



## AGENDA

### HIGHWAYS ADVISORY BOARD

**Tuesday, 16th September, 2008, at 10.30 am** Ask for: **Karen Mannering**  
**Council Chamber, Sessions House, County**  
**Hall, Maidstone**

Telephone **(01622) 694367**

*Tea/Coffee will be available 15 minutes before the start of the meeting.*

#### **UNRESTRICTED ITEMS**

*(During these items the meeting is likely to be open to the public)*

1. Membership

The Board is asked to note that Mr C Hibberd replaces Mr R A Marsh and Mrs E M Tweed fills the vacancy occasioned by the death of Mr C J Law.

2. Substitutes

3. Election of Chairman

4. Declarations of Interests by Members in items on the Agenda for this meeting.

5. Minutes - 8 July 2008 (Pages 1 - 20)

6. Kent Highway Services - The Director's Update (Pages 21 - 22)

7. Disabled Persons Parking Bays (Pages 23 - 30)

8. KHS Winter Service Review (Pages 31 - 46)

9. Safety Cameras (Pages 47 - 54)

10. Progress Report on Major Capital Projects (Pages 55 - 70)

11. Victoria Way Phase 1, Ashford - Approval to Scheme Outline Design and Implementation Strategy (Pages 71 - 78)

12. Amended Fees and Charges for 2008/09 and 2009/10 (Pages 79 - 84)

#### **EXEMPT ITEMS**

*(At the time of preparing the agenda there were no exempt items. During any such items which may arise the meeting is likely NOT to be open to the public)*

Peter Sass  
Head of Democratic Services and Local Leadership  
(01622) 694002

**Monday, 8 September 2008**

*Please note that any background documents referred to in the accompanying papers maybe inspected by arrangement with the officer responsible for preparing the relevant report.*

## KENT COUNTY COUNCIL

---

### HIGHWAYS ADVISORY BOARD

MINUTES of a meeting of the Highways Advisory Board held on Tuesday, 8 July 2008 at Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone.

PRESENT: Mr R F Manning (Chairman), Mr T J Birkett, Mr J R Bullock, MBE, Miss S J Carey, Mr I S Chittenden, Mr C G Findlay, Mr M J Harrison (substitute for Mrs P A V Stockell), Mr W A Hayton, Mr D A Hirst (substitute for Mr R A Marsh), Mr C J Law, Mr J I Muckle, Mr R A Pascoe, Mr A R Poole, Mr R Tolputt and Mr R Truelove.

OTHER MEMBERS PRESENT:- Mr C Hart and Mrs E M Tweed.

IN ATTENDANCE: Mr G Mee, Director, Kent Highway Services; Mr D Hall, Head of Transport and Development; Mrs C Bruce, Head of Network Management; Mr K Hills, Head of Community Operations; Mr D Cook, Technical Officer; Mr I Procter, Road Safety Manager; and the Head of Democratic Services (represented by Mrs K Mannering).

### UNRESTRICTED ITEMS

#### Petitions

Mr D Hall formally reported receipt of two petitions relating to (a) the speed of buses in Kent Road, Cheriton; and (b) the speed of traffic passing through Leathercourt.

Both matters had been referred to the relevant Area Transport Team. The Kent Road issue would be reported to the next meeting of the Shepway JTB; and a small working group had been established.

#### 1. Minutes

*(Item 3)*

(1) Further to paragraph 1(1)(b), Mr Hall informed the Board that as the proposed no waiting at any time parking restrictions on London Road, Sittingbourne would not be implemented, there was no need to submit a report to this meeting.

(2) RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting held on 8 May 2008 are correctly recorded and that they be signed by the Chairman.

#### 2. Kent Highway Services – The Director's Update

*(Item 4 – Oral report by Director, Kent Highway Services)*

(1) The Director gave a verbal update on some of the key issues and developments in KHS, which included:-

- (a) the completion of the re-organisation and structure – the new site at Ashford would be opening on 31 July 2008.
- (b) potholes/street lighting/road condition
- (c) Canterbury JTB Scrutiny report

8 July 2008

(2) The Chairman informed the Board that a response from EDF had still not been received.

(3) During discussion the Board agreed that a written executive summary from the Director be submitted to future meetings.

*Following a proposal by the Chairman, Members agreed to consider Item 13.*

### **3. Magnolia Avenue, Cliftonville – Road Noise Complaint**

*Item 13 – Report by Head of Community Operations)*

*(Mr C Hart was present for this item)*

(1) A resident of Magnolia Avenue, Cliftonville approached KHS last year concerning the road noise that he was experiencing in his bungalow. This resulted in a vibration investigation by KHS and a report to the Thanet Joint Transportation Board (JTB) on 11 June 2008. The motion that was adopted was that the matter of concrete roads be referred to the Highways Advisory Board. The draft minute of the JTB; the report to the JTB; a plan of the area of Cliftonville; and photographs indicating the condition of Magnolia Avenue were set out in the Appendices to the report.

(2) The condition of Magnolia Avenue was such that there were no hazards present. Concrete roads were generally built on areas of poor ground conditions and over time voids formed beneath them, this was quite normal. The resident complained that road noise and vibration was transmitted through these voids into his and other residents homes. Sound tests were carried out inside one of the properties and it was found not to be measurable as it was below the ambient noise level.

(3) Concrete roads were generally built in the 1950's and 60's and had performed extremely well considering that their design life was for 40 years. They were now emerging as a significant maintenance problem throughout Kent and were very expensive to repair once they had failed. As a result of this high cost they had a low priority for funding and only received funding when failure had occurred and action was necessary. This now needed to be addressed by a review of the policy on maintenance of concrete roads.

(4) As part of the 2008 annual survey of the roads in Kent, KHS had been asked to identify all concrete roads and determine their relative condition. This would enable a priority to be established so that funding could be allocated to the most urgent cases and a comparison made with the repair of blacktop roads.

(5) In addition KHS had been asked to identify suitable low cost, long term repair methods. It was suggested that funding be allocated so that pilots of the various methods were carried out to evaluate the methods for suitability and cost. Magnolia Avenue would have to take its turn once its priority had been established by the survey.

(6) The inspection and sound checks etc had not identified the need for any short term action at Magnolia Ave. KHS was progressing identification of all concrete roads and were determining their condition. The assessment would identify the position of Magnolia Ave. and whether any long term action had a priority or was necessary. This would be followed by a policy review on the maintenance of concrete roads.

(7) Mr A R Poole moved, Mr R Truelove seconded as an amendment:-

“That Magnolia Avenue be chosen for the pilot study.”

(8) The Board noted the report.

**4. Mitigating Against the Impact of Operation Stack**

*(Item 5 – Report by Head of Network Management)*

*(Mrs E M Tweed was present for this item)*

(1) Further to Minute 6 of 8 May 2008, whilst all agencies (Highways Agency, Interroute, Kent Fire & Rescue, Kent County Council, other local authorities etc.) worked together during Stack to minimise the effect of Stack, it was done so in support of Kent Police in their role as the lead agency. A number of concerns and suggestions had been put forward by the public, County Members and other stakeholders about the management of, and mitigation against, Stack, and these had been explored further with Kent Police and the Highways Agency.

(2) On 19 June, Kent Police led a de-brief focussed on the protracted Stack incident that took place during March. The purpose of the de-brief was to proactively learn from the lengthy deployment of Stack and to formally report the findings. This multi-agency event involved stakeholders including the Highways Agency, Interroute, Kent Fire & Rescue, Eurotunnel, Port of Dover, SE Coast Ambulance and KCC. Learning was centred around the use of intelligence, the command structure, silver control, Operation Stack phases and communication and citizen engagement. The report was awaited with interest.

(3) The protracted nature of Stack caused by the industrial action by SeaFrance officers in March, resulted in press, public and member interest – and a number of suggestions about how it might be better managed in the future. Managing Operation Stack was a complex operation; safety of HGV drivers, residents, the travelling public and police personnel was of prime importance, and Kent Police were mindful of the need to keep Kent moving whilst Operation Stack was deployed.

(i) **Holding back lorries elsewhere on the network** – preventing HGVs from entering Kent by holding them in France/Belgium or elsewhere in the UK.

This was a frequent suggestion aimed at sharing the problem and reducing the effect on Kent. It would require co-operation at a national level and centralised control from the Home Office of autonomous police authorities; it was logistically impossible (how did you stop lorries safely and where did you put them?); there were no existing powers that would enable this idea to be effected, nor was there any national appetite to change this. Even at the height of Operation Stack in March there was no possibility of civil contingencies being required – the problem just was not sufficiently severe.  
Potential for future deployment: Virtually non-existent.

(ii) **Contraflow to keep the M20 open both ways between junctions 8 and 9.**  
Since March, the Highways Agency had significantly invested in signs and cones to implement this option should it ever be required. The option was not without its difficulties – in short, the problems associated with vehicles travelling along the hard shoulder which was not constructed to the same standard as the main carriageway; the need to safely segregate vehicles which were travelling towards each other on the same side of the carriageway at speed with only cones and a buffer lane separating them; the ability to enforce a reduced speed limit.

Potential for the future: High.

(iii) **Improved signing at M20 junction 10.**

Local traffic joining the M20 at junction 10 (coastbound) to travel to junction 11 could be caught up in phase 1 of Operation Stack (when it was implemented) because there were no advance warnings.

The Highways Agency were considering a feasibility study looking at advance signing on KCC's network to approaches to all junctions on the M20. They were also looking at the potential to install quickly implemented gateways to on-slips on all motorway junctions as part of a national programme. KCC would no doubt be consulted as part of any proposals and would have to weigh up the benefits and dis-benefits to Kent's road networks.

Potential for future deployment: Medium.

(iv) **Quick Moveable Barrier (QMB)**

The QMB was currently being installed by the Highways agency between junctions 11 and 12.

The objectives were to avoid directing local traffic on to the A20 from the M20. However, members should be aware that Kent Police intended to take traffic off at junction 11 before returning it to the M20 to join the contraflow. The Highways Agency intended to monitor performance of the QMB to ensure that it met operational objectives.

Further feasibility would be required to evaluate whether the QMB could be expanded to junction 13 or towards junction 10, or both.

Potential for future deployment: High.

(v) **Central Reservation Gateways**

Members would no doubt be aware that the Highways Agency had installed gateways in the M20 central reservation between junctions 8 and 9. This was part of a national programme designed to manage incidents more effectively; gateways were being installed where there was more than 5km between junctions.

Potential for future deployment: High. Not designed with Stack in mind but high potential to manage Stack more effectively.

(vi) **Traffic Management at Junction 8**

The congestion at junction 8, caused as all vehicles left the M20 before HGVs were directed back down the M20 and car and local HGV traffic directed onto KCC's road network, was the most pressing network management issue. Traffic could queue back to junctions 7, 6 and sometimes back to junction 5. As well as the irritation factor, there were inherent safety issues.

On line sorting, keeping HGVs on the motorway and directing only cars and local traffic off at junction 8 ran counter-intuitive to practice as it meant swapping lorries into lane 3 and cars to lane 1.

This option could be linked with option 2 (contraflow) and KCC continued to work with Kent Police and the Highways Agency to find a longer-term solution.

Potential for future deployment: Low.

(vii) **Further Capacity**

Widening of the M20 between junctions 11 and 12 and/or 12 and 13 would increase capacity of existing phases. The Highways Agency was looking at this as a longer term option.

Potential for future deployment: Low

(viii) **Junction 10a**

The Highways Agency were currently consulting on a new junction to the east of junction 10. This might create further, as yet unquantified, options.

(4) Discussions continued between a number of agencies to manage Stack more effectively.

(5) The Board noted the report.

## **5. Quiet Resurfacing Prioritisation Methodology**

*(Item 6 – Report by Director, Kent Highway Services)*

(1) The report set out a methodology for prioritising the County Council's investment in quiet surfacing schemes and put forward a robust and transparent process for determining the priority of re-surfacing quiet surfacing schemes within Kent. The prioritisation methodology considered both the potential noise benefits associated with re-surfacing a given section of road, the impact that would have on local residents and the cost of undertaking the resurfacing scheme; thus providing an indication of the cost-benefit of each scheme.

(2) Road traffic noise was widely considered to be a genuine nuisance to those people who lived, worked and attended school or college in the vicinity of a culpable road(s). In the most prominent cases, constant or regular exposure to high levels of traffic noise could have a detrimental impact on the quality of life experienced by local people and could potentially result in a significant proportion of the population being bothered by it. Although KHS had no influence over vehicle tyre types or engine manufacturing, it could take steps to reduce vehicle type noise by specifying the type of road surface installed at a particular location and thereby seek to improve people's quality of life.

(3) Noise was measured in units called decibels (dB). As traffic noise fluctuated continually, it was necessary to define it in a manner that could be related to the subjective response of those experiencing it. Attitude surveys had indicated a relationship between the annoyance caused by traffic and the sound level exceeded for 10% of the time during an 18 hour period between 0600 and 0000 (midnight). Road traffic noise was generated as vehicles travelled along a road and was a major contributor to environmental noise exposure to premises, including residential properties, located nearby. The main sources of road traffic noise were:-

- Engine and Powertrain Noise; engine and vehicle exhaust noise tended to be the dominant source of noise when traffic was moving slowly, particularly when traffic comprised a large proportion of heavy goods vehicles.
- Tyre Rolling Noise: tyre noise was likely to be experienced when traffic was free flowing, especially at moderate to high speeds.

- Body Rattle Noise: this noise occurred when a vehicle, particularly a heavy goods vehicle, passed over a traffic hump, pothole or sunken trench in the carriageway; thus causing the vehicle body, and sometimes its goods, to rattle.
- Other Factors, these included; vehicle speed, volume of traffic, heavy goods vehicle composition, gradient of the road and surface type.

(4) The proposed methodology for predicting road traffic noise was taken from an existing approach provided by the Department for Transport's (DfT) Calculation of Road Traffic Noise (CRTN). The method was based on acquiring accurate traffic information relating to the traffic composition and vehicle speeds over a set period. Additional information was also collected and included; road gradient and surface type and could be acquired using the JCAM (carriageway condition survey) technology. The CRTN deemed that valid noise prediction levels could be made within 300m of a road; therefore this determined that properties within this distance of a targeted road would be included.

(5) The proposed methodology also provided an ability to measure the influence of the road surface on noise generation and allowed for a comparison of different surfaces and standard measurement conditions. The approach had been incorporated into the noise test provided by the Highways Authorities Product Approval System (HAPAS) and was currently used in the UK for the approval and certification of road surfacing products for use on public roads. Therefore, a comparison could be made for given road surface type against that for a standard Hot Rolled Asphalt (HRA) surface.

(6) Studies had shown that surfaces with a smaller aggregate size were quieter. This was as a result of the different vibrating frequency as the tyres passed over the surface. For example, a surface dressing with a 6mm aggregate had been shown to be approximately 2dB(A) quieter than one with a 10mm aggregate and approximately 2.5dB(A) quieter than one with 14 mm aggregate. It should be noted, however, that in some cases of surface dressing, by reducing the aggregate size, a loss of durability might occur. Modern TSCS (also know as Quiet Surfacing) could be significantly quieter than dense HRA and surface dressed surfacing of the past. The influence of a road surface on noise would also be determined by vehicle speed; generally speaking, the greater the vehicle speed, the greater the level of noise reduction.

(7) TSCS provided a surface that was safe under wet skidding conditions as water on the road could escape from beneath the tyre patch through interstices in the surface as well as the texture depth and type tread. There were no known incidences of higher rates of pedestrian crashes as a result of quieter surfacing being applied.

(8) The proposed methodology also sought to quantify the proportion of people "bothered" by road noise. The Highways Agency's Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) provided industry standard noise nuisance levels for human response to noise. It provided the percentage of people annoyed by road traffic noise, defined as 'bothered very much or quite a lot'. The relationship between nuisance and noise was based upon research undertaken by TRL. Using this relationship, the total number of people bothered by road traffic noise in a given scenario could be predicted.

(9) Information relating to the existing road surface could be acquired via the JCAM carriageway condition survey and integrated with the noise reduction level at the analysis stage in order to determine the scope of reducing road traffic noise. The key stages of the assessment methodology comprised:-

8 July 2008

- Based upon the predicted noise level, noise nuisance levels for each receptor would be calculated using the tables contained within DMRB. For residential properties an average occupancy of 2.36 would be assumed. Where schools were present the approximate number of pupils would be confirmed.
- The total number of people bothered by noise would be calculated for the two scenarios and compared.
- The cost of resurfacing the road would be calculated and divided by the reduction in people bothered by road traffic noise for each scheme.
- All sites proposed for resurfacing were then ranked with those providing greatest noise benefits and lowest cost being preferable to those with least noise benefits and highest costs.
- The priority list would be presented to the Board on an annual basis for their recommendation to approve the programme of works.

(10) In order to rigorously test and calibrate the proposed methodology and the noise prediction model component, a brief Pilot Study was recommended. The study was planned for the Summer 2008 and would identify two suitable roads and seek to quantify potential noise reduction levels at each site and prioritise where investment should be made based on the reduction in people bothered and the cost-benefit at each scheme. If supported, the results of the survey would be presented to the Board.

(11) The Board supported:-

- (a) the proposed methodology for prioritising quiet surfacing schemes; and
- (b) a Pilot Study, which would run during the Summer 2008.

## **6. Traffic Regulation Order - Electronic Consultation**

*(Item 7 – Report by Head of Network Management)*

(1) The report provided information on the proposed traffic regulation order electronic consultation process that would allow the public to view and comment on Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) via the website.

(2) KHS occasionally received complaints from County Members and the general public when traffic regulation orders were being implemented stating that they were not adequately consulted through the process. It was clear that another method of reaching a greater number of Members and residents throughout Kent would be helpful. Therefore KHS proposed to use the KCC web site to reach those, and potentially other people.

(3) All Local Highway Authorities must comply with statutory legislation when conveying information about TROs to the public. The legislation required LHAs to advertise the TROs in a newspaper in the area in which any road or other place to which the order related was situated. To ensure that KCC complied with the legislation, KHS used a countywide newspaper known as the Saturday Observer and the Kent on Sunday newspapers supplied by the KOSmedia Group to advertise TROs in Kent. The newspapers were free papers and relied upon the public to pick them up at supermarkets, garages, etc. KOSMedia Group printed and distributed approximately 160,000 newspapers in Kent that covered all parts of Kent.

(4) The population of Kent including Medway was over 1million people and approximately 80% of the population had Internet access. Therefore using the KCC web site as an additional means to advertise TROs would reach a greater number of residents of Kent provided it was avertdedly sign posted.

8 July 2008

(5) The TRO Notice would appear on the web site on the same day as the Notice appeared in the newspaper and would remain there for the full 21 day consultation period. There would be an opportunity for the public to make their observations or objections to the proposals by clicking in a box on the web page and typing in their reasons for either support or objection of the TRO. They would be advised of the date by which they must reply and if necessary what date their comments would be reported to the relevant Joint Transportation Board. This would reduce the amount of letters to and from officers.

(6) The pages that would appear on the web site would be a front cover (giving information and directions of how to proceed), a copy of the Notice of proposals, the proposed Order and a statement of about why the proposals were being advertised. When the observations and/or objections had been considered and after the Joint Transportation Board the same process would be used when making the Order.

(7) Promoting the TRO information in a variety of media such as the newspapers, which was a statutory obligation, and the website would capture a wider audience in Kent and would benefit those members of the public who often use technology to keep up to date with current affairs within Kent County Council.

(8) The Board supported the introduction of a TRO Electronic Consultation via the KCC website.

