

KENT COUNTY COUNCIL

HIGHWAYS ADVISORY BOARD

MINUTES of A meeting of the Highways Advisory Board held in the Darent Room, Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone on Tuesday, 8 January 2008.

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

IN ATTENDANCE: Mr G Harrison-Mee, Director, Kent Highway Services; Mr D Hall, Head of Transport & Development; Mr N Bateman, Head of Technical Services; Mrs R Best, Transport Planner (Rural and Cycling); Mrs C Bruce, Head Of Network Management; Mr J Farmer, Regeneration & Projects Manager; Mr K Hills, Head of Community Operations; Mr M Palmer, Head of Finance; Mr I Procter, Road Safety Manager; and the Head of Democratic Services (represented by Mrs K Mannering).

Prior to the commencement of the meeting the Chairman informed the Board that the Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen of Joint Transportation Boards had been invited to attend the meeting. The Chairman welcomed those present.

Petition

Mr Hall formally reported receipt of a petition from Mr G M Prosser, MP relating to improvements on the A258. Mr Hall was Chairman of a Working Group set up to look into the matter. He informed Members that a report of the Working Group's recommendations would be submitted to the Board.

UNRESTRICTED ITEMS

1. Minutes
(Item 3)

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting held on 13 November 2007 are correctly recorded and that they be signed by the Chairman.

2. Kent Highway Services - The Director's Update
(Item 4 – Report by Director, Kent Highway Services)

(1) The Director's Update report looked back on the last 12 months and highlighted some of the achievements from Kent Highway Services' hard working staff in Kent County Council, Ringway, Jacobs and TSUK. Staff from across the Alliance had been involved in organisational review for well over a year yet still delivered some significant, innovative improvements to service delivery, and kept pace with the challenging performance targets that were now published monthly in the report to all Members.

(2) The Alliance Board had developed a key set of indicators that reflected the broad range of services delivered by KHS and that helped put focus and drive into the service. In the last 12 months staff had worked hard to come to grips with a stronger performance culture and, whilst progress had been made, more needed to be done and the new organisation structure for KHS would help to deliver further improvements. Some key successes to note were:-

- continued good number of compliments KHS received, averaging at almost 50 per month
- significant reduction in streetlight repair time from 17 days in April to 5 days in the most recent set of results. Over 5,000 faults were fixed each month.
- 98% achievement of response to emergency sites within 2 hours
- significant improvement in 12 months of letters answered within 10 days. In September 2007 we achieved only 50% within target, we were now achieving over 80%. We receive nearly 1200 letters each month.
- Regular achievement of over 85% of all waste material being recycled.

(3) As the seven new teams became fully operational in April next year the Director planned to drive the performance and evidence based working within KHS, and recognised that there were some parts of the service that were not yet measured sufficiently to provide the information to understand how service delivery could be improved.

(4) In order to help in the understanding of the accountabilities and responsibilities of the seven new service groups, set out below were some examples of service improvements or actions over the last year:-

Community Operations (Kim Hills)

- We had placed the order with Commercial Services for over 60 new vans that could run on 30% bio-diesel fuel and raised the profile of our inspectors and enforcement officers across Kent.
- We were setting up a training programme for our highway inspectors to ensure they had a formal qualification and gained the recognition they deserved for the key role they played.
- We have trialled a new 'quiet' surfacing on the A26 in Tonbridge that had received rave reviews from local residents.

Technical Services (Norman Bateman)

- We had replaced the streetlights on A229 Bluebell Hill with longer life, low maintenance lanterns that lasted longer and reduced maintenance costs.
- We had started the asset data collection for streetlights, safety barriers, signs, trees and drainage that would help us get a better understanding of the asset and improve our maintenance regime and improve efficiency.
- We had been instrumental in developing new national guidance for the management of bridges.
- LED Streetlight pilot.

Countywide Improvements (Behdad Haratbar – acting)

- We were on target to deliver over 500 maintenance and improvement schemes this year.
- We had achieved a prestigious national award for the 'Fastrack' scheme in Dartford.
- We had co-ordinated all Alliance partners to programme the resurfacing of the up lane of Blue Bell Hill in a weekend road closure early next year.

Transport & Development (David Hall)

- We were recently awarded 'Transport Authority of the Year' – a great achievement.
- We had successfully launched the travel pass for 11-16 year olds with a bigger roll out planned.
- We were leading the way with school travel plans and had over 300 in place.

