued to make significant investment, through both funding and personnel, in the creation of good quality public transport services throughout the county. The County Council is committed to attaining modal shift from car to public transport, by enhancing the provision of bus services and by improving access for all. Wherever possible KCC will make use of the new powers contained in the Local Transport Act 2008 to enhance the quality of the partnerships between the County Council and its stakeholders.

(2) Recent initiatives such as the development of Quality Bus Partnerships, the countywide roll-out of the Freedom Pass and the planned introduction of Smartcard will continue to deliver sustainable transport options throughout the county, thus improving the quality of life and ensuring a first-class public transport service for the residents of, and visitors to, Kent.

6. Recommendation

Members are requested to note the report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background Documents: The following background documents have been used in the preparation of this report:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kickstart Bus Funding Competition 2009 – Guidance on the application process (Department for Transport, January 2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Transport Act 2008 - Improving local bus services: Guidance on Voluntary Partnership Agreements (Department for Transport, February 2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Transport Act 2008 - Quality Partnership Schemes: Statutory guidance to English local transport authorities and metropolitan district councils (Department for Transport, March 2009)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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