## **7. Kent Highway Services, Capital Works for 2008/09 Assessment, Strengthening and Structural Maintenance of Structures**

*(Item 8 – Report by Director, Kent Highway Services)*

(1) The report advised Members of the schemes from which the programme of capital works on highway structures would be delivered in 2008/09. The capital allocation made for the Assessment, Strengthening and Structural Maintenance of highway structures in 2008/09 was £1.666 million. This was below the bid in the Local Transport Plan of £4.17million intended to work towards a regime of 'Good Asset Management' as recommended in the 'Code of Practice for the Management of Highway Structures' by 2011 and to meet the targets in the LTP for the Strengthening Index and Bridge Stock Condition Indicators.

(2) It was also less than the figure of £3.3 million identified in a report to the Director of KHS in August last year, prepared in response to concern about the potential for closure of weak bridges due to delays in the remedial programme. The sum was aimed at completing the strengthening programme by 2012 whilst hopefully maintaining the status quo on overall condition of the asset.

(3) A programme of works was being prepared to enable output to be managed both within the original allocation but also in anticipation of any improved funding should additional resources become available.

(4) A case had been made and bid submitted for a share of any additional funding which might become available later in the financial year with the aim of delivering as much as possible of the programme outlined in the report to the Director referenced above. To manage delivery within budget at whatever amount, the planned works had been scheduled at three levels as detailed below and were being prepared for staged implementation through the year.

(5) 'Unavoidable Works' comprised schemes which were:-

8 July 2008

- (a) already in progress
- (b) essential safety works
- (c) committed through the completion of advanced ecological works and/or approvals.
- (d) where land agreements had agreed access times and terms which it would be detrimental to rearrange.

“Must do” works were those where there was real potential for risk now in failing to deal adequately and timely with the existing situation.

“Should do” works were those remaining schemes which were made up of the programme identified in paragraphs (2) and (4) above.

(6) The total budget needed to deliver the schemes was variously:-

- (a) “Unavoidable” Works - £1,435
- (b) “Must do” Works + (a) - £2,835
- (c) “Should do” Works + (b) - £3,355

(7) Decisions on the implementation of schemes would be made at the time when/if additional monies became available but in any event in July, September and December. Schemes would none the less be fully prepared to take advantage of any situation or ultimately, for an April 09 start. All the schemes were listed in the Appendix to the report.

(8) Three review initiatives were underway which might produce further contingency opportunities in relation to works of maintenance and upgrade on structures:-

- (a) Finalising the Capital Programme of Work for ensuring the requirements of the EU Tunnel Safety Directive (2004) and the Road Tunnel Safety Regulations 2007 were met in respect of Ramsgate Tunnel.
- (b) A review to locate bridges of significant strategic importance to the highway network and identify what action was necessary to mitigate their potential non-availability. This was the subject of a report to the Alliance Board in April.
- (c) Implementing the Code of Practice for the Management of Highway Structures which would focus more attention on improving maintenance regimes. This too was reported to the Alliance Board in April.

(9) The scheme preparation programme for 08/09 was being progressed to facilitate the ability to respond to any additional budget provision which might become available during the financial year.

(10) Taking advantage of such opportunities was essential to ensure delivery of a Structure Asset which was both fit for purpose and moved towards the recommendations for Good Asset Management detailed in the ‘Code of Practice for the Management of Highway Structures’ as they related to the KHS defined levels of service.

(11) The Board noted the report.

## **8. 20 mph Speed Limits Outside Schools**

*(Item 9 – Report by Director, Kent Highway Services)*

(1) In November 2006, a report on the feasibility of introducing a Kent-wide policy of 20mph limits outside all Kent schools was considered by the Board. The report

8 July 2008

recommended retention of the existing policy for 20mph limits and zones but did not propose an extension to all schools due to cost and practicality of enforcement without traffic calming. A further report on the issue had been requested by Members.

(2) The safety of children particularly in the vicinity of the school gate was of the highest importance. However, whenever introducing 20mph limits or zones, the County Council must address a number of issues:-

- Would the introduction of such a policy actually reduce child pedestrian casualties?
- What type of limit should be used and at what cost?
- Could an enforceable and acceptable countywide policy be introduced?

(3) The existing policy allowed the introduction of 20mph limits or zones at any location where such measures could be justified, primarily in crash savings terms. The policy also included other factors such as the socio-economic profile of an area along with the presence of local shops and schools, however, it did not provide a specific priority for roads outside schools.

(4) A study of three areas had been carried out, which covered a total of 154 schools. The study looked at crashes involving child pedestrians who were injured between the hours of 07:00 and 09:00 in the morning and 15:00 and 17:00 in the afternoon during the 3 years 2005 to 2007. Saturdays and Sundays were excluded, as was the month of August.

- The study revealed a total of 211 crashes (2 fatal, 18 serious, 191 slight). Of these 36 (0 fatal, 4 serious, 32 slight) or 17% were located 300m either side of the school gate.
- However, the study showed considerable variation between areas with the highest percentage of 31% and the lowest percentage of just 8%.
- All of the fatal crashes and 78% of the serious crashes occurred away from the school gate.
- In one area even if all 6 reported crashes had happened at different schools 57 out of the total of 63 schools had gone three years without an incident being reported by the Kent Police.

(5) A further study of all child pedestrian fatalities (up to and including 16 years old) during the last ten years showed that of a total of 29 fatalities none occurred within 300m of the school gate at the start or finish of the school day. The figures suggested that the introduction of a Kent-wide policy of 20mph limits and zones outside schools, as a crash reduction measure would be ineffective in reducing the majority of child pedestrian crashes.

(6) It was likely that the new crash reduction target beyond 2010 would feature further reductions in child pedestrian crashes particularly those involving fatal injuries. We would need to target our limited resources at those areas where crashes were being reported.

(7) Outside most schools, the congestion caused by parents picking up or dropping off children combined with large numbers of pedestrian and cyclists created a slowing of traffic at the very time that it was most needed. The crash figures indicated that despite the chaotic and dangerous appearance outside schools, crashes were more likely to happen away from the school where the speed of traffic was not constrained in this way.

(8) A vital policy issue was what type of 20mph limit should be adopted outside its 611 schools (not including independents), permanent, part time, part-time advisory or a combination of these. Permanent limits would see the limit operating all day every day. They would require the introduction of a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) and road signs. The estimated cost for each site would be approximately £7,150 which included signs, posts, implementation, design fees, safety checks and in street lit areas lighting of the signs as required in the Traffic Signs and General Regulations and Directions (TSGRD) EDF connection and the TRO. This equated to some £4.1m for all 611 schools. This cost estimate did not include traffic calming.

(9) Part-time limits also required a TRO and it was likely that special authorisation would be required. Such limits would require specialist signs that would operate on a timer system. Signs currently used in Scotland had a 20mph speed limit sign with flashing lights at the top and bottom of the sign. The signs were not currently included in TSRDG and would also require special authorisation. Timers would need to be reset annually to take account of any changes to the schools start and finish times and holidays. The estimated cost here would be some £9,400 per school, as well as the costs described above all signs would require an electricity supply. The estimated cost for all schools would be £5.7m. Further costs associated with the signs included a higher level of maintenance and for re-setting the timers.

(10) Part-time advisory limits were basically the same as the system described in paragraph (8) above, except that being advisory no TRO was required, so the cost would be about £8,100 per site or £5m.

(11) Most activity outside schools took place at the start and finish of the school day, so logically the limit should be consistent with those times. The limit would not be appropriate at weekends or during school holidays and the lower speed limit should be in place only at those times to be self-enforcing and understood by the motorist. It should be noted that when variable limits were monitored in trials outside schools very little reduction in speed was observed, unless speeds were already low, typically not above 24mph. Research for the Department of Transport on the effectiveness of 20mph limits stated "that where speed limits alone were introduced, reductions of only about 2mph in 'before' speeds are achieved. 20mph speed limits are, therefore, only suitable in areas where vehicle speeds are already low (the Department would suggest where mean vehicle speeds were 24mph or below), or where additional traffic calming measures are planned as part of the strategy".

(12) The view of the Kent Police was that 20mph zones and limits should be self-enforcing. This meant that the majority of limits and zones outside Kent's schools would require traffic calming features. Not only would this be restrictively expensive but with many schools on "A" and "B" class roads, such features, particularly road humps could not be used. In addition, traffic calming features would be permanent and this did not fit with the need to have the limits only in place when they were actually needed. Drivers were likely to resent having their speed physically reduced when the need for slower speed existed only at start and finish of school days. Members had also concluded previously that physical traffic calming measures should be seen only as a last resort to specific crash and speed problems.

(13) If a countywide policy were adopted then a priority rating system would need to be developed to see which schools should be done first. Crash data would play a part however the speed, levels of traffic and HGV flow might all need to be taken into account.

Such a process would require a very considerable amount of work and a number of years to implement. It was believed that we would be challenged as schools discovered how far down the list they were. Even if we progressed at 50 schools per year starting from next year 09/10 it would take approximately another 13 years to achieve.

(14) On the three key issues there appeared to be no case for implementing a countywide policy for the introduction of 20mph limits outside all Kent's schools. Crash savings would be minimal and unlikely to significantly contribute to any new crash reduction target. The cost was prohibitive, the speed limits would be unenforceable and the time frame to implement such a policy excessive.

(15) The Board supported the proposals for recommendation to the Cabinet Member for Environment, Highways and Waste that:-

- (a) the County Council should not adopt a county-wide policy for the introduction of 20 mph limits or zones outside all Kent schools;
- (b) the County Council should retain its existing policy of implementing 20 mph limits or zones at locations where there was a clear and justifiable need for the scheme; and
- (c) the effects of advisory part-time limits in the county should be investigated further and a pilot involving 6 sites where this could be implemented should be developed. The potential costs and objectives of the scheme would be brought back to the Board towards the end of the financial year, seeking funding during 2009/10. If this proved effective then further schemes could be considered.

## **9. 2007 End of Year Crash and Casualty Numbers and Progress against National 2010 Casualty Targets**

*(Item 10 – Report by Head of Network Management)*

(1) The crash records for 2007 for Kent were finalised in May. The totals were used in establishing best value performance indicators, government targets and establishing trends. In 2007, 91 people were killed on roads in Kent (excluding Medway), 632 received serious injuries and 5743 were slightly injured. There were 4779 crashes. Appendix 1 of the report showed crashes and casualties by severity for 2007.

(2) To help focus on achieving continuous improvement in road safety the Government had set a national target for reducing casualties by 2010. Compared with the 1994-98 average the target was:-

- A 40% reduction in the number of people killed or seriously injured in road accidents (KSI) – KCC as part of PSA2 intended to achieve this target by the end of 2007
- A 50% reduction in the number of children killed or seriously injured.
- A 10% reduction in the slight casualty rate expressed as the number of people slightly injured per 100 million vehicle kilometres (MVKm). Kent did not have a traffic model appropriate for KCC roads. Therefore a simple 10% reduction in slight casualties had been used to set targets in Kent.

(3) Compared with the 2010 target KSI, casualties on Kent roads (including motorways and trunk roads) were within ½ % of the 2010 target and at target, rounded to the whole number it was the 40% target. Child KSI casualties had exceeded the 2010 target. Slight

8 July 2008

casualties showed a reduction of 3.5 %. Appendix 3 of the report showed that on the roads for which KCC was responsible, the KSI 2010 targets had been exceeded.

(4) From Appendix 5 of the report it could be seen that the 47 child KSI casualties in 2005 appeared to have been an exceptionally low year. It demonstrated the variable nature of year on year totals as shown on the trend graph from 1994 for child KSI casualties, although the overall trend was downward.

(5) The 2007 total KSI casualties on Kent roads showed a 3.2 % reduction compared with 2005. KSI casualties on the roads for which KCC was responsible, however, had a 4.8% increase compared with 2006; despite this there was a 41.8% reduction compared with the 94-98 average on KCC roads. The overall trend might be flattening out or even increasing. The casualties on the Highway Agency's roads in 2007, however, showed a 27.1% decrease. The 2007 figure was consistent with the overall trend and 2006 might have been an abnormally high year for casualties on the HA roads.

(6) 2007 slight casualties on Kent roads had shown a less than 1 % reduction compared with 2006. Slight casualties on roads for which KCC were responsible had shown a 4.6 % increase although the 2007 figure compared with 2005 showed a 5.5% reduction, and, compared with the 1994-98 average there had been a 7.7% reduction. This reflected the volatile nature of slight casualties.

(7) Overall KCC's performance was good, as the 2010 KSI targets had been achieved. The trends in casualties showed a well established downward pattern albeit that it did now appear to be flattening out. The challenge over the next 3 years, 2008 to 2010, was to maintain and better the government's targets. It was vital that we continued to deliver programmes of work aimed at both improving the road infrastructure and road user behaviour. In addition to this, to achieve a down turn in the figures the casualty reduction links fostered with the Highway Agency, Police, Fire and Rescue and the other partners must be further developed into strongly focused measures aimed at influencing the road user across the County. The developed partnership working activities on the strategic network needed to be extended to the local network. It should however be noted that despite a co-ordinated approach to reducing casualties, those targets were outside the direct control of this highway authority, as the daily decisions of each and every road user of Kent would affect the outcome. This target could therefore still be missed in 2010 because of random fluctuation and circumstances outside the control of the highway authority

(8) The Board noted the report.

## **10. National Rail Station Travel Plan Pilot**

*(Item 11 – Report by Head of Transport and Development)*

(1) A partnership led by Kent Highway Services had recently made a successful bid to participate in a National Rail Station Travel Plan Pilot. The Rail White Paper proposed that station travel plans be tested through a series of pilots, and ATOC was co-ordinating the pilot projects on behalf of the Department for Transport (DfT). Ashford station was selected as one of 24 successful applications across England out of a total of 70 bids. Bids for Canterbury West and Folkestone Central/West were unfortunately not successful but it was hoped that lessons learnt from the pilot would enable best practice to be rolled out to these and other stations across the county.

(2) The report was to make members aware of the Ashford Station Travel Plan project which would develop good practice in improving integration and enhancing access to the station as well as reducing the impact of increased rail travel on the local road network. It was timely given forecast increased demand from the introduction of High Speed Rail Services from 2009. It also had the potential to complement short to medium term infrastructure improvements led by the HST Task Force and linked to Ashford's Future.

(3) The National Passenger Survey (NPS) showed that walking was the most popular means of accessing the station, with other public transport (underground, rail, bus/coach) also having a high share. Car travel accounted for 21% of passengers, while cycling had a marginal share at 1.7%. Station Travel Plans had the following potential benefits:-

- increased passenger numbers, particularly in the off-peak (surveys had shown, many people were deterred from travelling by rail because the station car park was full)
- more sustainable travel to the station would reduce emissions and benefit the environment
- passengers who switched modes or shared a car would save on car park fees and fuel
- reduced congestion around the station would reduce journey times for everyone

(4) Ashford Station was on the edge of Ashford town centre, about 600 metres walk from the south eastern corner, and a 5 minute walk from the McArthur Glen shopping centre. As the junction of several railway lines, it offered a frequent service to London via Tonbridge or Maidstone to the North, Canterbury, Margate and Ramsgate to the East, Folkestone and Dover to the South and Hastings through to Brighton to the West. There was a fair amount of rail-heading from a wide catchment area, including many rural villages. The station also provided an important geographic link between the town centre (to the north-east) and the Designer Outlet retail park (to the south) which had implications for public transport, walking and cycling provision.

(5) The introduction of Domestic Services on High Speed 1 (HS1) in December 2009 would reinforce the importance of Ashford station for domestic users, and it was expected that there would be growth for all modes of transport including rail-heading. The planned expansion of the town would increase the population from approximately 60,000 to 135,000 by 2029 and would also increase demand for services significantly.

(6) Southeastern had carried out forecast studies from now until 2014, during this period there was a predicted increase of 46% in footfall at Ashford Station. Footfall in 2006/2007 was 2,432,484, by 2010/2011 this was predicted to grow to 3,227,963 and by 2013/14 footfall was predicted to be 3,543,496, an extra 1,111,012 passengers a year.

(7) Forecast growth would put significant pressures on the infrastructure at the station. With this in mind and also taking into account passenger satisfaction surveys, Ashford Station had been included on the National Station Improvement Programme, (NSIP) and £1.2m was in the budget to improve facilities for customers on the station lease area. These longer term plans would look to enlarge the station building, improve customer waiting areas and customer information, as well as toilets, lighting etc. Southeastern and

8 July 2008

Network Rail were working with both KCC and ABC to improve facilities at and around the station and to integrate the station with the town by providing improved bus facilities, an improved taxi waiting area and greater segregation from car traffic.

(8) To be included in the pilot programme, the Ashford Station partnership led by Kent Highway Services, in conjunction with Southeastern Trains and Ashford's Future had been asked to agree to the following:-

- Baseline data and monitoring to be carried out during the Autumn of 2008
- Commitment of financial and staff resources for the projects' duration
- Evaluation and production of regular reports to enable the dissemination of lessons learned and good best practice.

(9) In return for signing up to the conditions, pilot stations could expect to receive:-

- A financial contribution to the pilot (likely to be for research elements of the work)
- Support from other pilot sites and the Steering Group
- Positive publicity for their company / organisation

(10) A Kick Off Conference for the successful projects would be held on 23 July and following that the project was expecting to follow a timeline as set out in Appendix A of the report.

(11) The National Rail Station Travel Pilot provided an exciting opportunity for Kent to participate in a national initiative to promote sustainable travel to rail stations. The development of the Travel Plan and supporting initiatives would assist the sustainable expansion of commuter rail travel in Kent as a result of the new HS1 services. It was intended that best practice be rolled out to other stations in due course.

(12) The Board noted the report.

## **11. Smarter Choices – 2008 Progress Report**

*(Item 12 – Report by Head of Transport and Development)*

(1) Smarter Choices was about improving sustainable travel options and encouraging people to use alternatives to the car to help tackle congestion and reduce pollution. Initiatives included travel planning with schools and businesses, improving public transport, marketing, car sharing, car clubs and tele/flexible working.

(2) Research had shown Smarter Choices contributed cost effectively to national and local priorities improving accessibility and social inclusion, encouraging regeneration, reducing pollution and carbon emissions and increasing levels of physical activity. For Kent the initiative was a key part of delivering statutory duties and policies in Travelling to School; Choosing Health, Every Child Matters, the Education and Inspections Act 2006 and our Local Transport Plan (LTP2).

(3) The report provided an update on the initiatives reported to the Board on 1 May 2007 and sought continued member support for their implementation. With the recent substantial increases in fuel prices, the report was especially timely.

(4) The Education and Inspections Act 2006 placed a duty on local authorities to promote the use of sustainable travel and transport on the journey to school. Kent's

8 July 2008

Sustainable Travel to School Strategy was duly published as a consultation draft on 31 August 2007 and was due to be published in its final form on 31 August 2008.

(5) Good progress was being made on the delivery of the Strategy and its development had led to improved joined-up working between directorates involved in co-ordinating travel to school, including KHS, CFHE and Commercial Services.

(6) As part of its Area Based Grant, Kent received £112,865 per annum (5 years from 2007/08) from Government to support the delivery of the strategy. Core work areas currently included:-

- An infrastructure audit, highlighting sustainable transport provision at all Kent schools
- A Sustrans Bike IT officer promoting cycling to schools in Ashford
- Partnership funding for the Kent and Medway Walking Bus Group Charity
- Improving web based travel information for schools, pupils and parents
- Additional project staff to support the promotion of sustainable travel to schools

(7) 2007/08 had been another very successful year for improving travel to school, with a further 87 schools developing travel plans. This brought the total to 413, and equated to approximately 68% of all Kent schools. We were on target to achieve 100% of Kent schools by 2010. School Travel Plans had now secured over £2.5 million of additional capital grants for Kent schools to spend on infrastructure in the school grounds.