Network Management (Caroline Bruce - acting)

- We were the first Authority to replace all traffic lights with LED's
- We had opened the Traffic Management Centre and planned to roll the coverage out to Canterbury and Tonbridge/ Tunbridge Wells next year.
- We had launched the traffic and travel website with the plan to record all roadworks on an interactive mapping system.

Business, Performance and Communication (David Beaver - acting)

- We were the first authority to have a dedicated page in a local newspaper to get our message across.
- We had developed and published a monthly set of key performance indicators that reflected the full highway service.

Finance (Mike Palmer)

- We had appointed a Head of Finance onto the management team who had commercial, private sector experience.
- We had received an 'extra' £15 million of budget
- We were on track to exceed our income target of £2.55 million.

(5) Despite all the changes and uncertainty for staff we had delivered a significant amount of innovative and nationally recognised good work so far this year. We were on track to re-shape the service by April 2008 and there would clearly be a period of bedding down.

(6) During discussion Mr Hall informed Members that a report relating to Kent Freedom Pass would be submitted to the Board in March.

(7) The Board noted the positive progress being made to improve service delivery and would support staff through the period of significant change that still lay ahead.

3. Transforming Kent Highway Services

(Item 5 – Report by Director, Kent Highway Services)

(1) The paper gave a brief summary of the presentation given by Geoff Harrison-Mee (Director of Kent Highway Services) and Kim Hills (Head of Community Operations). The presentation updated HAB on the implementation of the new Highway Service in Kent.

(2) KHS had been through progressive changes over the last 2½ years which had seen:-

- The transfer of functions and staff from 12 districts, with the creation of 3 new Divisions.
- Mobilisation of a new Alliance contract. This had created a partnership of four organisations (KCC, Ringway, Jacobs and TSUK) coming together as the Kent Highway Services Alliance working together to deliver the highway service.
- Transformation – a root and branch review of the highway service and an in depth challenge of operation and processes.

The next stage was to implement a highways service from 1 April 2008.

(3) KHS believed that there were significant opportunities for improving service delivery by joining up processes across the Alliance and in particular with regard to efficiency, increasing customer satisfaction and engaging with the community.

(4) KHS wanted to:-

(a) drive efficiencies through integrated processes across organisational boundaries:

- negating the need for double handling and input of data to multiple systems;
- freeing up staff time and other resources; and
- maximising work on the ground.

(b) improve customer satisfaction:

- designing customer-focused services to meet community expectations;
- being clear about what they could do and when they'll do it; and then
- delivering on that commitment.

(c) deliver high quality services through:

- innovation;
- effective business systems; and

- motivated, high performing teams.
- (d) provision of operational accommodation and facilities
- Co-location / co-working
 - 24 hour operational facilities
 - Modern winter maintenance service
- (5) The presentation covered:-
- The journey so far
 - New delivery structure
 - Customer and Community
 - Use of information technology
 - Accommodation / facilities
 - The challenges ahead
 - The vision
- (6) A significant amount of work had already been completed over the last 12 months in remoulding the highway service. Implementation of the new structure had commenced. The next 12 months would be a vital part of the process.
- (7) The Board supported the next phase of implementation.

4. The Future of Highway Drainage *(Item 6 – Report by Head of Technical Services)*

- (1) As part of the Transformation of Kent Highway Services, many of the fundamental maintenance activities were given a much clearer focus in terms of maintenance delivery. One of those critical service activities was highway drainage, not only in the maintenance of the existing drainage provision but in the delivery of fundamental improvements to the systems and the creation of new systems where necessary.
- (2) It had always been recognised that highway drainage systems received not only the rain that fell on the highway network but also the run-off from many other catchment areas, examples being large car parks, farmers fields, private driveways and many others.
- (3) It was proposed that although individual businesses/residences might have to be tackled separately, the National Farmers Union might provide a working partner for co-operation in many rural areas. Field management techniques and ditch maintenance were two maintenance opportunities.
- (4) Existing highway drainage systems and their maintenance were fundamental to keeping customers safe on their journeys. This safety issue plus the need to ensure that highway drainage did not cause the flooding of dwellings, were the two main priorities for the immediate future.
- (5) At present, a drainage working group had been delivering proposals for the future provision of the service. Staff from across the Alliance had been pooling knowledge and resources to revamp the service. Transformation made highway

drainage a critical deliverable with a Countywide Drainage Team reporting to the Head of Technical Services for all aspects of the service.

