

## KENT COUNTY COUNCIL

---

### HIGHWAYS ADVISORY BOARD

MINUTES of a meeting of the Highways Advisory Board held in the Council Chamber, Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone on Tuesday, 9 January 2007.

PRESENT: Mr R F Manning (Chairman), Mr W A Hayton (Vice-Chairman), Mr T J Birkett (substitute for Mr K Sansum), Mr J R Bullock, MBE, Ms S J Carey, Mr D S Daley, Mr C G Findlay, Mr C J Law, Mr R A Marsh, Mr J I Muckle, Mr R J E Parker, Mr R A Pascoe, Mr A R Poole, Mrs P A V Stockell and Mr R Tolputt

ALSO PRESENT: Mr A H T Bowles, Mr K A Ferrin, MBE and Mr M V Snelling

IN ATTENDANCE: Mr D Hall (Head of Transport & Development), Mr G Mee (Director - Kent Highway Services), Mr L Holliday (Network Performance Manager), Mr N Bateman (Head of Technical Services), Mrs C Bruce (Interim Director Kent Highway Services); Mr M Sammut, Senior Transportation Engineer; and Mr M Smith (Transportation Manager - East Kent Division); and the Head of Democratic Services (represented by Mrs K Mannering).

#### UNRESTRICTED ITEMS

**1. Minutes - 14 November 2006**  
*(Item 2)*

(1) Mr K A Ferrin, MBE, Cabinet Member for Environment, Highways and Waste, attended the meeting to explain to Members his reason for not agreeing to the Board's proposal set out in paragraph 6(18) – Provision of 20mph Zones Outside Schools in Kent. He informed the Board that he would be giving his approval to the original motion as follows:-

- (a) KCC should not have a specific policy of 20mph limits or zones outside all Kent schools;
- (b) specific problem areas outside schools be identified and assessed for the suitability for a 20mph zone; and
- (c) KCC lobby government for a change in the rules to allow for 20mph limits outside schools by virtue of flashing lights.

(2) RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting held on 14 November 2006 are correctly recorded and that they be signed by the Chairman.

**2. Kent Highway Services - A 21st Century Service**  
*(Item 3 - Report by Director, Kent Highway Services)*

*(Prior to consideration of the report Members received a presentation from Ian Newiss, Director of Operations, Jacobs)*

*(Following a question and answer session, the Chairman thanked Mr Newiss for a very informative presentation)*

(1) On 4 December 2006 the final version of the Paper “Kent Highway Services – A 21<sup>st</sup> Century Service’ was approved unanimously by Cabinet and fully endorsed by Paul Carter and Peter Gilroy. The paper described why it was desirable for Kent Highway Services to operate from two divisions rather than three. The optimisation of accommodation would free up capital funding to reinvest in the service, to fund new technology to drive efficiencies, reduce annual overhead costs and improve customer satisfaction. The paper gave more detail of a technology enabled service.

(2) All local authorities were being placed under increasing pressure, including financial scrutiny, to make the best use of available resources in delivering their services to the public. A well-managed highway network was a core component of the services and the highway asset was probably the most valuable asset that many local authorities maintained.

(3) KCC only knew in general terms the size and condition of the highway asset since the asset registers were prepared back in the 1980’s and 1990’s and very little updating had taken place since. At best KCC could only suggest investment levels necessary to maintain the asset and offset depreciation. There was an absence of co-ordinated forward works programmes that could save costs and minimise disruption to the travelling public. The asset records were held in disparate databases that relied on manual input. It was not currently possible to fully record inspection regimes and maintenance operations and therefore the Council was exposed to risks, including corporate manslaughter charges.

(4) There was a varying degree of sophistication with the use of technology across the KHS Alliance partners. Ringway and Jacobs maintained quality business management systems and had invested in document management. TSUK made use of innovative technology in intelligent traffic systems. In KCC the business procedures were not consistent, the technology was not integrated and therefore none of the systems talked to each other. Staff were deprived of the basic tools to deliver a 21<sup>st</sup> Century Service with a significant impact on efficiency.

(5) The vision was to create systems that all the Alliance wanted to use because they were easy to navigate, bring efficiencies and add value to the service. The systems would have the following attributes:-

- One shared Alliance system with single entry point to current, accurate information updated in real time
- A system that informed the public and others, managed expectations and improved the reputation of KHS
- A system that was valued by staff and supported them in delivering a high quality service, supported the culture and drove innovation, improvement and efficiency
- Delivery of measurable benefits through self auditing performance measurement
- Clear accountability for workflow, information, budget management and allowed us to meet all legislative obligations.