(8) This year Government funding was being supplemented by funding through the Local Transport Plan with schools invited to bid for additional grants on the basis of their delivery against Travel Plan objectives and targets. Kent's School Travel Plan initiative was funded by Government through to March 2010 as part of its "Travelling to School Initiative" and from 2008/09 this funding would form part of the Kent Agreement 2 and contribute to delivering against National Indicator NI 198: "Children travelling to school – mode of transport usually used."

(9) All Kent schools were now required to complete information relating to mode-share on the journey to school as part of their annual census returns. Data from 2006/07 provided evidence of a 5% increase in walking to school at primary schools for the first time in several decades.

(10) As part of funding secured to support statutory duties in the Education and Inspections Act, a Bike IT officer had been appointed in a match funding arrangement with the sustainable engineering charity Sustrans. Bike IT officers worked with schools to encourage cycling through training, teaching basic cycle maintenance skills and projects to enthuse children about cycling. The emphasis was on safety, but there were plenty of fun activities to get the message across that cycling had both health and environmental benefits. Bike IT, had seen a ten-fold increase in cycling levels in participating schools in other UK towns and cities – bucking the trend in declining numbers of children cycling to school. Early indications were that similar results were starting to be achieved in Ashford. A bid had been made to Sustrans for a second officer covering schools in Kent Thameside.

(11) KCC's partnership with the Kent and Medway Walking Bus Group Charity (including Medway Council) continued to deliver outstanding results on walking to school. Kent had some 50 buses, the most walking buses of any local authority in the UK. A new risk

8 July 2008

assessment procedure and the appointment of a part-time co-ordinator had helped to ensure that the buses, which relied on parent volunteers, continued to be properly managed and monitored. The partnership had also delivered two new Walk to School initiatives as part of the KM Green Footsteps Challenge, namely the Walking Bug and Walk on Wednesday (WOW). Over 140 schools across Kent and Medway had taken part in WOW and The Walking Bug during 2007/08. This had involved some 35,000 pupils and their parents. It was estimated that between October 2007 and May 2008, the schemes had taken over 110,000 school-run journeys off Kent roads.

(12) In 2006 Government announced a £15 million fund to provide grants of £1,000 to state funded infant/primary schools wishing to establish or expand a walking bus scheme. Grants were available for 3 years, subject to an annual review of progress. As a result over 131 schools were supported with successful applications, levering in a further £95,500 for Kent schools to spend on supporting walk to school activities. Approximately two thirds of the schools had met the obligations of their funding and retained funding for the second year of funding in 2008/09.

(13) National, regional and local planning policy required that assessment was made of the impact of new development on the highway network, that consideration was given to the accessibility by all transport modes and that Travel Plans were produced for developments that generated significant demand for travel.

(14) The number of Travel Plans secured through the planning process had increased substantially in recent years leading to a requirement for improved tracking, monitoring and enforcement. Unlike the preparation of a Transport Assessment, developing a Travel Plan was not a one off exercise which could be carried out to secure planning consent and then 'shelved'. Commitment was required on an ongoing basis to deliver against the targets within it. Guidance on Transport Assessments and Travel Plans had been developed and we were working with the Kent District Councils to improve practice and support the emerging Kent Regeneration Strategy.

(15) In January 2007 the Maidstone Car Club was launched in partnership with Streetcar, the largest operator of car clubs in the UK. The scheme currently operated with two VW Polo Blue Motions in designated bays outside Sessions House and utilised web-based and Smartcard technology to book and use the cars. The key objective was to provide County Hall employees and Members requiring adhoc use of cars during the working day, with an alternative to driving to work at congested peak times, thus helping to alleviate congestion and parking pressures at and around County Hall as well as for nearby residents and businesses.

(16) The scheme had been very successful as a pool car initiative for KCC employees and excellent feedback had been received concerning the quality and cleanliness of the vehicles and the reliability of the service. The scheme effectively now paid for itself, albeit with usage of the vehicles recharged to the relevant business unit.

(17) In recent months, the concept of the pay-as-you-go car had gradually gained credence among local residents and businesses, leading to a marked increase in use by nearby residents. A major promotional push in April 2008, culminated in the potential for a third car to be located centrally to support the Travel Plan for the new Maidstone Borough Council offices. Discussions were also taking place with other districts regarding the possible expansion of the scheme to other parts of the County.

8 July 2008

(18) Kentcarshare was KCC's web-based journey matching facility, developed in partnership with Liftshare. It continued to be a flag-ship initiative for sustainable transport in Kent and had expanded rapidly since its launch in September 2005. Kentcarshare was a free, secure, internet-based service that was easy-to-use. The service allowed you to register your journeys, and find passengers or drivers to share regular or one-off journeys. With rising fuel prices, the potential cost savings of sharing a journey just once or twice a week were substantial, not to mention the benefits for rush hour congestion. To date, it was estimated that the scheme had saved over 1.5 million miles and 481 tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub>, the equivalent that would be absorbed by 160,000 trees.

(19) KHS were supporting a number of national and local events during the summer highlighting sustainable travel and transport and the wider 'green agenda'. These included:-

*National Liftshare Day – 9 June*

Promotion of Kentcarshare to all KCC employees and a competition to win tickets for the Hop Farm Music Festival.

*National Green Transport Week – 16 - 22 June*

The week involved the promotion of sustainable transport to all KCC employees as part of the development of a KCC wide travel plan. Communication via the Directorate Team Briefings encouraged managers and their teams to discuss ways to improve efficiency and reduce the environmental impact of their business travel. This included the publication of a manager's checklist and a number of green travel tips. Free breakfast vouchers for cyclists at a number of KCC offices were also very popular.

*Maidstone Goes Green Week – 23 to 30 June*

The development of an exciting new partnership between KCC, Maidstone Borough Council, The Maidstone Town Centre Management Group and Maidstone's three main shopping centres (The Mall, Fremlins Walk and Royal Star Arcade) led to opportunities to promote sustainable transport in the town under the umbrella of 'Maidstone Goes Green'. Free space was made available in all three of the shopping centres to promote KCC led 'green' initiatives and it was hoped that the activity would prelude a major event on 'In Town Without My Car Day' on 22 September. This was traditionally the culmination of European Mobility Week (13-21 September).

*European Mobility Week – 16 to 21 September*

Plans were currently being developed to build on 'Maidstone Goes Green', leading to activities promoting sustainable transport and travel, culminating in a fun family oriented event to celebrate 'In Town Without My Car Day' on 22 September.

(20) The success of Smarter Choices relied on developing partnerships with people and organisations across Kent. A fundamental principal of Smarter Choices was to develop and deliver highway schemes and services, which were aligned with people's travel needs. This could be achieved by continuing to engage with the public and other stakeholders to raise awareness and ownership, leading to the development of effective schemes that delivered real behavioural change.

8 July 2008

(21) Smarter Choices gave Kent an opportunity to make good progress towards improving access, tackling congestion and delivering sustainable development as defined in the LTP2. The plan built on good practice and was achievable and cost effective.

(22) The Board noted the good progress being made and continued to support the delivery of the programme.

*The Chairman agreed to take the following Item in addition to those on the agenda.*

**12. Proposed Prohibition of Driving Traffic Order – Mill Lane, Beltinge, Herne Bay**  
*(Item 14 – Report by Head of Transport and Development)*

(1) A paper presented to the Canterbury Joint Transportation Board (JTB) on 10 June 2008 was attached as an appendix to the report. The objector attended the JTB meeting and verbally withdrew his objection, provided that he would be granted an exemption to the traffic order. The JTB then resolved to recommend to the HAB that the traffic order should be made without an exemption for the objector, as recommended in the paper, and the Chairman of the JTB advised the objector that this would be another opportunity for his case to be heard.

(2) The traffic regulation order under consideration would prohibit driving along a short length of road at Mill Lane, Beltinge and was a planning requirement of an adjacent development. The objector owned land immediately to the west of Mill Lane and had a number of accesses onto Mill Lane, one of which would not be useable if the prohibition of driving order were to be made. The remaining accesses would be outside the length of road where the traffic order was proposed and would therefore continue to be accessible. If the landowner were to be given an exemption to the order, this would weaken the effect of the order and would allow driving in a length of road which was proposed to be used by pedestrians and cyclists only.

(3) The best arrangement for the area was for the Prohibition of Driving Order to be made in Mill Lane with no exemptions, apart from emergency vehicles. This would mean that the Order could be enforced with a robust bollard that only the emergency services could remove. An exemption for the landowner to drive along Mill Lane would compromise the safety of pedestrians and cyclists. The local city and county members agreed with this view.

(4) At the request of the Chairman of the Canterbury JTB the paper was put before HAB for their decision. A copy of the objector's comments to the Cabinet Member was circulated at the meeting.

(5) The Board supported the JTB resolution.

This page is intentionally left blank

## Kent Highway Services – The Director’s Update

A report by Geoff Mee, Director of Kent Highway Services, to the Highways Advisory Board on 16<sup>th</sup> September 2008.

---

### Introduction

1. This Director’s Update sets out some of the key issues and developments going on in KHS.

### Key issues and points of interest

2. **Opening of the new Office/Depot at Ashford** – a successful opening took place at the end of July and in recent weeks staff from across the Alliance have been moving into the new building and depot and getting to grips with their new surroundings and co-working teams. We continue to look at options for the west of the County to deliver our plan of delivering most of the highway services from two primary operational centres and Invicta House. In the interim we will be moving staff to Doubleday House complex by October.
3. **Highways Agency Area 4 Contract** – the tender was returned in August and we await, hopefully by Christmas, a decision from the Highways Agency. The tender was returned in the name of Ringway Jacobs with KCC acting as a key supply chain partner to this company. This has ensured that any commercial risk remains with the private sector companies but still allows KCC to be part of, and influence, the delivery team and services to the public of Kent.
4. **Performance** – our monthly key performance indicators have dipped in recent months leading to a backlog in outstanding faults repairs, letters answered and increase in complaints. This is primarily due to bedding in of the new operational structure, accommodation moves and new IT system implementation. The Alliance wide Executive management team has developed an action plan to get the service back on track and we have seen the elimination of the backlog in Community Operations and Drainage.
5. **New Contact Centre call logging system** – demand on the 08458 247 800 and [kent.highwayservices@kent.gov.uk](mailto:kent.highwayservices@kent.gov.uk) continues at over 15,000 calls/emails per month and the new system is helping us to identify, track and put in place specific improvements to deal with the back log in outstanding service requests that have been building up. We continue to encourage Members to recommend this point of entry to the public, Parish Councils and indeed themselves for all service requests so that they can be actively managed. There have been problems in recent weeks caused by a lack of agents to answer and handle calls but meetings have taken place with the contact centre management team and we are assured that service will improve by the end of October.
6. **EDF** – pursuit of a closer and more cohesive relationship between KHS and EDF is continuing. Contact is now at a weekly operational meeting together with regular meets at Senior Management level. Although the performance of EDF has shown some improvement, it is important that we continue to pursue both their own performance as well as the way that KHS and EDF are performing together. A standard needs to be achieved that County Members and the public

are satisfied with. There is no doubt that neighbouring authorities have been suffering in the same way that Kent has in the past and we are pursuing a joint approach with them for future working relationships with EDF.

7. **Tracker Survey 2008** – the 2008 resident, Member and Parish/Town Council tracker survey will take place in November. In 2007 only 23% of Members responded to the on-line survey and this year it is planned to undertake a telephone survey with each Member in order to increase the response rate. Parish/Town Council return rate was also low at 18% and more work will be done to ensure a more representative return rate is provided as with such a low response rate the validity of the results is often questioned.
8. **Competitive Tendering** – tenders have been prepared and work will commence early in the new year for the delivery of £1.5 million of road resurfacing and £750k of integrated transport schemes. This market testing process is designed to ensure that information about current market rates is available to ensure the competitiveness of the long term Alliance arrangements with Ringway. It is important for all of us to ensure that the Alliance contracts drive benefit both in terms of the wider customer care and contractor design input from our commercial partners but this must be backed up by competitive prices.
9. **Parish Council Seminars** – Kim Hills, Head of Community Operations has invited a representative from all Parish/Town Councils to seminars organised in Maidstone or Canterbury on 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> October. The events are designed to update them on the changes in KHS and provide them with a chance to meet their local liaison and engineering teams. The seminar will be a mix of providing information and listening to their views. On this occasion the meetings are targeted to Parish and Town Councils and will not involve local County or District Members.
10. **Awards** – KHS has recently been highly commended in the National Transport Authority of the Year award and has been short listed for the British Quality Foundation Achievement Awards under Partnership Development category, we will find out the result in October.

## **Conclusions**

11. This Highways Advisory Board report is for information and Members are asked to note and comment on the progress being made and are asked to give their support to staff as the organisational changes bed in.

---

Contact Officers:

Geoff Mee 01622 694776

## **Disabled Persons Parking Bays**

Report by the Parking Manager, Kent Highway Services to the Highways Advisory Board on 16<sup>th</sup> September 2008

---

### **Introduction**

1. Disabled Persons Parking Bays may be introduced under a legal Traffic Regulation Order and are currently assessed, funded and managed by the 12 Kent District councils under guidelines set by Kent County Council. The introduction of the Disability Discrimination Act 2005 and the introduction of the Disability Equality Duty have necessitated a review of the existing guidance and policy. This report outlines the results of a consultation process carried out with a working party representing the County Council and the 12 District councils.

### **Background**

2. The 12 Kent District councils currently accept requests for disabled persons parking bays using application forms which require various criteria to be met. There are some differences in the assessment of these criteria, in that some district councils consider them to be mandatory and others use discretion based upon individual circumstances and local conditions.

3. The majority of the 12 Kent District councils charge a £30.00 non-returnable administration fee which is paid upon submission of an application for a disabled persons parking bay. The cost of the necessary legal work, signage and lines are met by the District authorities.

### **Developing Best Practice**

4. A Disabled Persons Parking Bay working party was formed, consisting of representatives of the 12 District councils and Kent County Council. Specialist advice was sought from partners and stakeholders as necessary.

5. The aim of the working party was to achieve a streamlined and consistent application process making use of best practice across the County whilst ensuring that all necessary legislation is adhered to.

### **Procedure**

6. Each individual criterion was examined and investigated and it was found that with the exception of the administration fee, all other requirements of the application process met the demands of the new legislations and duties, although there were anomalies across the 12 district councils concerning the way in which the criteria were used.

### **Administration Fee**

7. There is no current legislation that grants a Local Authority the power to charge an administration fee for applications for disabled persons parking bays. The Disability Discrimination Act 2005 provides that 'a person should not be treated less favourably than others who do not have a disability'. Additionally, it must be considered that the parking bay is not for the exclusive use of the applicant, but can

be utilised by any driver holding and displaying a current blue disabled parking badge.

8. Research was carried out into procedures used by other Local Authorities across the Country regarding applications for disabled persons parking bays. It was found that of all the authorities investigated, none made any charge for the provision of a disabled persons parking bay.

9. Guidance was sought from the Kent County Council Legal Department to establish whether an administration charge would be within the terms of the relative legislation and duty. The advice that was received from the legal team stated that:

*'A local authority has a duty to act reasonably and not to treat a disabled person less favourably. An administration fee is unreasonable in these circumstances and should not be charged.'*

10. A new application form and set of guidance notes for a disabled persons parking bay was drawn up making use of the best practice currently in use across the County of Kent. The revised application form and guidance notes are more 'user-friendly', easier to administer and require standard mandatory requirements to be met (Appendix 1) whilst still allowing officer discretion for individual circumstance and local conditions.

11. The requirement for a £30 administration charge to be paid by the applicant was removed from the process.

### **Risks to the Authority**

12. Kent County Council has produced a standard application form and set of guidance notes which could be recommended for use by the 12 District councils within Kent. If the requirement for an administration charge is included within this procedure, both Kent County Council along with the 12 District councils should be aware that they may be open to a possible challenge under the Disability Discrimination Act 2005.

13. Although the public highway is owned and maintained by Kent County Council, the process and management of disabled persons parking bays is carried out by the 12 District councils. Kent County Council may recommend the exclusion of an administration fee; however, each individual District council will choose whether or not to follow the recommended procedures. It should be noted that if the local authority chooses not to follow the advice given by Kent County Council, any legal challenge will be made to the District authority and not to Kent County Council.

### **Recommendations**

14. It is recommended that the process, application form and guidance notes for an application for a disabled persons parking bay is adopted by Kent County Council. These procedures should be reported through the local Joint Transportation Boards by the individual District councils with a recommendation that each individual council accept Kent County Councils recommended process and procedure.

Accountable Officer: Lorna Day, Kent Parking Manager 01622 696873  
Appendix 1: Application Form and Guidance Notes for a Disabled Persons Parking Bay

## Application for a Disabled Parking Bay Guidance Leaflet

**Please read these notes carefully before completing your application form**

- Disabled Parking Bays can be provided on the road, near to your home, to help people who are unable to walk or have serious difficulty in walking. These are provided by and at the discretion of your District/Borough/City Council *at no cost to the applicant*.
- You will not have exclusive rights to the parking bay. Any person holding a Blue Badge may park in the bay.
- To apply for a bay you should experience frequent problems parking within walking distance of your property and:
  1. Possess a valid Blue Badge
  2. Receive the higher rate mobility component of the Disability Living Allowance; the War Pensioner's Mobility Supplement, or Attendance Allowance at the higher rate.
  3. Be the driver of the vehicle requiring the space
- There may be other circumstances where you might qualify for a bay. Please provide reasons in the designated space on the application form to support your application if you cannot answer yes to the three bullet points above.
- Contact may be made with your GP for the purpose of verifying the information submitted in your application. Your GP may charge you for any letters that they write. It is the responsibility of the applicant to bear any cost made by the GP.
- After your application is received an engineer will assess the highway conditions for suitability and will carry out informal local consultations before proceeding. Adjacent and opposite neighbours will be consulted in writing. The application will then be assessed and processed.
- An interim bay will then be put down subject to all conditions being met. At this point the bay is informal and cannot be enforced by a Civil Enforcement Officer. The next stage is the Traffic Regulation Order process, the purpose of which is to limit the use of the bay to Blue Badge holders only. This will involve an advertisement in the local press. Any person objecting to the bay can put forward their views which must be considered by an authorised Council Committee. If no objections are received then the process will continue.
- If the Council Committee uphold the objections then the interim bay will be removed. To consider objections it may be necessary for the committee to hold a site meeting to assess any problems.
- Only after a Traffic Regulation Order is in place, the use of the bay will be restricted to Blue Badge holders. Civil Enforcement Officers may issue penalty charge notices to vehicles not displaying a valid Blue Badge whilst parked in the

bay. The Council may affix a sign to your property, which notifies motorists that the space is for the use of Blue Badge holders only.

- After three years, you will be required to submit a new application to ensure that your details have not changed and that you are still entitled to a bay. It is your duty to inform the District/Borough/City Council of any changes in your circumstance in the meantime.
- Please take the time to ensure that you have read and understood this leaflet, and to complete all of the form before sending it to us. Errors or omissions may result in a delay in processing the application.
- Please contact us if you require this information in an alternative format.

# APPLICATION FORM

## DISABLED PERSONS PARKING BAY

Please read the guidance leaflet carefully before completing your application form and returning to your District, Borough or City Council.