(6) A full asset collection for all parts of the drainage infrastructure was underway. Every item of drainage hardware would be identified and located by electronic means either specifically or where maintenance took place. Every highway gulley would be identified and placed on a cleansing schedule as would all catchpits, soakaways and outfalls. All drainage lagoons would also be maintained together with all highway ditches.

(7) At this stage, it was important to identify all locations in the county where flooding took place on the highway and to determine the root cause of the problem. To this end, every possible source of information on highway flooding was being engaged and their knowledge recorded on a countywide GIS mapping base and a demonstration of the technique was on show for Members.

(8) All highway engineers and inspectors were being interviewed and the information collected from them would be recorded in the map base with the reason for the flood problem.

(9) The following other sources of information would be engaged:-

Fire Brigade

District and Parish Councils

Environment Agency

Internal Drainage Boards plus others

Members would also provide a very knowledgeable local source of information.

(10) The new drainage team would provide a very clear focus for this important part of the maintenance service. All recorded information would help determine future maintenance regimes, identify clearly locations for future capital investment and support the need to provide a safer environment for the travelling public.

(11) Mr Bateman informed the Board that he would be sending information to all County Members about their contributions to the highway flooding database.

(12) The Board noted the report.

5. Fort Hill De-dualling, Margate

(Item 7 – Report by Capital Programme Manager)

(Mr C Hart and Mrs E M Tweed were present and spoke to this Item)

(1) In support of Turner Contemporary and the adjacent Rendezvous site the intention was to de-dual Fort Hill. The purpose of the report was to explain the background, programme and funding and to present the scheme proposal for recommendation to the Cabinet Member for Environment, Highways and Waste for formal approval.

(2) Fort Hill was a short section of local dualling constructed many years ago that sits out of context with the rest of the B2051 coastal route between Margate and Cliftonville. The coastal side of Fort Hill was the site of Turner Contemporary and to the east beyond the RNLI Lifeboat Station, the Rendezvous development site.

(3) From the very inception of Turner Contemporary, the idea had been to return Fort Hill to a single carriageway. This would reduce the perception of severance and integrate Turner Contemporary and the Rendezvous development with the Town and particularly the old town. It would also free up surplus land that would contribute to the two developments either directly or in the context of improving the setting. It was as much about perception as reality but the single carriageway and associated improved street scene should help strike a better balance between the needs of pedestrians and drivers.

(4) The scheme would utilise the southern westbound carriageway which was the original alignment of Fort Hill. The junction with Turner Contemporary would remain signal controlled. The signals were mainly to cater for pedestrian movements and in particular to close the junction down in the event of the launch or recovery of the lifeboat that had to manoeuvre within the junction to access the slipway. Towards the top of Fort Hill, a right turn lane protected by island refuges would maintain good access to the Police Station. This area of the scheme might be subject to change post construction depending on the future access arrangements to the Rendezvous site. This was unfortunate but the difficulty was that the Rendezvous proposals were not yet defined and there was an obligation to commence the Fort Hill de-dualling in April 2008 to complement the Turner Contemporary programme. While the carriageway would be conventional asphalt, higher quality materials would be used for the kerbing and footway paving to raise the standard of the public realm.

(5) Outside of the basic scheme there was the opportunity to carry out complementary improvements to improve general pedestrian access and ambience. The pedestrian area between the Promenade running into the Turner Contemporary entrance and towards the Pier could benefit from improvement. King Street was also a key pedestrian route between the town and Turner but was dominated by two traffic lanes at the expense of narrow footways. Thanet District Council had proposals to revert to just one lane of traffic and widen the footways.

(6) The scheme was a lessening of highway and within the highway boundary and did not require planning consent. The nature of the scheme was such that specific public consultation had not been appropriate although the proposals had been implicit within the various submissions, exhibitions and recent public meeting related to Turner Contemporary. The intention would be to inform the residents and business that front the works and in the area prior to construction and to erect a Notice Board on the site with a plan of the scheme.

(7) Kent Highway Services had given a commitment to commence the scheme construction in April 2008. The works would be carried out by the term contractor Ringway and were expected to take 6 months and be completed by October.

(8) The estimated cost of the de-dualling scheme was £0.750m. The available funding was £0.750m composed of £0.550m underspend on the capital programme and £0.200m Cabinet Member allocation for footway improvements.

(9) A bid for Objective 2 funding had been successful with £0.850m awarded for 'Opening of the Eastern Seafront' and some of the funding should be available for top-up funding of the enhanced public realm. While the priority was the de-dualling, the objective was to carry out the more wider regeneration improvements to the adjacent King Street and the Promenade entrance to Turner Contemporary subject to funding availability.