(6) Technology requirements could be split into two clearly defined work streams:-

(a) **Network Management tools** designed to give a single point data source that met the Alliance business needs:-

- It would be an integrated database containing all of the asset information, inspection and survey results, works programmes,

and other records held globally against the road network. The data would be stored centrally with robust system architecture but which could be maintained by remote specialist teams.

- It would consist of a single set of core data that would instantaneously update all relevant datasets using wherever practical mobile technology, supporting all parts of the service from the Contact Centre to the Divisional and other Alliance offices.
- The core business processes would be standardised to ensure efficiencies but specialisms would also be available, such as Roadworks, Street Lighting, Arboriculture and Highways maintenance applications.
- There would be end to end work flow management. This would ensure that defects reported to the contact centre would automatically initiate a response by an inspector or maintenance team to minimise the report to fix times. Mobile technology would provide accurate feedback information.
- There would be links to inform the public where the works were planned and we would be able to co-ordinate the works with the utilities. The links would include real time information from the Kent Traffic Management Centre to help us plan the efficient operation of the highway network.
- The system would automatically raise works orders, capture actual costs and provide reports to Corporate Finance. It would also have the ability to provide personally tailored performance indicators to KHS users.

(b) **Business Management tools** would ensure that the day to day business could be operated effectively, efficiently and consistently with the minimum number of touch points in any delivery process. Required actions would be notified automatically and progress monitored and reported.

(7) The processes would ensure compliance with Alliance Contracts, Legal requirements, Health and Safety, Recruitment, Training and Employment policies. They would assist with Performance Management and Risk Assessment. New technology would allow knowledge and Best Practice to be disseminated across the Alliance and would include:-

- Policies Procedures and Guidance notes
- Corporate Information and branding
- Technical Indices
- Human Resource Information
- Document Management
- Communications and information cascades.

(8) An essential ingredient in raising overall performance levels would be the adoption, wherever appropriate, of common systems and standards across the Alliance. This would be achieved by designing the relevant elements of the systems to meet the nationally recognised standards in the fields of Quality, Environment

and Health and Safety (i.e. ISO 9001,14001,18001). The procedures and processes of all parties would be built into an overarching system certified by an external accreditation body. A fully disciplined approach to applying the systems would lead to more consistency, less waste, less duplication, better use of resources and overall cost savings. It would be the 'single source of truth' for all necessary management information to enable the Alliance Board to monitor and improve performance of the Alliance in managing the highway asset.

(9) KHS were confident that the benefits would be:-

- Faster response to, and resolution of, fault reports.
- 25% reduction in calls to the Contact Centre by increasing customer access to information and fault reporting through the KCC website and by cutting the number of repeat calls.
- A reduction in incidents which lead to insurance claims by between 5 and 10% through improved maintenance management.
- Streamlined processes enabled by technology from start to finish, integrating client, consultant and contractor leading to a 10 to 15% saving in staff time across the KHS Alliance.
- Reduction in administration through an integrated business and asset management system releasing staff time to focus on improving customer satisfaction.
- Increased staff motivation, better career prospects, greater job satisfaction and flexibility, and a workforce plan that was sustainable against the challenges of an ageing workforce and industry competition.

(10) KHS had been reviewing how it delivered all operational aspects and the conclusion to this work was due early in 2007. KHS must take the output from the review and implement it. But only with a significant investment in technology would KHS be able to deliver the service that stakeholders and the public wanted, and that staff were proud to provide.

(11) The Board noted the report.

### **3. Kent Highway Services - our response times to requests for service**

*(Item 4 - Report by Director, Kent Highway Services)*

(1) The Kent Highway Services Contact Centre was launched in April 2005 and at the time handled 5,000 calls per month from the single 08458 247 800 telephone number. The Contact Centre now handled over 16,000 highway enquiries per month with around half of those resulting in service requests passed to the Divisional Offices for action.

(2) Since July 2006 and the start of the new contracts a new range of leaflets and around 180 KHS logo'd vehicles had raised the profile of the KHS brand along with the telephone number and email address.

(3) The next step to help improve public satisfaction was to provide better information on the response times that people who contacted KHS could expect from the highway service. This would help to manage expectations about how long a repair would take or a letter to be answered.