Please complete this form in **BLOCK CAPITALS**

### Part One: Particulars of Applicant

Title: MR / MRS / MISS / MS / OTHER

Surname:

First name(s):

Address:

Postcode:

Contact telephone number:

Date of Birth:

GP's name:

GP's Address:

**(Contact may be made with your GP in order to verify the information that you have given in your application. Your GP may make a charge for this process)**

## Part Two: Further Details

Blue Badge serial number and expiry date:

**(Please enclose a photocopy of both sides of your Blue Badge)**

(We will share these details with the Blue Badge Team at Kent County Council in order to verify the information you have given)

**1. a. I receive the Higher Rate Mobility Component of the Disability Living Allowance:**

Yes [ ]

No [ ]

**1. b. I receive the War Pensioner's Mobility Supplement**

Yes [ ]

No [ ]

**1. c. I receive Attendance Allowance at the higher rate**

Yes [ ]

No [ ]

(If you have answered yes for 1a, 1b or 1c please enclose a copy of your award letter, or other documentation to demonstrate your eligibility under one of these criteria)

**2. Are you the main driver of the vehicle?**

Yes [ ]

No [ ]

**3. Is the vehicle registered to the same address used in this application?**

Yes [ ]

No [ ]

**(Please provide a copy of the insurance certificate for your vehicle)**

**4. Do you experience frequent problems parking within walking distance of your property?**

Yes [ ]

No [ ]

**5. Do you have any suitable off street parking available within your property or the ability to create it?**

Yes [ ]

No [ ]

**6. Where is the vehicle normally kept?**

On street [ ]

Driveway [ ]

Garage [ ]

Other (please describe) [ ]

To qualify for a bay you must meet strict criteria; however you may still be provided a bay in other circumstances. Please provide any evidence to support your application below. (Please continue on a separate sheet if required)

**Part Three: Declaration**

- I declare that to the best of my knowledge, all the information I have given in this application is correct.
- I acknowledge that the bay can be used by any Blue Badge holder
- I agree, where necessary to have a sign notifying the use of the space on my property
- I have enclosed photocopies of all supporting documentation
- I consent to the information I have given being reviewed by officers and Members within the District/Borough/City Council in order to process the application
- I consent to the information I have given being shared with Kent County Council's Blue Badge team for verification purposes
- I consent to the information I have given being shared with my GP for the purposes of obtaining information to support my application, if required
- I consent to the Engineer consulting with my neighbours as part of the site survey for verification purposes, if required
- I have read and understood the application form and guidance leaflet

**Signature:**

**Date:**



Please note that your details and the information that you provide will be processed by ( ) District/Borough/City Council, in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998 to assist in the processing of your application.

## **Part Four: to be completed by the Engineering Department**

I **approve** / I **reject** this application

Signed:

Designation:

Please state reasons:

### **For District Council use only:**

Acknowledgement sent out:

Date Blue Badge verified:

Neighbours consulted:

Objections received:

Application to be progressed: Yes [  ]

No [  ]

Site Visit arranged for:

Date interim bay installed:

Date TRO advertised:

Objections received:

Date report to Committee:

Committee decision:

Date TRO formalised:

Review date (+ 3 years):

Additional notes:

## **KHS Winter Service Review**

A report by the Director of Kent Highway Services, to the Highways Advisory Board, on 16<sup>th</sup> September 2008.

---

### **Introduction**

1. On 18 September 2007 the Highways Advisory Board supported the Winter Service Policy Statement and Plan for 2006/07 and these were used as the basis for all winter service operations. This report gives information relating to the winter of 2007/08 and seeks approval of the Winter Service Policy and Plan for 2008/09.

### **The Winter of 2007/08**

2. The winter service policy requires precautionary salting on 'A' and 'B' and other busy roads (as defined in the policy statement paragraph 2.1.2) where frost/ice is likely to form on road surfaces. An analysis of winter weather and the action taken by Kent Highway Services (KHS) for 2007/08 is contained in Annex A. A table of forecast accuracy and other performance indicators are given in Annex B. A statistical comparison of winter activities for the 2007/08 winter with the preceding four years is given in Annex C.

3. On all occasions, during the winter of 2007/08, when frost was forecast and frost occurred, precautionary salting had taken place in advance of freezing temperatures. There were instances during the winter service period where a frost was not predicted in the main forecasts issued at 14:00 hrs, but subsequent updates warned that frost was likely. This activated precautionary salting instructions where necessary.

4. Overall the winter was mild but also with some very brief snow interludes. See Appendix A for full details.

### **Finance**

5. The KHS winter service budget for 2007/08 was £2,225,000 and the out turn was £1,822,000. For 2007/8 there was no requirement for funding from the corporate emergency fund for snow emergency cost. The budget for 2008/09 has been set at £2,326,000

### **Contract Arrangements**

6. The KHS winter service contractor for the winter of 2007/08 was Ringway Infrastructure Services, within the alliance partnership agreement formed by Kent Highway Services. Ringway Infrastructure Services will be the service provider for the winter of 2008/09.

### **Forecast Service**

7. The Meteorological Office supplied forecast services for the winter of 2007/08 under a five-year agreement, which the Board agreed in 2003. This agreement has now expired. There are other weather forecast service providers who have emerged

over the last few years that provide a similar service to the Met. Office. These are private companies that have been winning tenders with local authorities in the UK and have gained credibility. An informal price was supplied to KHS by one of these market leaders, for road weather forecasting during the 2008/09 winter season. This indicated a substantial saving could be made. I was therefore decided to formally tender the winter forecasting service for the coming winter. The result of this process should be known by the date of this meeting.

8. The ice prediction service has been provided by Vaisala Ltd in the past and they have performed well again over the past winter season. It is therefore proposed to continue the relationship with Vaisala Ltd. for the coming winter.

### **Winter Service Policy and Plan 2008/09**

9. The Winter Service Policy 2008/09 is given in Appendix D (Any alterations are shown in *Italics*). There are no significant changes to the policy for the forthcoming winter. Copies of the Winter Service Plan for 2008/09 have been placed in the Members Room.

### **Pre-Wetted Salt**

10. Pre-wetted salt will be operated from our depots at Haysden and Ashford this coming winter. It is the intention to introduce pre-wetted salt at the other new or refurbished depots as they come on stream.

### **Conclusions:**

11. Subject to the views of this Board it is proposed that the Cabinet Member for Environment, Highways and Waste be asked to:

- (i) note the contents of this report, particularly the decision to tender the winter weather forecasting service.
- (ii) approve the Winter Service Policy and Plan for 2008/09
- (iii) agree to continue the arrangement with Vaisala Ltd. for the provision of ice prediction computer services.

---

Accountable Officer - Peter Lott (01622 696854)

Previous Committee reference: Winter Maintenance Report to the Highways Advisory Board, 18 September 2007.

**The Winter of 2007/08**

1. October

The month was dominated by high pressure which resulted in a relatively dry month. It was colder between the 19th and 24th with some localised air and more widespread grass frosts, but due to the warm ground there were no road frosts. It was the coolest October for 4 years. Road surface temperatures remained above freezing during the period and precautionary salting was not required.

2. November

Temperatures reached 17.4°C at East Malling on 1st. There were some chilly nights in the first week but it was too mild for frosts. In the second week temperatures were lower with air frosts recorded on the mornings of the 12th and 13th. East Malling recorded minus 3.7 Celsius early on the 16th and there was a report of snow in the county on this day. Low pressure returned from the 18th and the next few days saw rain and showers, often heavy and thundery. On the 23rd as winds turned more northerly again, temperatures dropped. It was a cold start initially over southern England on the 24<sup>th</sup> but it turned milder with fronts moving in from the north-west for the rest of the month. Precautionary salting took place on 4 nights during November; one of these was a partial run.

3. December

The month divided into three parts, an unsettled period for the first ten days followed by a generally anticyclonic spell and a further unsettled weather later in the month. Between 11th and 21st a large high pressure area became established over northern Europe and extended to cover much of the UK. There were widespread overnight air frosts and at East Malling on the morning of 20th and 21st temperatures fell below minus 5 deg Celsius and Sevenoaks recorded the only ice day of 2007. From the 23rd there was a resumption of unsettled and windy weather, but with some drier days in-between. Precautionary salting took place on 13 nights during December.

4. January

It was a mostly mild and unsettled month; indeed at Gravesend the average maximum was higher than the exceptionally mild January last year. There was a short cold snap during the first week and a drier spell towards the end of the month. The month started relatively mild with southerly winds but winds soon turned easterly bringing much colder air with some snow and sleet which later turned to rain on the 3rd. Milder air spread from the west later on the 4th with strengthening southerly winds. The 10/11th and 15th were wet days with 15 to 22mm of rain recorded. There was a frost early on the 17th but generally it was fairly mild, exceptionally so in the period 18th to 20th, with the overnight minimum over the 19th/ 20th the highest on record for January at some localities. High pressure extended north on 26th bringing several days of fine and dry weather for most although with some cool nights and overnight fog. There was heavy rain on the 31st. Precautionary salting took place on 8 nights during January. Salting was required twice in the same night on one occasion due to predicted and actual snow fall.

5. February

This was a dry and sunny month with above average mean temperatures but not as mild as the exceptional February 2007. The month started cold with showers feeding

down from the north-west. A cold front moved southwards on the 3rd, bringing some heavy rain and strong winds for a time. It became fine and very mild with 14.8°C at East Malling on the 10th. Between 11th and 21st it was dry and largely sunny but with widespread overnight frosts and some fog, especially between the 16th and 20th, with -6 deg C on morning of 17th at East Malling and -5.4 the next morning. More generally cloudy conditions spread from the west for the 22nd and 23rd. A cold front then moved south-east on the 24th, bringing the first significant rainfall in nearly two weeks. Precautionary salting took place on 12 nights during February; one of these was a partial run.

## 6. March

This was the wettest March over England since 1981. Temperatures and sunshine were generally slightly above average. A deep area of low pressure brought gale force winds on the 1st with outbreaks of rain or showers, winds then turned northerly later on the 3rd and during the 4th, bringing colder, but sunnier weather. Strong, westerly winds returned on the 6<sup>th</sup> with rain or showers. Many places had gales and heavy rain on the 10th and again on the night of the 11th and into the 12th. Heavy rain spread north-eastwards during the 15th, and lasted into the 16th. Any remaining rain across southern England cleared southwards with much colder northerly winds following and clear skies overnight allowed for some sharp frosts. Much colder and very strong northerly winds spread southwards for the Easter Weekend which was the most wintry period of the entire winter. Many places had snow with an area of significant snowfall giving a temporary cover of up to 2 cm across some parts on Easter Sunday morning and this was followed by a sharp overnight frost and further snow on the morning of the Bank Holiday Monday. The weather gradually became milder courtesy of westerly winds. However, it became much more unsettled and at times very windy with outbreaks of rain, heavy in many places later on the 28th and 29th. The final days of the month were quieter with sunshine and scattered heavy showers. Precautionary salting was required on 8 nights. Salting was required twice in the same night on one occasions due to predicted and actual snow fall.

## 8. April (until 21st day)

This month was a tremendous contrast to the previous April, albeit with temperatures within 0.1 deg of normal as a countrywide average. It was the coldest April since 2001. Snow fell on the 6th to a depth of 5 cm in Maidstone, it slowly melted through the day but some 2 cm was still existed at 0900 on the 7th with 6-7 cm of lying snow the North Downs. Almost all the remaining frosts in the month then followed on successive nights but temperatures remained on the low side until the 15th with minimum at East Malling as low as plus 0.4 deg C. The second half of the month saw temperatures climbing thereby imparting substantial heat below the road surface and no further problems were encountered despite some cooling of the air late in the month. Precautionary salting was required on 4 nights.

Salting was required twice in the same night on one occasion due to predicted and actual snow fall.

9. Precautionary salting took place on a total of 49 nights during the operational winter maintenance period. On 3 of these nights, double precautionary salting runs were necessary. This gave rise to a total number of 52 occasions when the primary routes were treated. Of these there were 50 occasions when precautionary salting of primary routes took place countywide with selective treatment taking place on the remaining 2 occasions. Selective treatment was possible as a result of central

decision making based on detailed weather information provided by the Meteorological Office and the County's road weather stations. The cumulative total of whole salting runs equates to 51.1 which is close to the budgeted figure of 55.

10. Precautionary salting of secondary routes, required because particularly cold weather conditions or snow was forecast, took place on 15 occasions. This figure is higher than normal and reflects the incidence of predicted and actual snow falls.

11. A summary of the accuracy of weather forecasts, provided by the Meteorological Office, for the last six winter maintenance periods is given in the Performance Indicator table in Annex B of this report. The figures are based on the 24-hour weather forecasts issued at 14:00 hrs every day between 1 November and 31 March inclusive.

12. The table shows that forecast accuracy for the 2007/08 winter service period is in line with previous years.

## Annex B

### PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

#### 1. Table of Forecast Accuracy

	01/02	02/03	03/04	04/05	05/06	06/07	07/08
<b>Correct Forecasts</b>							
(i) No frost predicted No frost occurred	109.6	112.0	112.0	106.0	98.0	133.0	121.0
(ii) Frost predicted Frost occurred	27.6	31.6	31.0	28.0	37.0	11.0	20.0
<b>Incorrect Forecasts</b>							
(i) No frost predicted Frost occurred	3.9	2.5	1.0	5.0	3.0	2.0	3.0
(ii) Frost predicted No frost occurred	9.9	4.9	8.0	13.0	14.0	6.0	8.0
% Correct forecasts	<b>91%</b>	<b>95%</b>	<b>94%</b>	<b>88%</b>	<b>89%</b>	<b>95%</b>	<b>93%</b>

Note:

No account is taken in the above table of updated forecasts issued up until midnight. When these are taken into account the forecast accuracy rises to **95%**.

#### 2. Coverage Factor

The primary salting route network length as a percentage of total county maintained road length is 30%.

#### 3. Precautionary Salting Route Length

The average number of kilometres salted per route is 45 km.

**WINTER SERVICE STATISTICS**

	<b>2002/03</b>	<b>2003/04</b>	<b>2004/05</b>	<b>2005/06</b>	<b>2006/07</b>	<b>2007/08</b>
<u>Precautionary Salting Routes</u>						
Number of primary precautionary salting routes	61	62#	63^	63	55**	55
<u>Precautionary Salting</u>						
Number of nights primary precautionary salting routes treated	39	5	56	65	25	49
Number of occasions primary precautionary salting routes treated	51	59	74	74	31	52
First full precautionary salting run	08.12.0 2	27.11.0 3	13.11.0 4	17.11.0 5	08.12.0 6	14.11.0 7
Last full precautionary salting run	16.03.0 3	11.03.0 4	12.03.0 5	15.03.0 6	21.03.0 7	08.04.0 8
Expenditure, excluding money spent on snow clearance or persistent ice.	£1,881K	£2,245K *	£2,145K	£2,497K	£2,263K	£1,822K
<u>Snow Clearance</u>						
Number of days of lying snow	7	7	14	5	2	2
Number of days of snow emergency	3	0	11	4	1	0
Expenditure due to snow emergency	£401K	0	£1,200K	£192K	£29K	£0K
Expenditure due to persistent ice	0	0	0	0	0	0
<u>Snow Fencing Lengths</u>						
County Roads	0m	0m	0m	0m	0m	0m
<u>Salt Bins Numbers</u>						
County roads	1,102	1,102	1,102	1,102	1,102	1,102
<u>Snow Clearing Equipment</u>						
Number of farmers' snow ploughs	250	250	250	250	250	250
Number of snow blowers	7	7	7	12	12	12
Number of snow throwers	4	4	4	4	4	4

# Additional route on the A229, top of Bluebell Hill due to new road layout

\* Includes money spent on dealing with minor snow events and additional cost of the extra route at the M2/A229 Bluebell Hill junction.

^ Additional route in Shepway to cover de-trunked A259

\*\* Number of routes reduced due to route optimisation

**KENT HIGHWAY SERVICES**

**WINTER SERVICE  
POLICY STATEMENT**

**FOR 2008/09**

**This page is intentionally left blank**

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

### **1.1 Winter Service - Statutory Duty**

1.1.1 The legal position relating to winter service changed on 31 October 2003 with the introduction of the Railways and Transport Safety Act 2003 (Section 111). This legislation added an additional sentence to section 41(1) of the Highways Act 1980 (c.66) (duty of highway authority to maintain highway). The additional sentence is as follows: -

“(1A) In particular, a highway authority is under a duty to ensure, so far as is reasonably practicable, that safe passage along a highway is not endangered by snow or ice.

(This new legislation overturned the previous ruling by the House of Lords in 2000, which stated that highway authorities did not have a duty under section 41(1) of the Highways Act 1980 to prevent or remove the formation of or accumulation of ice and snow on the road).

1.1.2 The County Council recognises that the winter service is essential in aiding the safe movement of highway users, maintaining communications, reducing delays and enabling everyday life to continue. It is very important to both road safety and the local economy. The winter service that the County Council provides is believed to be sufficient so far as is reasonably practical to discharge the duty imposed by the legislation.

1.1.3 The County Council, as highway authority, takes its winter service responsibilities extremely seriously. However, it is important to recognise that the council has to prioritise its response to deal with winter weather due to the logistics and available resources.

1.1.4 The County Council provides the winter service through Kent Highway Services (KHS) which is an alliance between Kent County Council, Ringway Infrastructure Services and Jacobs Group.

### **1.2 Winter Service Standards**

1.2.1 In order to respond as quickly and efficiently as possible to its responsibilities KHS has adopted policies and standards for each of the winter service activities and these are detailed within this document. In July 2005 the Roads Liaison Group, published ‘Well Maintained Highways’. Section 13 deals with ‘Winter Service’ which updates the same section in the ‘Code of Practice for Maintenance Management’ published in 2001. Our current approach has been reviewed and found to be consistent with the guidance as recommended in the new document. The operational details for the winter service activities in Kent are detailed in the Winter Service Plan 2008/09 that complements this Policy Statement.

1.2.2 KHS provides a winter service which, as far as reasonably possible will:

- Minimise the loss of life and injury to highway users, including pedestrians, and preventing damage to vehicles and other property

- Keep the highway free from obstruction and thereby avoiding unnecessary hindrance to passage

### 1.3 County Council Maintained Highways

1.3.1 Kent Highway Service (KHS) delivers the winter service on Kent County Council maintained highways.

### 1.4 Motorways and Trunk Roads

The Department for Transport (DfT) is the highway authority for motorways and all-purpose trunk roads in Kent and the Highways Agency acts for the DfT in this respect. Responsibility for the operational maintenance of motorways and trunk roads lies with the Highways Agency. KHS therefore has no responsibility for winter service activities on these roads. However, close liaison exists between the Highways Agency consultants over action taken during the winter service operational period within respective areas of responsibilities.

## 2. WINTER SERVICE OBJECTIVES

### 2.1 Salting

#### 2.1.1 Objectives:

- To prevent the formation of ice on carriageways (precautionary salting)
- To facilitate the removal of ice and snow from carriageways and footways (post salting).

#### 2.1.2 Roads to be Included within Primary Precautionary Salting Routes

Routine precautionary salting will be carried out on pre-determined primary precautionary salting routes covering the following roads:

- Class 'A' and 'B' roads
- Other roads included in the top three tiers of the maintenance hierarchy as defined in the Kent Highway Asset Maintenance Plan. These are termed Major Strategic, Other Strategic and Locally Important roads.
- Other roads identified by Community Delivery Managers (based on local knowledge and experience), that are particularly hazardous in frosty/icy conditions

2.1.3 It would be impractical and financially draining to carry out precautionary salting of footways, pedestrian precincts or cycleways and therefore no provision has been made. However, there will be a certain amount of salt overspill onto footways and cycleways when precautionary salting is being carried out on adjacent carriageways. Post salting of footways and cycleways will be carried out on a priority basis during severe winter weather, as resources permit.