(10) The Board agreed that the scheme for the de-dualling of Fort Hill and associated works on The Promenade and King Street shown on Drawing No. B0647400/20 be referred to the Thanet Joint Transportation Board.

6. Circular Roads 1/2006 Setting Local Speed Limits, Update

(Item 8 – Report by County Transportation Manager)

(Representatives from the Association of British Drivers were present for this item)

(1) The results of the work carried out on the speed limit review to the south of Maidstone were set out in the report. This was the latest in a series of HAB reports (September 06 & January 07) on the speed limit review. It explored the results of the demonstration area south of Maidstone and a “rough sort” of the remaining “A” and “B” road network to establish the way forward. The principle aim of the project was to provide a consistent standard for speed limits across the county. The report also considered the circular as a potential policy document for the county.

(2) The demonstration area lies to the south of Maidstone and included a total of 12 roads. Key to the work being undertaken was that it should produce the opening statement of Circular Roads 1/2006 that being “Speed limits should be evidence led, self explaining and seek to reinforce people’s assessment of what was a safe speed to travel. They should encourage self-compliance and not be seen by drivers as being a target speed at which to drive in all circumstances.” It was essential that the right balance between the needs of local residents and drivers was met. In the past, some lower speed limits had produced little or no change in driver behaviour and in some cases brought into disrepute previously well observed speed limits.

(3) The reports were split into three specific areas. Speed limit changes, signs and TRO’s. They indicated changes to some 27% of existing speed limits, improvements to signs and this issue was covered in greater detail in paragraph 7 of these Minutes plus modifications to TRO’s. Work on improving signing, particularly gateways would take place over the next two years. Detailed design and full consultation of the demonstration area would take place during the next financial year 08/09 with implementation of the demonstration area in 2009/10.

(4) Rough sort work indicated that the county should be split into three areas on a rolling programme with completion in 2012/13 starting in Mid Kent.

(5) In communications with the parish councils it was clear that enforcement was a key issue. Although enforcement of speed limits rested with the Chief Constable it was clear that all limits must be properly signed. Of equal importance was that all speed limits were understood and accepted by drivers so that enforcement levels were kept to a minimum.

(6) Meetings with Kent Police had taken place and they had accepted the methodology used to determine the speed limits within the demonstration area. They had in the past raised concerns and objections regarding the implementation of some lower speed limits.

(7) Local communication with Parish Councils in the demonstration area had been through John Wilson of East Farleigh PC who had agreed to act for all councils within the demonstration area. His role was to reassure the Parish Councils within the area that the County Council’s approach was robust and in line with the Government’s guidance.

(8) During 08/09 once detailed designs and draft TRO's had been produced then full consultation would begin. This would follow the normal Kent process with adverts and a formal request to statutory bodies. We would also discuss the methodology used with formal groups and organisations.

(9) At this time there was insufficient time and funding to also consider "C" and unclassified roads although they should not be completely ignored. Where a crash analysis indicated that a lower limit was wholly or partly the measure required to reduce crashes then a crash remedial report could be produced and funding for that scheme provided through the Transport and Safety Package PIPKIN.

(10) One key objective of the report was to test circular roads 1/2006 to see if it was fit for purpose. The report concluded that in the main the document provided a consistent standard to be applied. There were a few issues to resolve and further work would be undertaken along with consultation with the DfT, other highway authorities and Kent Police to see if national or local flexibility was required.

(11) The work carried out indicated that although the review of the counties "A" and "B" road network would be completed by 2011, implementation of the recommendations would not be completed until 2012 / 2013 at the earliest. Bids for the funding of the review would need to be included within the LTP process but it must be noted that with limited crash savings likely to come from the review PIPKIN assessments might be low. Funding for this should not therefore be at the expense of crash remedial works as to do so might endanger the chances of achieving the government's 2010 target of reduced casualties.

(12) It was also clear that Circular Roads 1/2006 offered us the chance to achieve a consistency of standard for speed limits on Kent's Roads. We would need to ensure that the balance between the needs of residents and drivers was fairly maintained. Further work, assessment and consultation was needed before 1/2006 could be recommended as a county policy.

(13) The Board noted the recommendations of the reports and the progress towards the 2011 target.

7. Signing Policy Review

(Item 9 – Report by Head of Technical Services)

(1) A report on work to be undertaken on reviewing current policy and including new policy for signs and road markings was circulated for information. The report also included information on the review of speed limits.