(4) A key part of the Transformation process was to drive efficiency and improve service delivery but within the context of a core set of published response times. A leaflet had now been produced that set out the response times and this would be formally launched in January 2007. A session was held with over 120 front facing staff in December to launch the standards and provide customer care training.

(5) A table which set out some examples of response times and levels of current performance was included in the report. Publication of the response times gave clear guidance to KHS staff on the level of service they needed to deliver. It also provided those who use the service with information to manage their expectations of the service they would receive. The Transformation process would be identifying different, improved and more efficient ways to deliver service to meet the response times. A report presenting the results of the performance indicators listed in the table and a range of other key results was reported to the Alliance Board each month.

(6) The Board:-

- (a) noted the progress being made in Kent Highway Services; and
- (b) supported the response times and would help promote these within the community.

#### **4. Circular Roads 1/2006 Setting Local Speed Limits, Update**

*(Item 5 - Report by County Transportation Manager)*

*(Mr J Wilson, Chairman of East Farleigh Parish Council and TRAMP, was present for this item)*

(1) Further to Minute 8 of 19 September 2006, the report set out early progress and indications of time scales. An internal working group had been established to set the agenda for meeting the Government's requirement to review speed limits on all A and B class roads by 2011. The group, which contained a mix of KHS staff, including Jacobs, would be undertaking a significant proportion of the work.

(2) A demonstration area had now been selected so that problems and pitfalls could be identified before the work was undertaken Countywide. This was an area south of Maidstone that included a number of A class roads around the periphery with several B class roads running through it. There were also a number of villages contained within the area. Speed checks would be undertaken and consideration would be given to the likely physical measures that might be required. There would be a significant amount of consultation and preparation of traffic orders to be undertaken. It was envisaged that Jacobs would be commissioned to undertake a good proportion of the work.

(3) An outline scheme with full estimates of cost would be reported to Members next year with the intention of funding speed limit changes and associated measures in the demonstration area in 2008/09. It should be noted that the scheme would only consider A and B class roads. The experience gained from the exercise would help to develop the full programme enabling all A and B class roads to be reviewed and the required changes implemented by the Government's deadline of 2011.

(4) The pilot study work was likely to cost in the region of £100,000 and would be funded from the Integrated Transport pot in 2007/08. The work should be completed by March 2008.

(5) Where a high crash record was identified on a C or unclassified road, it might be necessary to implement a lower speed limit with or without physical measures. This would be covered by a crash remedial scheme which could be included with A and B road schemes in the local transport plan budget or funded separately as appropriate following a detailed report on that site and its associated issues.

(6) The Board noted the early progress made on implementing local speed limits.

*Following a proposal by the Chairman, Members agreed to consider Items 9, 10 and 11 prior to Items 6, 7 and 8.*

**5. A2 Pepperhill to Cobham Widening Scheme, A2/A282 Improvement Scheme and M25 J1b to 3 Widening**

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

(1) Further to Minute 19 of 11 July 2006, the report gave an update on the progress of the works, the works programme and ongoing consultations between SKANSKA (the consortium delivering the project for the Highways Agency), and County and Gravesham Borough Council officers. Improvements to the A2/A282 junction were also underway and the report outlined the programme and discussions between the contractor Costains and County officers.

(2) Both the schemes started in September with off-line works, the A2 Pepperhill to Cobham scheme's being at Tollgate and Pepperhill. Downs Road was closed to the public and would remain closed for the duration of the works. The Tollgate Hotel, which was significantly affected by the widening works, was acquired by the Highways Agency and was being used as a site office and public information centre.

(3) The start of works ceremony for both schemes was on 10 November held at the former Tollgate Hotel, being carried out by Dr Stephen Ladyman MP, Minister of State for Transport, who started the bored piling machine for the foundations of the new Tollgate bridge. The day was also the first of two of a public exhibition of both schemes at the former Tollgate Hotel.

(4) Regular liaison meetings had been set up for both schemes between the contractors and KHS, including fortnightly co-ordination meetings for the A2 Pepperhill to Cobham scheme, and for the A2/A282 scheme overview group meetings every 2 months; the group consisting of representatives from KCC, DBC, GBC and HA. The M25 Junction 1B to 3 improvement scheme was currently undergoing public consultation following an exhibition held over 7, 8, & 9 December.

*A2 Pepperhill to Cobham Widening*

(5) Details of imminent works, including lane closures, were given on the HA's web site [www.highways.gov.uk/A2beancobhamphase2](http://www.highways.gov.uk/A2beancobhamphase2) The SKANSKA public relations officer was Gordon Hounslow who could be contacted on 07831 196325. The works programme was currently as follows:-

- (a) 15 January commence construction of additional vehicle crossovers, through central reservation, on A2. This would require traffic management measures with narrow lanes operating between Marling Cross and Thong lane for 8 months.