## 2.2 Snow Clearance

### 2.2.1 Objectives:

- To prevent injury or damage caused by snow
- To remove obstructions caused by the accumulation of snow (section 150 of the Highways Act 1980)
- To reduce delays and inconvenience caused by snow

2.2.2 Snow clearance on carriageways will be carried out on a priority basis as detailed in paragraph 6.2.

2.2.3 Snow clearance on certain minor route carriageways will be carried out by local farmers and plant operators, who are under agreement to the County Council, using agricultural snow ploughs and snow throwers/blowers. Snow clearance on other minor route carriageways will be carried out as resources permit. Some minor routes and cul-de-sacs will inevitably have to be left to thaw naturally.

2.2.4 Snow clearance on footways and cycleways will be carried out on a priority basis as detailed in paragraph 6.3.

## 2.3 Snow Fencing

### 2.3.1 Objective:

- To reduce the number of obstructions caused by the accumulation of snow (Section 102 of the Highways Act 1980)

## 2.4 Roadside Salt Bins

### 2.4.1 Objective:

- To provide motorists and pedestrians with the means of salting small areas of carriageway or footway, where ice is causing difficulty, on roads not covered by primary precautionary salting routes.

## 3. WINTER SERVICE GENERAL

### 3.1 Winter Service Contracts

3.1.1 Winter service in Kent is included within the Term Maintenance Contract awarded to Ringway Infrastructure Services. This contract was awarded in 2006 and will last for five years.

### 3.2 Winter Service Season

3.2.1 In Kent the weather can be unpredictable and the occurrence and severity of winter conditions varies considerably through the season, and from year to year. Severe winter weather is most likely to be experienced in December, January and February but ice and snow can occur earlier or later. To take account of all possible winter weather the County Council's Operational Winter

Service Period runs from mid October to mid April. Exact dates for the coming winter are given in the Winter Service Plan.

### **3.3 Alternatives to Salt**

3.3.1 A number of alternative materials to salt are now available which can be used for the precautionary and post treatment of ice and snow. The cost of these is extremely high and there are also environmental disadvantages associated with most of them. Salt will therefore, for the time being, remain in use throughout Kent for the precautionary and post treatment of snow and ice.

## **4. WEATHER INFORMATION**

### **4.1 Weather Information Systems**

4.1.1 An effective and efficient winter service is only possible with reliable and accurate information about weather conditions, at the appropriate times in the decision making process. KHS utilises the best weather forecast information currently available allied to the latest computer technology to ensure that decisions are based on the most accurate data available at the time.

### **4.2 Weather Reports**

4.2.1 During the operational winter service period Kent Highway Services will procure detailed daily weather forecasts and reports specifically dedicated to roads within Kent.

### **4.3 Principal Winter Service Duty Officers**

4.3.1 Experienced members of staff from Kent Highway Services will act as Principal Winter Service Duty Officers, throughout the operational winter service period, on a rota basis. The Officer on duty is responsible for the following: -

- Receiving forecast information from the forecasting agency
- Monitoring current weather conditions
- Issuing countywide salting instructions for primary and secondary routes
- Issuing the Kent Road Weather Forecast

4.3.2 The Kent Road Weather Forecast will be issued daily containing information about expected weather conditions together with any salting instructions. The Principal Winter Service Duty Officer will also be responsible for issuing forecast updates and any revised salting instructions when necessary. The Kent Road Weather Forecast will be sent to alliance members, contractors, neighbouring highway authorities, and other relevant agencies.

## **5. SALTING**

### **5.1 Planning of Precautionary Salting Routes**

5.1.1 Primary precautionary salting routes will be developed from those lengths of highway that qualify for treatment, whenever ice, frost or snowfall is expected. Each primary precautionary salting route will have a vehicle assigned which is

capable of having a snowplough fixed to it, when required. Secondary precautionary salting routes will also be developed from other important highways for treatment during severe winter weather conditions.

## **5.2 Precautionary Salting**

5.2.1 Precautionary salting will take place on scheduled precautionary salting routes on a pre-planned basis to help prevent formation of ice, frost, and/or the accumulation of snow on carriageway surfaces.

## **5.3 Post Salting**

5.3.1 Post salting will normally take place on scheduled precautionary salting routes to treat frost, ice and snow that has already formed on carriageway or footway surfaces. Post salting may also be carried out on roads or sections of road beyond the scheduled precautionary salting routes.

## **5.4 Spot Salting**

5.4.1 Spot salting will normally take place on parts or sections of scheduled precautionary salting routes either to help prevent formation of ice, frost and/or the accumulation of snow or as treatment to ice, frost and the accumulation of snow that has already formed on carriageway or footway surfaces. Spot salting may also be required on roads and footways, or sections thereof, beyond the scheduled precautionary salting routes.

## **5.5 Instructions for Salting of Primary Routes**

5.5.1 Instructions for precautionary salting of primary routes will be issued if road surface temperatures are expected to fall below freezing unless:

- Road surfaces are expected to be dry and frost is not expected to form on the road surface
- Residual salt on the road surface is expected to provide adequate protection against ice or frost forming

5.5.2 Instructions for precautionary salting of primary routes will also be issued if snowfall is expected.

5.5.3 The Principal Winter Service Duty Officer will issue routine instructions for precautionary salting of primary routes, for the whole of Kent, by means of the Kent Road Weather Forecast.

5.5.4 The Principal Winter Service Duty Officer or Community Delivery Managers may issue instructions for post salting and spot salting.

## **5.6 Instructions for Salting of Secondary Routes**

5.6.1 The Principal Winter Service Duty Officer will issue instructions for precautionary salting of secondary routes if heavy frost, widespread ice, or snow, is expected.

## **6. SNOW CLEARANCE**

### **6.1 Instructions for Snow Clearance**

6.1.1 The Principal Winter Service Duty Officer and/or the Community Delivery Managers nominated representatives are responsible for issuing snow clearance instructions. Snow clearance will initially take place on scheduled primary precautionary salting routes, based on the priorities given in para. 6.2.1. Subsequently, snow clearance will take place on secondary salting routes and other roads, and footways, on a priority basis.

6.1.2 Snow ploughing shall not take place on carriageways where there are physical restrictions due to traffic calming measures, unless it has been deemed safe to do so following a formal risk assessment and a safe method of operation documented.

### **6.2 Snow Clearance Priorities on Carriageways**

6.2.1 Snow clearance on carriageways should be based on the priorities given below: -

- A229 between M20 and M2, A249 between M20 and M2, A299 and A289;
- Other "A" class roads;
- All other roads included within primary precautionary salting routes;
- One link to other urban centres, villages and hamlets with priority given to bus routes;
- Links to hospitals and police, fire and ambulance stations;
- Links to schools (in term time), stations, medical centres, doctor's surgeries, old people's homes, cemeteries, crematoria and industrial, commercial and shopping centres;
- With the approval of Community Delivery Managers, other routes as resources permit.

### **6.3 Snow Clearance Priorities on Footways**

6.3.1 Snow clearance on footways should be based on the priorities given below:

- One footway in and around shopping centres, and on routes to schools (in term time), stations, bus stops, hospitals, medical centres, doctor's surgeries, old people's homes, industrial and commercial centres and on steep gradients elsewhere;
- One footway on main arteries in residential areas and the second footway in and around local shopping centres;
- With the approval of Community Delivery Managers, other footways, walking bus routes and cycleways as resources permit.

### **6.4 Agricultural Snowploughs for Snow Clearance**

6.4.1 Agreements will be entered into by whereby snowploughs provided and maintained by KHS are assigned to local farmers and plant operators for snow clearance operations, generally on the more rural parts of the highway.

## **6.5 Snow Throwers/Blowers for Snow Clearance**

6.5.1 KHS also has a number of snow throwers/blowers, which are allocated to operators on a similar basis to the arrangements for agricultural snowploughs.

## **7. SEVERE WEATHER CONDITIONS**

### **7.1 Persistent Ice on Minor Roads**

7.1.1 During longer periods of cold weather Community Delivery Managers may instruct salting action to deal with persistent ice on minor roads which are not included within the precautionary salting routes.

### **7.2 Ice and Snow Emergencies**

7.2.1 During prolonged periods of severe and persistent icing, or significant snow fall, delegated officers may declare an ice or snow emergency covering all or part of the County. In this event Community Delivery Managers will implement a course of action to manage the situation in either of these events.

## **8. ROADSIDE SALT BINS**

### **8.1 Provision of Roadside Salt Bins**

8.1.1 Roadside salt bins can be sited at potentially hazardous locations for use by the public, to treat ice and snow on small areas of the carriageway or footway.

## **9. SNOW FENCING**

### **9.1 Erection of Snow Fencing**

9.1.1 Snow fencing is expensive, but in exceptional circumstances can be very useful at a limited number of sites that regularly experience severe problems with drifting snow. Community Delivery Managers can make arrangements with landowners to allow the erection of snow fencing, but without payment.

## **10. BUDGETS**

### **10.1 Winter Service Budget**

10.1.1 The budget for the annual operational winter service period is based on salting the primary precautionary salting routes on 55 occasions. The main budget is managed by the Head of Community Operations as a countywide budget.

### **10.2 Ice and Snow Emergencies**

10.2.1 There is no specific budget allocation within KHS for ice or snow emergencies. The cost of dealing with periods of icy conditions or significant snowfalls will be met by virement from other planned programmes of work on the highway or from special contingency funds for emergencies.

## **11. PUBLIC AND MEDIA COMMUNICATIONS**

### **11.1 Neighbouring Authorities and other Agencies**

11.1.1 The Kent Road Weather Forecast containing details of the winter service action for Kent will be transmitted daily to neighbouring highway authorities and other agencies so that activities can be co-ordinated regionally.

### **11.2 The Media**

11.2.1 Local media organisations will be informed when instructions for salting of primary precautionary salting are issued.

### **11.3 Pre-Season Publicity**

11.3.1 It is important that the public are aware of and understand the KHS approach to winter service. A leaflet for drivers and other road users relating to winter service is available.

### **11.4. Publicity during Ice or Snow Emergencies**

11.4.1 Liaison with the news media, particularly local radio stations, is of the utmost importance and links will be established and maintained particularly during ice or snow emergencies.

## **Safety Cameras**

A report by the County Network Manager to the Highways Advisory Board on 16th September 2008

---

### **Summary**

1. The Kent and Medway Safety Camera Partnership (K&MSCP) was launched in 2002. The partnership operates across the Kent Police area covering both Kent and Medway and its sole purpose is to reduce road crash casualties.
2. The K&MSCP produces an annual report which is circulated to each Partner organisation setting out progress to date and challenges for the future. Each year this report is presented to the Highways Advisory Board (Appendix 1).
3. The K&MSCP report considers issues associated with safety cameras in the county and the Kent Police area as a whole:
  - An overview of the partnership and its structure
  - Funding
  - Operations during 2007/08
  - Casualty reduction
  - Communications
  - Future activity and funding arrangements

### **The value of Safety Cameras**

4. In recent years road crash casualties in Kent have reduced overall. This success is due to a variety of factors involving many areas of work undertaken and supported by our various partners and stakeholders. Much of this has been achieved through a wide range of KCC led road safety interventions including education, training and publicity, as well as engineering measures. Much of the work over the last few years has been funded through the PSA Performance Reward Grant (PRG, awarded based on KCC's notable success in reducing casualties in a targeted way.
5. The Partnership has been in existence for six years, during this time its work has reduced total casualties by 36% at camera sites across the KCC network, consistently performing above the national average. The contribution of the work of the Kent and Medway Safety Camera Partnership to overall reductions in casualties has been substantial.
6. As reported to the July meeting of the HAB, KCC is making significant progress in reducing casualties. A reduction of 471 KSI per year was achieved by the end of 2007, this included 73 at safety camera sites at known crash sites. At the sites where cameras are now used there had been 14 fatalities per year between them, but now we record four or five per year since the introduction of the devices.

## Recommendation

7. Members are asked to acknowledge the annual report of the Kent and Medway Safety Camera Partnership, and the success of KCC's Road Safety activities and the Partnership.
- 

Accountable Officer:

Ian Procter, Road Safety Manager

01622 666375

[ian.procter@kent.gov.uk](mailto:ian.procter@kent.gov.uk)

**The Kent and Medway Safety Camera Partnership  
Annual Report from the Project Manager: August 2008  
Progress of the Partnership during 2007/08**

**Introduction**

1. Roadside cameras which detect speeding vehicles, or those who contravene red lights at traffic signalled junctions, are generically called 'Safety cameras'. These play a vital, but limited, role in the wider road safety strategies of the three traffic authorities in Kent (Kent County Council, Medway Council and the Highways Agency). Speed cameras in particular contribute to raising awareness of the dangers of inappropriate or excessive speed on the roads, and are installed only where significant numbers of injuries have been caused by traffic travelling in excess of the posted limit.
2. Whilst the cameras are installed and maintained by the three traffic authorities, their operation also requires the co-operation of the Police (as law enforcers) and Her Majesty's Courts Service (who endorse licences and process the payment of Fixed Penalties). These five organisations formed the Safety Camera Partnership in Kent in 2001 and gained approval to join the national 'cost recovery' programme from July 2002.
3. July 2008 therefore represented the Partnership's sixth anniversary. In previous years I have reported on the past progress of the Partnership and herein I wish to provide information on the sixth year of operation.

**Funding**

4. Funding for safety cameras including all administration, staff salaries and all running costs associated with the cameras and processing of offences, has previously been provided entirely from Central Government under the DfT's 'Cost Recovery' programme. This money was then reimbursed by the Partnership from Fixed Penalties received from offences detected by the cameras. Thus the operation and installation of the cameras has not been a burden on the respective budgets of the Partner organisations, nor on the public purse.
5. All camera sites installed in the county of Kent have been located where speed in excess of the limit has led to an on-going pattern of injury. The identification of camera sites and the installation of the associated street furniture remains the responsibility of the traffic authorities; whilst the processing of offences and collection of fines remain the roles of Kent Police and Her Majesty's Courts' Service.
6. The funding mechanism dictates that the Grant can only be used to reduce casualties, and in particular the incidents of serious injury and death. The Partnership is not a law enforcement tool but is a casualty reduction measure targeted specifically where there is a pattern of casualties that can be influenced by speed reduction. The Partner Organisations have agreed to a set of criteria to ensure that the cameras are only used as a last resort at the most

appropriate road safety problem sites. Members approved this criteria in July 2006.

### **Operation in 2007/8**

7. There were no proposals to establish any new safety camera sites in the County since the degree of speed-related crashes at casualty hot-spots was either insufficient to warrant the use of such a device and/or there was a more practical, appropriate or more economical alternative remedial measure.
8. However, Kent County Council (Kent Highway Services) identified the need for an extra camera housing to be installed on an existing Safety Camera site on A229 Loose Road Maidstone; and Medway Council completed the installation of their time-over-distance 'average speed check' system on the A228 which had commenced in early 2007.
9. The Partnership continued to operate the current fixed and mobile sites to ensure a continuing reduction in speed and casualties. The use and position of traffic signs indicating the presence of cameras, and reminding drivers of the speed limit at that point, have been reviewed and enhanced across the county. Whilst there is no legal requirement for any of these signs the Partnership is keen to ensure that all drivers are aware of the speed limit and the need, at camera sites in particular, to observe it.

### **Casualty Reduction**

10. Based on casualty data up to the end of 2007 the cameras across Kent and Medway have reduced the number of KSI by 59%. This is a further improvement on the result that I reported last year and shows the continuation of the excellent work of the cameras, and continues to exceed UK casualty reductions. The total number of people who are killed or seriously injured at our camera sites has reduced by 89 per year. The total reduction in all casualties is 299 per year where safety cameras are located. There have been no fatalities at the camera sites in Medway for a full three years.

### **Communications**

11. As part of the Partnership's operation it undertakes publicity and education activities to support the role of the safety cameras. The Partnership collectively produced a Marketing Plan aimed at increasing awareness, understanding and acceptance of safety cameras; and intended to promote the benefits of reducing both speeding and red-light running, and the role safety cameras play in preventing crashes and casualties. The plan focuses particular attention on vulnerable road user groups, which are frequently involved in speed-related crashes and also people who drive for a living who are predominant in road crashes.
12. Education initiatives included: 'Know the Limits' - a road safety game show which toured shopping centres and featured an online competition which was completed by over 1000 people; 'Driving Business Safely' - a seminar focusing on the new Corporate Manslaughter Law which was attended by over 100 Kent businesses; and a television, radio and newspaper advertising campaign inviting

the public to log onto its website. Several campaigns for 2008 are already planned, including a PR and online promotion of the 'Streetlights mean 30mph' message.

13. The Partnership's website ([www.kmscp.org](http://www.kmscp.org)) is updated weekly and details all Partnership information including an interactive map of all fixed, mobile and red light safety cameras. It also provides a contact point for the public and has had over 138,000 hits since it originally launched in January 2003.
14. Literature and display material is regularly produced which highlight the dangers of excessive speed. Partnership staff also attended numerous shows and events for the public with material explaining the operation of cameras which provided further opportunities for the public to see how the cameras work, meet the staff and ask questions. The 'Fit for the Road?' stand at the Kent County Show is a joint initiative between all road safety partners and was awarded third prize in the public sector category in 2007, the aim for 2008 now being to scoop second place.
15. Numerous events will be attended during 2008 including the Kent County Show; Biggin Hill Air Fair; Margate's Big Day Out; World Super Bikes at Brands Hatch; various Kent Fire and Rescue Community Safety Days; and Police Station Open Days.
16. The Partnership has also enjoyed a vast amount of coverage in both the local and national media. In the past year 45% of the local media coverage of safety camera issues and campaigns has been positive, 33% neutral coverage and 21% negative coverage. The Partnership's Project Manager, Communications Manager and Communications Officer have appeared on local television, given radio interviews and given presentations to various clubs, societies and organisations.
17. The Partnership also undertakes a routine survey of public perception amongst residents and drivers in Kent. Of those interviewed in June/July 2007 18.6% had heard of the camera Partnership, 58.7% agreed that fewer crashes are likely to happen where cameras are installed, and 67% of Kent residents agreed that the primary aim of safety cameras is to save lives.
18. This Partnership is working closely with its road safety colleagues to deliver consistent campaigns across the county. For example, it has teamed up with KHS, Medway Council, the Ambulance Service, Kent Fire & Rescue, Kent Police and the Highways Agency to produce the hard-hitting theatre production "Licence to Kill?" which was shown to 5000 sixth form students in November. The production won the Gold Award in the not-for-profit category of the Chartered Institute of Public Relations' 2007 PRide Awards. Kent Fire & Rescue have also supported the Partnership not only with staff resource but also by contributing £6,000 of funding towards educational campaigns.

### **Future Activity**

19. From April 2007 the mechanism for providing funding for safety cameras changed. Monies are now provided via the existing LTP2 allocations and is an additional supplementary grant on top of the usual LTP allocations. These

monies are entirely grant (in effect a cash allocation) and are not therefore part of any 'borrowing'. The services provided by the Police and Her Majesty's Courts Service must be funded from this new LTP supplementary funding in order that they can continue to support the administration of any offences detected. However there is no longer a requirement to refund the Government through the value of fines.