(2) As part of the Transformation process the highway asset had been split into various service groups. The asset group of non-illuminated signs, road markings and safety barriers was tasked with various key deliverables, one being to develop KHS policy for this asset group.

(3) The current policy regarding signs was published in 2002. It had not been formally reviewed as a whole document since it was first published. As revised legislation and best practice had emerged officers had been updated through bridging sessions, however, the main document had not been updated in line with emerging legislation and best practice. The result being that officers were working to different standards dependant on what courses they had attended and documentation retained.

(4) Whilst the policy document provided valuable information it was not suitable for the new asset group as it dealt solely with signing. The results of the work carried out on the speed limit review were set out for information to support the current state of this asset group.

(5) Signs that were covered by the speed review survey reported in paragraph 6 of these Minutes were:-

- Speed Limit Signs
- Warning Signs
- Direction Signs (Advanced and Flag types)
- Other Signs (e.g Tourist, Parking etc.)

(6) Details of the existing signing stock within the demonstration area enabled identification of any signing which was superfluous and could be removed in addition to the indicative costs of maintaining the signing stock in the future. The results from the survey were reviewed in comparison with DfT guidance (TSRGD 2002) and KCC's existing signing policy.

(7) The site surveys were carried out between March and May 2007. The vegetation at this point was not considered fully grown and the survey results could not take into account any further damage which had happened to a sign since the survey dates. All road signs were assessed in terms of their appropriateness, condition and visibility to the road users.

(8) The surveys identified the poor state of the existing signing stock, a lack of maintenance and poor visibility of them, a particular problem in rural areas.

(9) The results shown in Appendix 1 of the report were taken from a draft of the Speed Limit Review report. Further work was still being undertaken in the demonstration area and therefore the results were accurate at this time but might change.

(10) A larger amount of damaged signs were present on the A roads. This might be due to the high flow of traffic along the routes. A couple of B roads had high numbers of damaged signs and this could indicate that the routes were often used by HGV's or agricultural vehicles. Damaged signs could also reflect poorly sited signs on rural B roads.

(11) The A roads had the highest number of vegetation covered signs which might be affected by private vegetation which was difficult to get cleared. The B roads were predominately rural and vegetation coverage was generally expected.

(12) There were a high number of speed limit changes along B roads but varied degrees of speed limit terminal signing. The gateway features were more effective on the A roads. The gateway features ranged from only speed limit terminal signing to the full gateway with yellow backed signs, red surfacing, dragon's teeth and speed roundels in the carriageway.

(13) Costs and budget allocations for the reviewed signs and lining policy and the speed limit review demonstration area would be reported at the Highways Advisory Board in March 2008.

(14) It needed to be highlighted that the demonstration area covered only 7% of the county's A and B road network. Further work was needed to identify the state of signing on the C class and unclassified roads.

(15) The speed limit review survey had found the Kent Signing Policy was generally robust. The general ethos of the policy allowed for consideration of a

number of matters including road safety, rural location etc. The problems had been in the application of the policy. Mis-application of the policy ranged from illegal signing to poorly located signing.

(16) The policies set by KHS for signing within the current document were not clearly defined. The framework for how signing and lining was delivered and funded was lost amongst the good practice elements which also formed the current signing policy document.

(17) Policies set for signing and road markings needed to clearly define the level of service KHS would be able to achieve, easily monitored and along with this the appropriate levels of annual funding obtained to deliver on any policies set.

(18) The Board noted:-

- (a) the work needed to be undertaken and its impact on current projects; and
- (b) that the revised policy on signs and road markings would be presented to a future meeting of the Board.

8. Fees & Charges for 2008/09

(Item 10 – Report by Director of Kent Highway Services)

(1) The report sought approval of revised fees and charges for 2008/09 in respect of a wide range of services provided by Kent Highway Services. The Local Government Act 2003 (Section 93) provided the power for charging for discretionary services but also stipulated that local authorities might only cover their reasonable costs in providing such services. This year the changes had been reviewed in the light of fees and charges made by other counties. The annual report was prepared earlier than last year to allow more notice to be given of planned increases prior to April 2008. The estimated total income for 2007/8 was £2.9m. This was mainly comprised of energy charges, highway searches and development related fees (£1.7m) and RASWA charges (£1.1m).

(2) The main source of income was from developers who were required to pay S38 or S278 fees relating to supervision of new estate road construction and in some cases commuted sums for future maintenance of new highway infrastructure.