20. Between KCC and Medway Council the total Grant allocation for 2007/08 was £3,488,336 and this exceeds current Partnership costs. From April 2007 all grant monies not used on the Safety Camera Partnership can be retained by the local authorities for use on other road safety initiatives and so the difference is being used to further the range of Road Safety activities in the county. The level of Grant in subsequent years reduces slightly year-on-year.
21. The introduction of the new funding arrangements has also brought a relaxation in the rules and governance of the project, allowing more flexibility (if it is needed) in the deployment of law enforcement techniques to target road safety issues. To this end the three Transport Authorities in the county have considered the incidence of mobile phone use while driving, and the non-wearing of seat belts by drivers.
22. These offences are regularly observed by the Partnership's Safety Camera Operators (when using mobile cameras) and are occasionally captured on film when a speeding driver is also clearly seen to be using a hand-held device and/or not wearing a seat belt. Until now the Department for Transport would not allow these offences to be processed under their regime. All but the most extreme offences have, until now, had to be overlooked.
23. Very recent surveys undertaken on urban roads in Kent and Medway show that around 10% of drivers and passengers are not wearing their seat belts, which is alarmingly high. Around 1% of drivers are also visibly using their hand-held mobile phones whilst driving in towns. In the last twelve months Kent Police attended 84 collisions resulting in fatal injuries; of these ten people were not wearing their seat belts. The incidents involving people who were at the time using a hand-held device or similar distraction is also an area of serious concern.

## **Proposal**

24. The Safety Camera Partnership's Board proposes to pilot and test a project whereby an offence of using a hand-held mobile phone, or similar device, should be processed through legal prosecution where the cameras have captured reliable evidence. The proposal also extends to processing seat belt offences where these also have been clearly observed by a Camera Operator and captured by camera. This is aimed at reducing the use of mobile phones while driving and is aimed at increasing seat belt use, both of which will impact positively on road casualty statistics in this county.
25. Members are asked to support a short-term trial, probably isolated to just one area in Kent and Medway, during which time any driver observed using a mobile phone will be contacted by letter to advise them that this is potentially dangerous as well as illegal. Where any occupant of a vehicle is seen not to be

wearing a seat belt then again it is proposed that the Partnership's staff write a letter to the Registered Keeper of that vehicle to advise them of the risks associated with not wearing a seat belt. During this trial period there will be no punitive prosecution except in the most extreme cases.

26. The use of mobile phones and seat belts will be surveyed again to judge what effect this trial will have had on road user behaviour, and I will report back to Members in early 2009 on the results.
27. There are no additional cost implications for this trial as the Partnership can use its existing resources to carry out this work. The detection of seat belt offences and mobile phone offences by the Partnership will remain restricted to the existing Safety Camera locations where there have been a history of serious injuries.
28. Also, Kent Police have embarked on a programme of modernising their Central Ticket Office procedures, equipment and staffing structures, which is on-going into 2008. The Partnership will continue to investigate improvements to efficiencies in the processing of offences in order to minimise operating costs; and to ensure that our openness and clarity with the public exceeds the expectations of the Freedom of Information Act.

## **Conclusion**

29. Members are asked to note the continuing success of the Partnership in reducing road deaths and serious injuries in its sixth year of operation, and the major contribution that this project makes towards KCC achieving the national targets for casualty reduction.
30. Members are also asked to approve the proposed trial of using the Partnership's existing resources to detect seat belt and mobile phone offences, and to write to offenders. This trial, if approved, would commence in the autumn.

---

Chris Rogers (01622 656391)  
Project Manager  
Kent and Medway Safety Camera Partnership

Background papers:

- Project Manager's Reports of:

- November 2002
- July 2003
- May 2004
- July 2004
- July 2005
- March 2006
- July 2006
- July 2007

This page is intentionally left blank

## **Progress Report on Major Capital Projects**

A report by the Head of Countywide Improvements to the Highways Advisory Board on 16<sup>th</sup> September 2008.

---

### **Introduction**

1. It is an appropriate time to update the Board on progress of the major transport and highway schemes following the last Report in March 2008. It is understood that the Board welcomes these reports and the intention is to continue to provide them half yearly and when there are important issues to bring to Members' notice.
2. The last six months continue to be dominated by the considerable efforts of the Team in progressing the growth area schemes in Kent Thameside and Ashford within the funding and time constraints; and progressing other schemes, mainly in East Kent. All of this has been made more difficult than usual against the inevitable settling in period involved in the KHS Transformation.
3. Everards Link Phase 2 was completed in July, in accordance with the revised timetable and spend profile agreed with DCLG.
4. The Public Inquiry into the statutory Orders for Sittingbourne Northern Relief Road commenced on 8 July and sat for seven days. Preparation beforehand and attendance at the Inquiry required the intensive participation of Jacobs staff and County Council staff across a number of Divisions.
5. East Kent Access Phase 1C received the Institution of Civil Engineers South East Association Brassey Awards 2008 in the Transport Project category and as Overall Winner. The scheme also received the Jacobs Performance Excellence Award 2008 which is a European award that won against a wide range of projects. This was a challenging scheme and the awards are a deserved recognition for the Project Manager, Jacobs and the contractor May Gurney.
6. The Board will be aware that Union Railways/London & Continental Railways have made a substantial claim against the County Council in connection with the South Thameside Development Route Stage 4. Following the Lands Tribunal hearing into Preliminary Issues in December 2007, the decision was issued in June and the President found for the claimants. However, the County Council has been granted leave to appeal in the Court of Appeal which would probably be heard later in 2008/early 2009.
7. The issue of construction inflation being significantly higher than retail price inflation remains a major concern for the funding of the larger LTP projects such as East Kent Access Phase 2 and Sittingbourne Northern Relief Road. DfT funding is on a cash basis and the County Council is obliged to make judgements about inflation over the development and construction period of the project.

## Progress

8. A progress or status report on Fastrack Everards Link Phase 2, Sittingbourne Northern Relief Road, Rushenden Relief Road, Ashford Ring Road, Newtown Road Bridge, Other Ashford Schemes, Eurokent Phases 4 & 5, Fort Hill De-dualling, East Kent Access Phase 2, other schemes and Land matters is given in the Appendix to this Report.

For brevity, only some of the background provided in previous reports is provided with the focus given to activity in the last half year.

A number of acronyms are used and a glossary is given at the start.

## Conclusion

9. Some of the issues referred to are live and matters may have progressed since the time of writing this Report. Where appropriate a verbal report will be given to the Board Meeting.
10. This report is for Members' information.

---

**Contact Officer:** John Farmer (01622) 696881

### Scheme Contacts

Kent Thameside Fastrack, Everards Link – John Turner  
Kent Thameside Fastrack, Northfleet Embankment – John Turner  
Sittingbourne Northern Relief Road – John Turner  
Rushenden Relief Road – Richard Shelton (Jacobs seconded Project Manager)  
Ashford Ring Road – Jamie Watson  
Newtown Road Bridge, Ashford – Jamie Watson  
Ashford Future Schemes – Simon Beaney (Jacobs seconded Project Manager)  
Eurokent, Thanet – John Farmer  
Fort Hill De-dualling – John Farmer  
East Kent Access Phase 2 – Geoff Cripps  
Borough Green Bypass – John Turner  
Operation Stack Lorry Park – John Farmer  
A2 On-Slip, Canterbury – Geoff Cripps  
Maidstone Schemes – John Turner  
Land and Property – Isla Britchford

## **Glossary of Terms**

DCLG	Department of Communities and Local Government
GAF(2)	Growth Area Funding – 2 <sup>nd</sup> tranche
GAF(3)	Growth Area Funding - current 3 <sup>rd</sup> tranche
CIF	Community Infrastructure Fund
DfT	Department of Transport
PE	Programme Entry
CA	Conditional Acceptance
LCA Part 1	Land Compensation Act Part 1
MTP	Medium Term Plan
NR	Network Rail
LTP	Local Transport Plan
CPO	Compulsory Purchase Order
SRO	Side Roads Order
SEEDA	South East England Development Agency
S106 contribution	Contribution under the Town & Country Planning Act
S106 Scheme	Navigable waterway Order under the Highways Act
S278 Agreement	Developer funded and constructed highway works

## **Kent Thameside**

### **Fastrack**

#### **Everards Link Phase 2 (EL2)**

Phase 2 will provide a link from the bus interchange at Greenhithe Station (Everards Link Phase 1) through to Ingress Park and eventually onto Swanscombe Peninsula. This will become part of the Fastrack riverside route.

Construction, by Birse Civils Limited, was completed at the end of July 2008. The cost has been funded by a £5.3m allocation from DCLG's CIF programme.

Although final accounts have yet to be submitted the scheme looks to have been delivered under the agreed budget. Various programme adjustments and hence quarterly funding projections have been needed and DCLG has been very supportive in managing change.

The scheme cannot be brought into use until Crest Nicholson, the developer of the Ingress Park site, has completed its connection of the route into Ingress Park. This is a planning obligation on the development of the site

When construction started, Crest was intending to construct their section in a similar time frame to EL2, but this has not happened. It is disappointing that the private sector has been unable to play its part in the timely support of the transport strategy for Kent Thameside.

Crest has an obligation to have its section of the Fastrack link completed by October 2010. It has informally indicated its intention to start construction in May 2009. However, with the down turn in the housing market there is no guarantee that date will be met. In any case the main works on the Crest site have to be done between May and September in any year, to avoid an important bat roost.

The County Council has therefore been faced with the issue of and cost of securing the EL2 works, and in particular the new underpass at The Avenue and an excavation that remains open at the start of the Crest section.

The underpass has been physically sealed at both ends, the excavation has been secured and overall access to the busway boarded off. However, keeping the site secure for what might be as long as 18 months is a concern and will continue to be monitored.

Although the County Council are no longer directly involved it is useful to mention that Network Rail are well advanced with works for the second phase of the upgrade of Greenhithe Station. This includes a new footbridge with lifts linking the platforms to replace a subway and general platform upgrades to complement the new booking hall that was completed in 2007.

#### **Northfleet Embankment**

This is another link in the Kent Thameside Fastrack public transport network.

SEEDA is Master Planning the development of the Northfleet Embankment area, broadly the land from Grove Road at Northfleet eastwards to the existing Imperial

Business Estate at Gravesend. This development will include dedicated Fastrack links.

The current network is missing a dedicated link from Bath Street, Gravesend to the Imperial Business Estate. DCLG is funding the design of this link with a view to a submitting a planning application.

### **Sittingbourne Northern Relief Road**

The Relief Road will provide a link across Milton Creek, linking Ridham Avenue and Castle Road, where existing developer funded sections of the Relief Road have already been built. It is a complex and expensive scheme because in addition to the Creek crossing, the scheme crosses the Sittingbourne & Kemsley Light Railway and a redundant landfill site.

The funding approval in principle is based on an estimated cost of £43.0m and funded by £29m LTP, £9.9m DCLG and £4.1 S106 developer funding.

The Public Inquiry into the Statutory Orders commenced on 8 July and sat for seven days. This was twice the anticipated time, mainly due to the number of non-statutory objectors heard, the time they took and the way in which the Inquiry was directed by the Inspector.

Prior to the Public Inquiry, a submission was made to satisfy Condition 4 of the planning consent that required submission of details of alternative bridge designs prior to the commencement of construction. A report, the 'Moveable Bridge Report', produced by Jacobs was submitted in fulfilment of this Condition. The planning condition was discharged by the Planning Applications Committee at its meeting on 13 May 2008.

Four of the five statutory objections to the CPO and SRO were negotiated away and the Public Inquiry was substantially about the S106 Scheme. Objectors were arguing for an opening bridge to ensure there was no restriction to navigation and that future regeneration of the creek should not be prejudiced.

The County Council's position is that £4-5m (increased capital cost and future maintenance/operating costs) for an opening bridge cannot be justified on the basis of the very limited use of the Creek, as identified in an independent report commissioned by the County Council and as demonstrated by objectors at the Inquiry and the absence of identified regeneration proposals that include boating as a key component.

The Inquiry went into considerable detail but the fundamental issue remains for the Inspector to consider and advise the Secretary of State as to whether the County Council is correct in its stance that it is not appropriate for the public sector to incur a large additional and unfunded cost for what is low or aspirational use of the Creek by yachts.

Little progress can now be made, other than at risk, until the Inspector submits his report and the Secretary of State has made a decision.

If the decision on confirmation of the Statutory Orders is delayed, or the current fixed bridge proposal rejected, then the Relief Road will be considerably delayed and prejudiced. The planning consent for the scheme expires in September 2009 and

delay, or rejection of the fixed bridge, would require a completely new planning submission. A moveable bridge decision would also require re-publication of the S106 Scheme, with the possibility of objections and another Inquiry, and further funding would need to be secured, including covering the effects of construction inflation resulting from the delay.

However, we are working with Jacobs to produce a number of programmes and spend profiles that will allow a degree of work on further scheme design and contract procurement processes to go ahead at minimal risk.

It is the case though that if a decision on the confirmation of the Statutory Orders is not made by about March 2009, the prospect of commencement of works within the timescale of the planning consent is very low. The delay to the Scheme could then be of the order of 18-24 months.

### **Rushenden Relief Road**

The County Council is progressing this scheme on behalf of and at the request of SEEDA. The scheme provides a new link between the A249 and the regeneration areas avoiding the unsuitable Main Road. The estimated cost is about £13m and would be funded by DCLG and SEEDA resources.

SEEDA are the Lead body for funding, assembling the land and satisfying the planning conditions.

SEEDA has had considerable difficulty in finalising the land negotiations and responding to the planning conditions to the satisfaction of English Nature but all this has now been completed.

The design is completed and the County Council invited construction tenders in summer 2007 at the request of SEEDA in anticipation of a start in autumn 2007. With the delay by SEEDA the validity of these tenders has now lapsed.

SEEDA are in discussions with DCLG on the revised funding and spend profile required to deliver the scheme with a revised start date of spring 2009.

New tenders will need to be invited at the end of September at the latest to achieve the desired start date. However, a formal Agreement is also required with SEEDA covering funding and risk and the County Council would require to see substantive progress on this and the key principles agreed before inviting tenders again.

All major infrastructure projects are difficult and the County Council and SEEDA continue to work in partnership to deliver this important regeneration infrastructure scheme for Sheppey.

### **Ashford Ashford Ring Road 2 Way Transformation**

The scheme is for the transformation of the Ring Road to 2 way and enhanced public realm and shared space concepts to the south and west sectors between Station Road and New Street. The scheme also includes enhanced public realm to Bank Street between Tufton Street and Elwick Road.

The total cost of the scheme is some £16m and is in the main funded from DCLG GAF(2) and GAF(3) but with other public, private and European funding.

Any major changes to a town centre road are difficult and controversial but this is compounded by the introduction of innovative shared space concepts and complex public realm designs, art and materials.

While much of this is new and at the forefront, Ashford is not a 'one-of' and these ideas are increasingly being promoted and advocated nationally as a solution to balance the needs of all users in town centres across the UK.

Substantial progress is being made. The Phase 1 transformation of the Ring Road to 2-way operation was successfully completed in July 2007 ahead of the Tour de France.

In July 2008 the public realm improvements to Bank Street were formally completed and marked by an event involving Members and the local business community.

The Victoria Road/Beaver Road junction conversion from a roundabout to a signalised junction together with the associated Victoria Road realignment was substantially completed in July 2008.

All efforts are now being directed at substantially completing the public realm works to Elwick Road/Godinton Road/West Street/Forge Lane by the end of October 2008 so that there are no major traffic management measures and inconvenience to the town centre and Ashford business community in the pre- Xmas trading period. The Godinton Road/Forge Lane section has been closed to traffic – with suitable diversions in place - to allow free access for construction over this complex section and to support the end date objective.

Following the announcement of GAF(3) funding at the end of 2008 it was possible to commit to the final scheme for West Street and Forge Lane. Unfortunately in spring 2008 the tensions between managing a live contact and imposing major design changes to replace an interim scheme led to financial monitoring and project management difficulties. A significant funding gap became apparent and following a thorough review it was identified that the likely out-turn cost could be as much as £1.5m short. This shortfall has now been covered by a further allocation of GAF(3) and LTP IT funding.

The difficulties on the Ring Road are varied and complex and a detailed report has been presented to the Ashford's Future Partnership Board. Experience has shown the need for absolute clarity about the scheme to be delivered and the roles and responsibilities at the outset and greater realism about what can be delivered within a short funding period. These lessons have been learnt for Victoria Way and future Ashford schemes.

It hardly needs saying that DCLG, Ashford's Future and Ashford Borough Council has been very supportive in understanding the complexity of the schemes and accommodating the increased cost and revised spend profiles.

### **Newtown Road Bridge, Ashford**

The scheme is to replace the deck carrying the railway and gain width and increased headroom so that the route is available for a future high quality SMARTLINK bus

service and to provide a better and less oppressive route for pedestrians and cyclists. The scheme has £4.8m Growth Area and £0.2m LTP IT funding and is being delivered on our behalf by Network Rail.

The scheme is close to completion. The bridge is substantially complete and the associated utility diversions and highway improvements are underway leading to completion in December 2008.

Tenders for the main bridgeworks were significantly above Network Rail's estimates and DCLG has been very supportive in accepting both increased funding and revised spend profiles.

### **Ashford – Transport Strategy**

The County Council is actively working on two projects that are the immediate priority within the overall Transport Strategy for Ashford:

- Victoria Way Phase 1 – A link between Victoria Road and Leacon Road. Although ostensibly to create a town centre street to reflect the growth of the town centre it will also offer a degree of traffic relief to the town centre. See separate Report to this Board meeting.

Funding will be from GAF(3) and CIF if current bid being prepared is successful.

- Drovers Roundabout to M20 Junction 9 – Improvements and signalisation of Drovers roundabout, signalisation of Junction 9 and a new footbridge over the M20. The scheme is related to development proposals including the proposed Park and Ride. A Report to the November 2008 meeting of the Board is anticipated.

Funding will be from GAF(3), RIF if current bid is successful and developer funding.

### **East Kent**

#### **Eurokent Phases 4 & 5, Thanet**

In partnership with Thanet District Council (TDC), SEEDA, and Rosefarm Estates, the County Council is constructing the access road at Eurokent. The County Council is forward funding the bulk of the Phase 5 construction costs on the back of the uplifted land values. The scheme will facilitate the development of the site and provide local bypass to a particularly poor section of Haine Road.

The overall cost is some £6.7m and SEEDA and Rosefarm are contributing £1.3m leaving the net cost to the County Council of £5.4m consistent with the budget allocation.

The 4-way land and funding Agreement was completed in December 2007.

Construction by Jackson Civil Engineering started in January 2008 and remains on target for completion in November 2008.

In addition to the highway works, the scheme includes the full provision of utilities so that adjacent development sites are fully serviced. A key element of this is the provision of a deep gravity foul sewer requiring micro-tunnelling techniques where open trench excavation is not appropriate.

On completion, a local bypass of Haine Road will have been achieved and limited traffic management measures will be installed on Haine Road to discourage unnecessary traffic. Residents and businesses will be consulted but full severance of the road is not proposed as it is desirable to retain a diversion route for traffic in the event of an incident or planned maintenance.

## **East Kent Access Phase 2**

Government indicated its intent in principle to fund the £64m cost when Programme Entry status was approved in July 2006.

The statutory Orders were published in October 2006 and a Public Inquiry was held in April 2007. The main statutory objections were successfully negotiated away.

EDF has a sub-station that requires to be moved and they look to the County Council to secure the necessary land. This is unusual as utilities typically use their own resources and powers to secure land and rights for service alterations. Land for the sub-station was not therefore included in the CPO and it has taken until August 2008 to secure land acceptable to EDF by voluntary negotiation. Now that this constraint has been removed it is anticipated that the Secretary of State will be in a position to confirm the Orders soon.

In anticipation of confirmation of Orders, work has progressed in preparing and submitting to DfT the Conditional Approval (CA) submission. This is an onerous task and requires a detailed submission that updates the Programme Entry bid and confirms the business case and scheme cost estimates and is formally submitted to DfT after the Orders are approved. Consideration of the CA by DfT can take 3 months and approval gives the Council Council authority to invite construction tenders.

Since Programme Entry the estimated cost of the scheme has increased to £71.00m. The bulk of this increase is the result of programme slippage and construction inflation and only a small element of the increase can be attributable to a direct increase in cost arising from the detailed design development of the scheme.

It is unfortunate that DfT seem unwilling to make this distinction and just look at the headline cost increase and as a consequence are demanding more supporting information beyond that which has already been submitted to them informally and following earlier discussions.

In any event, DfT has published new Guidance on Major Scheme Funding. EKA2 is regarded as a 'Transition Scheme' and if CA is approved then the County Council will be required to fund 25% of any increase over the £64m PE approval. DfT is passing all responsibility for assessing construction inflation unfairly onto promoters when Government is best placed to influence through national economic policy and to make those predictions.

In terms of the County Council's 25% contribution it has been identified and agreed with DfT that this can form part of the post scheme LCAPart1 liability. This has the advantage of being a liability spread over several years and in the future and gives more scope to budget for it within the context of the MTP.

EKA2 is a big scheme in major project terms but the principal risks are related to the long skew box structures under the railway at Foads Lane, archaeology and construction inflation.

Network Rail are actively involved and co-operating in principle but their processes are onerous and their stance can be inconsistent. EKA2 is a vital scheme to support the local community and the scheme is at the point where some higher level Officer or political engagement with Network Rail may be necessary.

Archaeology is likely to be extensive. Until excavation starts there is clearly a high degree of uncertainty but it is largely within our control and contract documentation is structured to build in flexibility to mitigate the risk. A key part of the tender list selection process was firms demonstrating proven experience on projects with a significant archaeological interest.

Construction inflation is a major concern and significantly out-stripping retail price inflation. At the start of the year, 6% was a reasonable judgement but following the recent increases in fuel prices the industry is suggesting 7-8%. Judging inflation several years hence is clearly difficult and small % increase changes can be very significant in quantum terms and financial liability.

In anticipation of Order confirmation and CA approval and construction procurement, a tenderer selection process has been conducted in accordance with European Union guidance. The process has been rigorous and involved a two-stage process and presentation to the firms so that they fully understood the issues and client requirements. Contractors have been selected using a financial and quality selection criteria and three firms have passed a pre-determined scoring threshold. It is inappropriate to add firms to the list just to generate a tender list of 4 or 5 firms.

In view of the further work to support the CA submission, DfT has advised that it might support the County Council inviting tenders in advance of CA approval. It would be preferable for both the County Council and tenderers to have the confidence that the next stage of funding approval had been achieved but there would also be benefits that tender returns would give that higher degree of reality about the construction cost and funding need.

These options are being assessed but a full construction start before summer 2009 is unlikely but proposals must be developed so that a substantive start must be made before September 2009 when the planning consent lapses. On this basis, completion of the scheme and being open to traffic is unlikely before the end of 2011.

### **Fort Hill De-dualling, Margate**

As part of the regeneration of Margate the decision was taken Corporately to de-dual Fort Hill to reduce severance and integrate the Turner Contemporary and Rendezvous sites more with the town and particularly the old town.

The scheme will include public realm and accessibility improvements to Harbour View and King Street, and to The Parade and Duke Street that are being promoted by Thanet District Council.

The overall cost is just over £1.0m and funding is £550,000 from the County Council, £200,000 from the Integrated Transport allocation for footway enhancements and the

remaining £300,000 from Objective 2 funding from ERDF funding secured by Thanet District Council and the County Council. The scheme is on budget but in any event the public realm works will if necessary be tailored to match the Objective 2 funding available.

Ringway commenced the works on 7 April and the de-dualling works are on programme to complete in October in accordance with a commitment given by the Director of Highway Services. The works are proceeding well and traffic is planned to be moved onto the new carriageway at the end of August. The high quality of the completed Parade area has been noted locally.

When the de-dualling scheme is completed and the released land is surplus to highway requirements a Stopping Up Order will be published to formally remove the public highway rights. The public realm works to King Street, Harbour View and Duke Street (recently added to the project) will not commence until September after the summer season and school holidays.

The de-dualling completion date of October is critical to the Turner Contemporary construction programme because the Turner works will be on part of what is currently highway.

## **Mid Kent**

### **Borough Green & Platt Bypass**

Following issues that led to the abandonment of the Celcon Planning Application Public Inquiry in 2007, the Leader gave a commitment that the County Council would submit a new planning application for the Bypass.

The development costs of about £200,000 are coming from top slicing KHS revenue allocation.

Work is on programme to submit a new application in March 2009. Environmental surveys continue, topographical survey is completed, traffic surveys are complete and a traffic model being developed.

Work remains on programme to submit a planning application in March 2009, on the basis that the scheme will be non-controversial with interested parties acting reasonably in the development of a new planning application.

However, the surveys and design work here raised two issues. The extraction of sand under the line of the bypass and the restoration of the land has left a number of areas of standing water. The ecological surveys to date have revealed that these areas host Great Crested Newts. This means that the County Council will have to identify and secure land for compensatory habitat outside the "red line" of the earlier planning consent. Changes in management of surface water drainage may mean attenuation lagoons of a greater size than in the original scheme, perhaps requiring land outside the "red line".

These issues are under consideration and discussion with Natural England and the Environment Agency but could delay the planning application submission or at least the issue of any planning consent.

## **A2 Slips Canterbury**

For some time, the County Council has been working with Canterbury City Council and assessing the traffic aspects and feasibility of providing the 'missing' slip roads on A2 Canterbury Bypass at Harbledown, A28 Wincheap and Bridge.

The headline benefits are that better provision of slip roads would improve accessibility and reduce unnecessary journeys within the City Centre.

The easiest, cheapest and most deliverable slip road would be the provision of the on-slip at Wincheap.

In a major step forward, Tom Harris MP, the Minister for State for Transport agreed in December 2007, that the on-slip at Wincheap can proceed and on the basis that associated measures are progressed in parallel to ensure the benefits to the City Centre are captured.

The on-slip is estimated to cost £1.5m and will be funded from the Integrated Transport allocations.

The County Council will promote and deliver the scheme. The scheme is being developed but planning permission and Orders will be required and a start before 2010 is unlikely and this would be influenced by whether a public inquiry was necessary.

The County Council is also actively engaged with the City Council and its development partner for the redevelopment of Wincheap business estate. These proposals would involve the provision of the off-slip and the local bypass of the A28 through the redeveloped area to take traffic away from the historic Wincheap area. The proposals are at an early stage but for practical and procedural reasons the County Council may ultimately lead on any future promotion of the off-slip.

## **Maidstone Schemes**

### **All Saints Link Road**

Maidstone Borough Council (MBC) has had long-standing aspirations for an All Saints Link Road (ASLR) that would run between Bishops Way and Wrens Cross. The objective is to remove traffic from that part of College Road between the Archbishop's Palace and the Carriage Museum and from Palace Avenue/Lower Stone Street. This would allow for some regeneration of the area and bring the Palace and its outbuildings together.

MBC has recently achieved Growth Point status and this had given added impetus to their aspirations for the Bypass.

The scheme is essentially to achieve environmental and regeneration benefits and neutral in traffic terms. The County Council has been asked to progress the Bypass on behalf of the Borough Council and with costs reimbursed.

The immediate objective is to develop an outline design in sufficient detail so that meaningful consultations can be had with statutory consultees to secure acceptance to a preferred scheme that could then be taken forward to planning consent.

The allocation of funding to MBC is such that with other schemes on its wish list there is limited funding for the ASLR design. It seems that there is not sufficient to promote a planning application, and no certainty that capital funding would come forward in the life of a planning consent if achieved in the next 18 months – 2 years.

MBC have yet to confirm the funding available for ASLR to inform the extent of the work that can be commissioned from Jacobs.

### **Upper Stone Street layby**

The Upper Stone Street scheme was to provide a layby on Upper Stone Street, to reduce the impact on traffic of inappropriate on-street parking. Consideration of the layby followed agreement in 2006 between the County Council and MBC about the rescinding of major works on Upper Stone Street which then allowed sale of property acquired for those works.

However, the area in which a layby could be provided without acquisition of other land is in an area where a layby might see little use and where a safety audit of a preliminary design has cast doubt on the proposal generally.

The intention was that capital receipts, up to some £300,000, would be used to fund design and construction of a layby.

An appropriate layby would require acquisition of land and a cost well in excess of the £300,000.

It would be more appropriate to develop a strategy for service access on the whole of Upper Stone Street and to implement that progressively, perhaps through development contributions.

No further action at present.

### **Wrens Cross**

The County Council wishes to see redevelopment of the Wrens Cross site that it owns and includes Listed buildings in a poor state.

The site is affected, albeit indirectly, by both the ASLR scheme and an Upper Stone Street layby strategy and the improvement of the Wrens Cross junction as part of the ASLR scheme.

Redevelopment options depend on whether the Listed structure is physically affected by the improvement of the Wrens Cross junction but that cannot be determined without design work that is as yet unfunded.

### **South East Maidstone Strategic Route (SEMSR) (to replace Leeds & Langley Bypass)**

No work on this scheme at present pending the outcome of traffic modelling work being undertaken to inform the Maidstone Borough Council Local Development Framework (LDF).

This LDF process has been delayed by MBC's need to consider, amongst other things, the Kent International Gateway application and the impact that might have on traffic flows in the area.

When this further work is completed the situation can be reviewed and discussion held with MBC on the way forward.

## **Land Matters**

### **Property and Land Held for Highway Purposes**

The only significant portfolio of properties that continue to be held are for the London Road – Hadlow Road Link, Tonbridge and they have a face asset value of some £5m. It is an important scheme in Tonbridge & Malling's Local Development Framework aspirations for Tonbridge but it is expensive and has failed to secure developer funding in the many years that it has been an approved scheme. Discussions continue with Tonbridge & Malling as to the realistic viability of securing funding for the scheme in the short to medium term and if not whether abandonment of the scheme and realisation of the assets needs to be reconsidered.

Many ad-hoc parcels of land continue to be identified by Corporate Property as in County Council ownership and held for highway purposes. The need to retain this land continues to be robustly reassessed in support of the Corporate initiative to realise capital receipts from tied up assets so that they can be better directed at services and more immediate and deliverable projects in support of T2010 objectives.

### **Land Compensation Act Part 1 Claims (LCAPart1)**

Claims are being received and assessed for:

A228 Leybourne & West Malling Bypass

M20 Junction 4

Hawkinge Bypass – Phase 1 – see below

Kemsley Fields – see below

Fastrack Phase 1 Major Scheme

Everards Link Phase 1

Other County and Developer schemes

The level of service to claimants and agents has temporarily suffered over the last 4 months as a staff resource has been lost as a result of the KHS Transformation process.

In the March 2008 Report I referred to the complaint to the Ombudsman in respect of Hawkinge Bypass Phase 1.

In summary, claims were rejected because the road had not been adopted within 3 years as required under the legislation. The Ombudsman accepted that there had been no intent by the County Council or collusion with the Developer to delay adoption to avoid valid claims being made but asked what remedy the County Council proposed.

In May 2008, the Cabinet Member took the decision that the claimants would be invited to resubmit their claims and that they would be processed in the normal way.

Developers frequently complain about the future intensification of use component of claim assessment. This is particular the case where the Developer builds a section of road that is or later becomes part of a wider strategic network.

The Developer of Kemsley Fields was particularly affected because this section from A249 connects into the proposed Sittingbourne Northern Relief Road (SNRR). The S278 Agreement was completed in 1992 and the SNRR was not an active proposal at that time. After taking Counsel advice and further consideration, the view is that a Developer can only provide an indemnity for what was reasonably known and understood by the parties to the S278 at the time it was completed. On that basis a Deed of Variation has been entered into with the Developer whereby any extra-over liability associated with the Relief Road will be met by the County Council.

This was an unusual situation and unlikely to be a frequent issue. However, KHS staff and Legal Services preparing S278 Agreements have been advised to bear this in mind when considering the LCA Part 1 financial indemnity clauses.

This page is intentionally left blank

## **Victoria Way Phase 1, Ashford**

### **Approval to Scheme Outline Design and Implementation Strategy**

A report by the Head of Countywide Improvements to the Highways Advisory Board on 16<sup>th</sup> September 2008.

---

#### **Introduction**

1. The transformation of the old ring road will be substantially completed in November 2008.
2. One of the key priorities for the newly created Ashford's Future Company and Ashford Future Partnership Board is now the implementation of Victoria Way Phase 1 which will create a new 'town centre' street and transport link between the International Station and A28 Chart Road via Leacon Road and Brookfield Road. See Fig 1.
3. This report sets out the background, design principles, funding and implementation strategy and governance issues. It also seeks approval to an initial outline design for the scheme as a basis for moving forward to public consultation, negotiations over land assembly and a planning application.

#### **Background**

4. The transformation of the old ring road has removed unnecessary road space and some traffic capacity. Plans are being progressed as part of the approved Transport Strategy for Ashford, that include Park & Ride and a new SMARTLINK bus rapid transit scheme, to limit traffic flows on the old ring road to about 85% of 2003 flows. The Borough Council's plans for the first Park & Ride on land near M20 junction 9 that include an enabling development proposal have been delayed and this increases the importance of implementing Victoria Way. In addition to the need to provide an alternative route for some through traffic, Victoria Way provides an essential route to support the expansion of the town centre, that includes plans for a new Learning Campus (14,000 students), new housing (about 1500 dwellings), car parking and other mixed commercial uses.
5. The concept for Victoria Way is established in planning policy terms through the Greater Ashford Development Framework (GADF), the Local Development Core Strategy (adopted in July 08), the Ashford Town Centre Area Action Plan (ATCAAP), a draft Public Realm Strategy and a Concept Design Study Report.
6. The town centre is planned to grow to reflect the growth of Ashford as a whole and in particular to the south and southeast and extending beyond the railway corridor to the area around the existing Victoria Road. The concept for the new Victoria Way is the development of a quality street that provides a new multi-purpose street and transport route between Beaver Road and A28 Chart Road taking some traffic pressure off the transformed old ring road. A complementary but separate proposal is for the Learning Link that aims to improve the pedestrian and cyclist links across the railway corridor from South

Ashford to the town centre. The interchange between the Learning Link pathway and Victoria Way will become a focal hub not dissimilar to Elwick Square on Elwick Road.

7. Whitelaw Turkington with Jacobs as a sub-consultant, and working with artists within a multi-disciplinary team has produced a Concept Design Study for Victoria Way and the Learning Link.
8. Work to develop the scheme is currently funded from Growth Area Funding – round 3 (GAF3) and DfT has invited, following a preliminary submission, a detailed bid for £16m of Community Infrastructure Fund (CIF) funding for 2009/10 and to be spent by March 2011.
9. A combination of GAF3 and CIF funding is consistent with the current £17m indicative cost estimate for the Victoria Way scheme.

### **Corridor & Highway Design Standards**

10. The transport modelling work and strategy considerations has identified that:
  - Victoria Way should be a single carriageway
  - No long term need to upgrade to dual carriageway.
  - Traffic signals at Leacon Road/Brookfield Road junction.
  - Provided the planned improvements to the A28 Chart Road are undertaken within a reasonable period (by about 2016), there is no need in traffic terms, to provide a Phase 2 extension of Victoria Way over the railway to Cobbs Wood within the period to 2031.
11. Climate change, rising fuel costs, working practices and the anticipated modal shift to public transport through the SMARTLINK bus rapid transit scheme for Ashford reinforce the unlikely need to upgrade capacity beyond a single carriageway road.
12. Although there is no immediate need to improve the A28 'Matalan' roundabout, this should follow as part of A28 Chart Road improvements and timing would be related to the rate of house building in south west Ashford and Chilmington Green.

### **The Design Concept**

13. The Concept Design Study has proposed a general 24m wide corridor over the eastern section between Beaver Road and Gas Works Lane. This is considered essential to create the high quality street scene for the new multi-purpose street including cycle and service facilities, turning lanes for traffic, trees and a significant pedestrian area as well as the built in flexibility if at any time in the future some additional transport facilities such as bus lanes, and waiting and loading areas were considered necessary.
14. Between Gasworks Lane and Leacon Road a transitional corridor dictated, by the ZED Homes development boundary to the south and the National Grid land to the north, is considered suitable where there is less emphasis on street scene as the road connects into the more established and traditional development area at Leacon Road.

15. Leacon Road will remain as it is today serving the business premises along its length. A new traffic signal junction is proposed at Brookfield Road with local widening to provide turning lanes and safeguard future SMARTLINK bus turning movements as well as crossing facilities for pedestrians and cyclists.
16. It is considered that Victoria Way should be seen as a new area of integrated public realm supporting new developments that will follow the construction of the Phase 1 scheme at a later date. However, the corridor is well defined by the end points, existing land use, an EDF sub-station constraint and ZED Homes planning consent - following an appeal against non-determination by Ashford Borough Council. Previous work by Urban Initiatives following the GADF, established the planned corridor width and tested a range of alignment options following consultation with local residents and business groups in 2005/6.
17. It is therefore reasonable to establish the road corridor now but with the pragmatism that changes can be considered to accommodate the evolving public realm ideas.

### **Public Realm Strategy**

18. The Elwick Road, West Street and Bank Street works have followed the Public Realm Strategy and undoubtedly looks attractive and creates distinctiveness for Ashford. However, there are concerns about the use of expensive materials, that either require a high degree of laying accuracy or which are not dimensionally consistent and raise issues of laying quality.
19. The implementation of high quality public realm cannot be considered in isolation from realistic needs of future maintenance, new development and statutory undertakers plant. A public highway including road and pedestrian areas is both a traffic and utility corridor and constantly vulnerable to excavation particularly along Victoria Way where developments and utility provision is as yet largely undefined. Construction of development sites will also cause damage. High quality materials with tight dimensional accuracy are difficult to lift and reinstate or repair to the original standard.
20. Buildability is also a factor and occupation of the highway for longer than necessary, laying difficult materials involving lots of disk cutting with noise and dust is not sensible.
21. In a town street environment, large clear areas of public realm are rarely achievable and paving regularly needs to accommodate utility covers, signage and street furniture that can detract from the high standards aspired to. However, the design must cater for all users and careful detailing will be required to ensure that Victoria Way is a high quality scheme that provides Ashford with a vibrant new street.
22. It is therefore proposed that the carriageway surface should be largely conventional 'blacktop'. The additional public realm should use a simple palette of materials that does not demand a high standard of dimensional accuracy for laying and that come from proprietary sources that do not require spare materials to be stored. It is far better to have a public realm that can be maintained than one that in practice can never be maintained to the original standard.

23. It is accepted that street furniture such as street lights and benches that give that visual distinctiveness are required and may not be available from proprietary sources, e.g. the bespoke artist designed street lighting columns developed for Elwick Road, that can be very expensive and their maintenance and replacement cost must be funded from the scheme budget. Indeed all operation and maintenance costs over and above that for a conventional highway improvement must initially be funded from the scheme budget. Provision for the long term maintenance of quality town centre public realm across the County is also an issue that needs to be addressed and to offset criticism from residents and the business community of what they would see as failing maintenance standards.