(3) The New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 [RASWA] and subsequent regulations determined charges for sample inspections, defects, licences, etc. The Road Safety team also provided a range of services, including cycle and minibus driver training for which a charge was made either to individuals or other departments and organisations.

(4) For most other fees and charges, where there was no specific evidence that the cost of processing and monitoring applications had changed significantly, increases of approx 3% were proposed which reflected the expected increase in staff costs and overheads. In most cases these were rounded up to the nearest £1.00 but an attempt had also been made to standardise charges for similar services. The proposed new fees and charges for 2008/09 were set out in the Appendices to the report. However some other charges which were statutory and for which there was no local discretion had not been included.

Highway Definitions, Land Charges, Information and Searches

(5) Following a review of Highway Definitions, Land Charges, searches and information it was recommended that charges were increased by 3% in line with the anticipated rise in staff and administration costs. Following a review of Freedom of Information Act requirements the charge of 10p per sheet for photocopying would remain unchanged although separate fees would now be applied for larger sized sheets or colour copies. The £10 minimum charge would be removed.

Developer Funded Highway Schemes

(6) The main source of developer fees was the standard charge of 8% of the estimated works value for the supervision of new estate road construction under S38 of the Highways Act 1980. This charge was in line with that charged by other local authorities and was currently adequate to offset supervision costs. There were also charges for supervision and fixed consultancy fees for advice to developers re alterations to the existing highway under S278 of the Highways Act.

(7) In addition commuted sums were sought wherever there was an ongoing maintenance cost relating directly to new infrastructure [e.g. for maintaining new traffic signals or inspecting structures]. The DfT in conjunction with leading Local Authorities, the Home Builders Federation and URS (lighting) were currently conducting a review of the approach to commuted sums in England and Wales. This was due to be completed during 2008/9. KCC would be providing input to the process at the working group stage. In the light of the review it was proposed to reconsider KCC's own commuted sum policy and amend it where appropriate during 2009/10. The current level of commuted sums and S278 charges was to be increased by 3% in line with the anticipated rise in staff and administration costs.

Skips and Scaffolding

(8) The skip/scaffolding/hoarding/materials licence fees covered the administration costs in the issuing of licences for placing of these items on the highway. The income generated was used to offset divisional costs in overseeing the safe positioning of them on the highway including enforcement action where necessary. The current charge was £15 per week. Skips were placed on the highway for no longer than was absolutely necessary. The permit was recharged via the skip companies. An increase to £16 was proposed for the current year. There were no changes proposed for vehicle crossings as these were determined by RASWA regulations but an increase of £5 on the administration fee was recommended. A separate licence was being considered for scaffolding/hoarding in future, possibly with a higher fee. Consultation with local Kent scaffolding companies would be carried out prior to a recommendation being made to the Board.

Road Safety

(9) Cyclist training was offered to Year 6 children through their primary school. Currently the Road Safety team provided cycle training for around 7,000 children per annum; approximately 43% of the total year group across the county. It was proposed to keep the cyclist training fee at £15.

(10) The National Driver Improvement Scheme (NDIS) and Speed Awareness course (SAC) were administered by the Road Safety team as the service provider for Kent Police. The schemes must be totally self-financing; no excess income could be generated for KCC. A small fee increase was recommended for the NDIS to ensure that the costs of running the scheme could continue to be met without the need for a subsidy. As the partners 'set-up' costs for the SAC had now been repaid and the level of the current fee was considered a deterrent for some drivers

attending the course it was proposed to reduce the fee from the existing £115 to £95.

(11) The Road Safety team provided minibus driver courses and reassessment [every 3 years] for KCC drivers. A small increase to the fee was proposed in line with wage cost increases. It was recommended that the fees were increased to £113 and £31 respectively.

(12) The Road Safety team provided monitoring and training functions for the School Crossing Patrol service managed by Education & Libraries Directorate. This was arranged through a Service Level Agreement (SLA). The current level of SLA income covered existing costs and so the charge for this remained unchanged.

(13) 'Theatres in Education' was a valuable activity that delivered key road safety messages to students in an innovative and exciting way. Annually the Road Safety team organised performances for year 12/13 students with a focus on driving issues including anti-drink drive and anti-drug drive. The team subsidised this for participating schools which allowed greater coverage within the available budget. It was recommended that the proportion of the subsidy (50%) should remain at the current level.

(14) The Board supported the proposal for recommendation to the Cabinet Member for Environment, Highways and Waste that the proposed Fees and Charges for 2008/09, as set out in Appendices 1 and 2 of the report, be implemented with effect from 1 April 2008.