### **Scheme Development & Implementation Strategy**

24. A two-stage approach is proposed to acknowledge the likelihood that a final public realm scheme would be vulnerable to damage from utilities and development construction, if installed now.
25. The full proposals including the full public realm scheme will however, be developed as a whole and submitted for planning consent.
26. The scheme for Phase 1 to be funded by the anticipated CIF funding and completed by 2011 will include the following (from east to west) (see Fig.2 – 5).
- (i) Beaver Road to Victoria Road School (Fig. 5) - The works to the junction of Victoria Way and Beaver Road (currently being completed as part of the Ring Road contract), will have some minor amendments to it to provide improved turning facilities at George Street. The road will be laid out in black top on a resurfaced carriageway, new kerblines and footways all within existing property constraints, and taking account of the current uses along this length as far as Victoria Road School.
  - (ii) Victoria Way School to ZED Homes site (Fig. 4 and Fig. 5) – a wider footway area is proposed fronting the school, and a school safety zone/traffic calmed area will be set out in changed carriageway materials to restrict traffic speeds to 20mph along the school frontage and extending west to include the crossing point of the Learning Link pathway. Victoria Square will be established in temporary, but good quality materials, through which the road route will pass over, requiring the demolition of the two Cherry Court office blocks. Some interim boundary treatments are proposed but respecting the existing uses.
  - (iii) The ZED Homes eastern site (Fig. 4 and Fig. 5) - the full 24m corridor width of highway route can be implemented, as land has been set aside for this within the ZED Homes planning permission. The route will include a single black top carriageway construction, with interim footway paving (that can be replaced with a higher quality scheme as development progresses). A new junction will be created at Gasworks Lane with turning lanes to provide access to and from the northern ZED homes site that includes a proposed multi storey car park.
  - (iv) The ZED Homes western site (Fig. 4) – west of Gasworks Lane junction the road will be laid out as above but with a reduced width corridor to reflect the ZED Homes housing scheme on the south side, an amended

access to the Southern Gas Networks Depot (National Grid Property) site to the north, and a transition to a standard road layout at Leacon Road.

- (v) Leacon Road (Fig. 2 and Fig. 3) will remain largely unaltered but a new traffic signal controlled junction with turning lanes, provision for pedestrians/cyclists to cross and safeguarding the route of future SMARTLINK buses will be installed at the junction of Brookfield Road.
27. Along development frontages, the wider public realm enhancement beyond the basic footway and cycleway provision will be regarded as a planning obligation on the respective developers and to be constructed with the development.
28. It is hoped that land for the scheme can be secured by voluntary negotiation but a Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) will be promoted to give programme certainty.
29. It is not necessary to acquire all of the land for the full scheme, and therefore become legally and financially liable for its acquisition, in order to build Phase 1. It is desirable that the onus is placed on developers of the land fronting Victoria Way to not only fund and build their frontage public realm but also to transfer the land at zero cost.
30. The situation in reality is not that simple. A considered view will have to be taken in due course about the extent of the planning application and CPO because including land along the south side of the Victoria Road which has several houses and commercial development might be inappropriate initially because of the Blight and associated cost implications.
31. ZED Homes has recently achieved a planning consent and they proposed building short isolated sections of Victoria Way to access their development. The planning permission allows for the full Victoria Way corridor to be safeguarded, but an interim scheme in order to meet their planned development phasing is proposed to be delivered by ZED Homes, not the Phase 1 scheme described above. Ashford Borough Council is in negotiations with ZED Homes regarding the consent and the outcome may also have implications for the Victoria Way implementation.

## **Project Governance**

32. The old ring road transformation is being successfully achieved, but not without issues of substantial increased cost, delay to programme and governance. The difficulties have been a consequence of having a complex innovative scheme within a town centre environment where the design programme slipped and overlapped construction procurement because of the overarching constraint of achieving spend within a funding deadline. This is not to deny some project management difficulties but they must be seen against the wider picture.
33. Experience has shown:
- The need for absolute clarity and sign off of the roles, responsibilities and scheme details between Chief Officers and Members within the County Council, Ashford Borough Council, Ashford's Future Company and Ashford's Future Partnership Board.

- Clarity on budget and deadlines for spend and realism of what can be achieved within the CIF 2 year funding window ending in March 2011 reflecting the processes and statutory procedures and external influences that can affect the delivery of a major highway scheme. The use of further GAF 3 support beyond March 2011, or other Ashford's Future partners' budgets may be able to assist in reducing any risks for the County Council around this spending deadline.
  - The need to progress the scheme within the budget allocated and for all parties involved to fully respect the agreed programme for delivery.
34. Achieving the above will allow the normal project management processes to function effectively and not be compromised notwithstanding the need for clear management of the Integrated Design Team that sets it apart from the traditional management of a Major Scheme.
  35. The Ashford's Future company has been set up by the main Ashford Future partners - Ashford Borough Council, the County Council, SEEDA and English Partnerships, specifically to take the lead on the delivery of the key projects required to deliver growth in Ashford. The concept of the new Victoria Way is one of these key priority projects and involves bidding for finance, enabling individual projects such as the 'quality street', car parking and development to all come forward in a co-ordinated way involving cross partnership co-operation to deliver the agreed vision.
  36. Victoria Way is a major regeneration scheme but it is also recognised that the road scheme will be 'public highway' and as such Kent Highway Services will have statutory operational and maintenance responsibility. While working fully with partners to achieve the mutual objectives for Victoria Way this legal responsibility is recognised and hence ultimate decision making on the highway scheme rests with the County Council.
  37. Put simply, the Ashford's Future Company has the overarching interest and responsibility for delivering the wider Victoria Way vision of which the Victoria Way highway/public realm scheme is only one, albeit key, element and is the direct responsibility of Kent Highway Services.
  38. This report is the basis of a cycle of reports and meetings with the partner organisations aimed at achieving this clarity of scheme vision and management responsibilities.

## **Programme**

39. The programme is aimed to achieve construction completion by March 2011 consistent with the funding timescales for CIF 2.
40. The main risks to achieving this programme are the conclusion of environmental and ecology survey and mitigation proposals and the successful acquisition of the land being achieved in time. The programme therefore relies on land being secured by voluntary agreement and without protracted negotiation, and no major ecological or design issues that in turn would delay consideration of the planning application.

41. The programme is optimistic but the Ashford's Future Company and Ashford's Future Partnership Board have accepted the risks involved.
42. The immediate activities are to progress the ecological and engineering surveys, develop the public realm design and consult with the local community and businesses with the objective of submitting a planning application in Spring 2009.
43. Jacobs have been appointed as the Lead Consultant and an Integrated Design Team is proposed to ensure input from all disciplines. Jacobs now have an in-house urban design capacity in the Maidstone Office and work on projects such as Dover Priory has been impressive. Whitelaw Turkington has been involved in the old ring road transformation scheme and were lead consultants for the Victoria Way Concept Design Study so they clearly have acquired knowledge. In the interests of the project and fairness to both consultants, a mini - design competition is being held to choose between them. Opening out the public realm procurement to other untried consultants was not considered to be in the best interests of the project and its timetable. Competition, albeit limited, will also give confidence about securing value for money.
44. The Integrated Design Team will include a public art involvement but this is low cost and the current commissions within the Concept Design Study will be extended.
45. A further report will be brought to the Board after public consultation and after the public realm proposals have been developed as a pre-cursor to obtaining Cabinet Member authority to submit a planning application. However, if programming priorities do not tie up with the Board schedule of meetings then any reporting may of necessity be a retrospective report.

## **Finance**

46. Scheme development is currently funded from GAF(3) which is held by Ashford Borough Council on behalf of the Ashford's Future Partnership Board. The Ashford's Future Business Plan has allocated £1.0m over 2007/08 and 2008/09. Any CIF2 funding award is likely to be direct to the County Council and a decision is likely in March 2009. Unlike the ring road project, Ashford Borough Council (rather than the County Council) is the Lead Body for GAF(3) and a formal funding agreement needs to be put in place.
47. DfT has invited Ashford's Future to submit a bid for £16m of Community Infrastructure Fund (CIF) funding by October 2009. A combination of GAF3 and a successful CIF2 funding bid is consistent with the current £17m indicative cost estimate.
48. The issue of future maintenance liability is accepted as an implicit factor in any new conventional highway infrastructure. However, the high quality public realm aspects of the ring road, Bank Street and now Victoria Way are a major concern. Public realm has higher maintenance costs and needs stocks of materials to be held e.g. paving materials and lighting columns. If the high quality objectives are to be sustained then maintenance also has to take place quickly after the need is identified. It is not just operational and structural maintenance that needs to be considered but the Borough Council would also

need increased resources to maintain the quality environment e.g. graffiti removal, litter clearance and chewing gum clearance.

49. GAF and CIF funding supports the capital cost but will not support the revenue implications of maintenance. These aspects are recognised by the partners and a protocol and appropriate funding mechanism will need to be established before the commitment is made to construct Victoria Way so that the County Council has the required confidence.

### **Recommendation**

50. Subject to the view of this Board it is proposed to recommend to the Cabinet Member for Environment, Highways & Waste that:-
- (a) the outline design for Victoria Way Phase 1 including the junction improvement for Leacon Road/Brookfield Road shown on Drg. No. B0501400 and H010 RevA is approved for development control and land charge disclosures.
  - (b) the general public realm and implementation strategy is noted.
  - (c) an Integrated Design Team is commissioned to develop the scheme proposals.
  - (d) 'in principle' negotiations are commenced with the commercial sector land owners to explore the potential for voluntary land acquisition.
  - (e) A Compulsory Purchase Order be progressed to ensure assembly of the land required for the scheme.

### **Contact Officers:**

John Farmer (01622) 696881 – Kent Highway Services

Andy Phillips (01233) 330823 – Ashford's Future Company

Figures to attach:-

Fig. 1 – Plan of Victoria Way within the Ashford Growth area context

Fig. 2-5 – Outline scheme plan

### **Background Documents:-**

Drg. No. B0501400 – H010 RevA on display

Victoria Way and Learning Link – Concept Design Study – January 2008

## **Amended Fees & Charges for 2008/09 and 2009/10**

A report by the Director of Kent Highway Services to the Highways Advisory Board on the 16<sup>th</sup> September 2008

---

### **Introduction**

1. This report seeks approval of amended fees and charges for 2008/09 (and 2009/10) in respect of a wide range of services provided by Kent Highway Services. The Local Government Act 2003 (Section 93) provides the power for charging for discretionary services but also stipulates that local authorities may only cover their reasonable costs in providing such services. This year fees were originally set for 2008/9 based on an approximate increase of 3%. This was in line with the anticipated rise in staff and administration costs. It has now become necessary to amend these charges due to additional increases in energy and other extraordinary costs. The current fees and charges will increase by approximately 10% and incorporate a degree of rounding up.
2. In order to prevent undue additional administration costs it is intended that the proposed new charges will be maintained through to March 2010. The increase is in line with the anticipated E&R budget increases for 2009/10.
3. This report is supplementary to the original report by the Director of Highways to the Highways Advisory Board on the 8<sup>th</sup> January 2008 and the report 'Income for Kent Highway Services' by the Alliance Executive to the Alliance Board on the 28<sup>th</sup> August 2008.

### **Conclusion**

4. Subject to the views of the Board the proposed amended Fees & Charges for 2008/09 and 2009/10 as set out in Appendices 1 and 2 will be recommended to the Cabinet Member for Environment, Highways & Waste for implementation with effect from 1st December 2008.
- 

#### Accountable Officers:

James Whitehorn [Finance] – 01622 696117  
Steve Horton [Road Safety] – 01622 221025

#### Background Documents:

Report by the Director of Highways to the Highways Advisory Board on the 8<sup>th</sup> January 2008.

**This page is intentionally left blank**

## Appendix 1

ITEM	FEE FOR 2007/08	FEE FOR 2008/09	AMENDED FEE FOR 2008/09	SERVICE GROUP
<b>Highway Definition –</b> Response to written or tel. enquiry from the public, solicitors, developers, district or parish councils re the highway boundary	£35	£37	<b>£40</b>	Transport and Development
Supplying plan to solicitors including an extract from the Definitive Map	£35	£37	<b>£40</b>	Transport and Development
<b>Land Charge Searches – CON 29</b>				
Self-service by a district council	No charge	No charge	<b>No charge</b>	Transport and Development
Part 1 enquiry answered by KHS	£12	£13	<b>£15</b>	
	£6	£7	<b>£10</b>	
Part 2 per additional answer by KHS	£35	£37	<b>£40</b>	
[Note: additional 10% handling fee is charged by the district for Part 1 & 2]	£5	£5	<b>£5</b>	
<b>Land Charges – Personal Searches</b>				
Up to 4 questions per site Each additional question				
<b>Approved Highway Schemes –</b> Information supplied, e.g. Board report	£35	£37	<b>£40</b>	County Wide Improvements
Copy of complete Scheme Drawings per plan supplied	£30	£31	<b>£35</b>	County Wide Improvements
Copy of extract from Scheme Drawings per plan supplied [up to max A3]	£20	£21	<b>£25</b>	County Wide Improvements
<b>Gazetteer:</b> un-collated copy per district	£25	£26	<b>£30</b>	Network Management
<b>Gazetteer:</b> collated copy per district	£30	£31	<b>£35</b>	
<b>Approved Strategies &amp; Policies</b> Printed copies of (cycling, walking, bus, maintenance plan, pavement design guide etc) for highway consultants	£25 each	£26 each	<b>£30 each</b>	Network Management

<b>Photocopies</b> of KHS documents or files for information:	10p per copy [minimum charge £10] No charge for staff time	10p per A4 copy 15p per A3 copy £1 per colour copy No charge for staff time	<b>10p per A4 copy</b> <b>15p per A3 copy</b> <b>£1 per colour copy</b> No charge for staff time	Business Performance, Communication & Finance
S278 fixed consultancy fee for advice to developer based on scheme value:  £0 - £50,000 £50,001 - £250,000 £250,001 - £1,000,000	£2,000 £4,000 £8,600	£2,060 £4,120 £8860	<b>£2200</b> <b>£4,500</b> <b>£15,000</b>	Technical Services
S278 fee for project management, design checks & site inspections	Actual costs incurred by KHS	Actual costs incurred by KHS	<b>Actual costs incurred by KHS</b>	Technical Services
<b>Tourism Signposting</b> Application fee	£155 + Actual costs incurred by KHS	£160 + Actual costs incurred by KHS	<b>£170</b> <b>+ Actual costs incurred by KHS</b>	Network Management
<b>Crash database</b> information supplied to highway consultants/businesses 3 year history of crashes at a location:- 5 year history of crashes at a location:- Note; there is no charge to members of the public/parish/district councils	£85  £160 (Excluding VAT)	£87  £165	<b>£100</b>  <b>£180</b>	Network Management
<b>Traffic Count</b> database information for private consultants/companies Manual count data  Automatic count data cost per week of information [Note: there is no charge to members of the public/parish/district councils]	Individually assessed  Individually assessed	Individually assessed  Individually assessed	<b>Individually assessed</b>  <b>Individually assessed</b>	Transport and Development  Transport and Development
<b>Stopping Up Orders</b> for Third Parties	Actual costs incurred by KHS	Actual costs incurred by KHS	<b>Actual costs incurred by KHS</b>	Transport and Development
<b>Pavement Licence</b> for	£115 per	£120 per	<b>£150 per</b>	

refreshment facilities with tables & chairs on the highway. Advertising costs are extra.	annum + £24 if defect found	annum + £24 if defect found	<b>annum + £25 if defect found</b>	Network Management
<b>Permit for Skip, Scaffolding, Hoarding or Materials stored on the highway</b>	£15 per week	£16 per week	<b>£20 per week</b>	Network Management
<b>Vehicle Crossing</b> over the footway Inspection fee [set by RASWA regs]	£72	£72	<b>£75</b>	Network Management
Admin fee for ordering the work	£115	£120	<b>£150</b>	
<b>Cycling Proficiency Training</b> Charges in this case are set for academic rather than financial year	£15 (from Sept 07)	£15 (from Sept 08)	<b>£15 (from Sept 08)</b>	Network Management
<b>National Driver Improvement Scheme</b> Self-financing scheme provided for Kent Police	£180	£186	<b>£190</b>	Network Management
<b>Speed Awareness Course</b> Self-financing scheme provided for Kent Police	£115	£95	<b>£100</b>	Network Management
<b>Minibus Driver Training</b> Internal KCC charge per driver	£110	£113	<b>£115</b>	Network Management
<b>Minibus Driver Reassessment</b> Internal KCC charge per driver	£30	£31	<b>£35</b>	Network Management
<b>School Crossing Patrol (SCP)</b> Internal SLA with KCC Education for training and monitoring SCP	£22,040	£22,040	<b>£22,040</b>	Network Management
<b>Theatres in Education</b> Charge to school for performance – approx £250 per performance	50% of cost	50% of cost	<b>50% of cost</b>	Network Management

## Appendix 2

ITEM	Charge for 2008/09	Amended Charge for 2008/09 and 2009/10
<b>Structures</b>	Cost of inspection, maintenance and commuted sum for eventual replacement in 120 years. Amount determined on a scheme specific basis.	Cost of inspection, maintenance and commuted sum for eventual replacement in 120 years. Amount determined on a scheme specific basis.
<b>Soakaways</b> (where smaller than structure definition)  Basic commuted sum factored by 1.5 to 3.0 depending on type, complexity and location  Structural Soakaways	Cost of inspection and maintenance over 15 years	Cost of inspection and maintenance over 15 years
	Commuted sum of £4,800 per soakaway	Commuted sum of £5,000 per soakaway
	Additional commuted sum for replacement cost	Additional commuted sum for replacement cost
<b>Traffic Signals</b>	Cost of inspection and maintenance over 15 years:	Cost of inspection and maintenance over 15 years:
	£55,600 per traffic signal junction £27,800 per pelican crossing	£60,000 per traffic signal junction £30,000 per pelican crossing
<b>Other traffic/signage system equipment</b> eg. illuminated signs, variable message signs, interactive speed signs, public transport real time inf. etc.	Cost of inspection and maintenance over 15 years; amount determined on a scheme specific basis	Cost of inspection and maintenance over 15 years; amount determined on a scheme specific basis
<b>Landscaping</b>	Cost of inspection and maintenance over 15 years; amount determined on a scheme specific basis	Cost of inspection and maintenance over 15 years; amount determined on a scheme specific basis
<b>Street Lighting</b>	Cost of inspection and maintenance over 25 years (but only if non standard higher cost equipment is accepted and installed).	Cost of inspection and maintenance over 25 years (but only if non standard higher cost equipment is accepted and installed).
<b>Approved Consultants List</b>	Standard charge of £270 to assess a consultant who wishes to be on the list	Standard charge of £300 to assess a consultant who wishes to be on the list
<b>Approval, Audit and Inspection</b> of consultants' projects during construction	Staff costs recharged to developers at hourly rates	Staff costs recharged to developers at hourly rates
<b>Non-standard or enhanced surfacing &amp; street furniture</b>  <b>Other items:</b>  On Bus Transponder Unit Real time information Sign Junction Priority Receiver LED Variable Message Sign Prism Variable Message Sign CCTV Camera Automatic Rising Bollard	Cost of inspection and maintenance over 25 years for non standard higher cost materials; amount determined on a scheme specific basis Cost of inspection and maintenance over 10 years: £8,100 £12,200 £3,100 £18,700 £10,300 £23,700 £169,000	Cost of inspection and maintenance over 25 years for non standard higher cost materials; amount determined on a scheme specific basis Cost of inspection and maintenance over 10 years: £9,000 £13,500 £3,500 £20,000 £11,500 £25,000 £200,000