- (b) In May commence work around Pepperhill Junction, requiring traffic management measures lasting approximately 12 weeks.
  - (c) Mid May closure of Marling Cross over bridge, followed by closure of Hever Court Road. Both closures being for up to 14 months, required to enable statutory undertakers' diversions and construction of the new bridge over A2, new roundabouts and link roads.
  - (d) April 2008 commencement of 7 further phases of traffic management on the Pepperhill section to enable tying in of new road.
  - (e) Dec 2008 traffic would be moved over to new road and start of landscaping of old road.
  - (f) Early Spring 2009 Completion of new road.
  - (g) Late 2009 complete landscaping of old road.
- (6) Main matters under discussion with SKANSKA:-
- (a) length of time of Marling Cross bridge closure;
  - (b) keeping Hever Court Road open;
  - (c) diversion routes for the above;
  - (d) roadworks co-ordination;
  - (e) detail design of the new junctions and connecting roads at Tollgate and Marling Cross which would be transferred to the County;
  - (f) old A2 - landscaping, footpaths/cyclepaths, equestrian routes and their bridges over new A2, and links to existing.
  - (g) permanent signing

#### *A2/A282 Improvement*

(7) The proposed completion date of the scheme was Spring 2008. Details of the works programme were unavailable at the time of writing of the report; they would be added following the public meeting on 14 December at their visitor and resource centre adjacent to Waller Park, Green Street Green Road, Darenth. However, details of imminent works, including lane closures, were given on the HA's web site [www.highways.gov.uk/A2A282](http://www.highways.gov.uk/A2A282). The Costain Community Relations officer was Martin Griffiths and the 24 hour public helpline was 0845 603 6374.

(8) Discussions with the Highways Agency over the deferment of the A2 west to north free flow slip and the safety over the 'interim' scheme continued into October but KHS were unable to convince the HA to overturn their decision. KHS were continuing to work with Costains to minimise traffic congestion on Watling Street due to traffic avoiding the road works.

#### *M25 Junction 1B to 3 Widening*

(9) The scheme was one of several being progressed by the Highways Agency to widen all the 3 lane sections of the M25 to 4 lanes. The scheme between Junctions 1B (Princes Rd, Dartford) and 3 (M20 Swanley) would be carried out within the existing highway boundaries, with no widening of structures and utilising the hard shoulder at pinch points. It had a budget of £65.94 million.

(10) The extra benefits of the scheme would be low noise surfacing, an environmental barrier at the Hawley Road bridge to further reduce the noise and reduce the visual impact of the road and traffic, and new lighting to improve the

safety of the road. The lighting would be of the latest technology with close cut off beams of light to minimise light pollution.

(11) The consultation period for the scheme ended on 14 February. Comments would be considered by the Highway Agency and taken into account as they deemed appropriate. The scheme and comments would then be considered by the Secretary of State. As the scheme was widening of the existing carriageways within existing highway limits no actual planning permission was required. Hence, subject to the Secretary of State's approval the scheme was proposed to start in August 2007 with completion in April 2009; a contract period of 20.5 months. This was a short construction period and the contractor Costains proposed to utilise appropriate overnight working to keep the contract period to a minimum.

(12) During construction the existing number of lanes would be kept open at peak times, which meant for most of the day, although they would be narrow lanes. There would be a 50 mph speed limit with an 'average speed specs speed camera system' as on the A2 scheme. There were no road closures proposed although overhead gantries would be manoeuvred into place overnight using rolling road blocks.

(13) The Board noted the report.

## **6. South Street, Deal - Approval to undertake Public Consultation** *(Item 10 - Report by East Kent Divisional Manager)*

*(Cllr N Collor, Chairman of Dover JTB, was present for this item)*

(1) On 18 September 2006 a report was tabled to the Dover Joint Transportation Board (JTB) concerning a proposal to improve the South Street area, Deal to provide better and safer bus interchange facilities. The report recommended approval to a scheme drawing for consultation. The JTB did not support the recommendation and thus an improvement to South Street could not now be considered further.

(2) At a subsequent Highways Meeting of the Dover County Members on 24 October 2006, the opportunity was taken to better understand the reasoning behind the decision. After considering the discussion that took place at the JTB and in recognition that public consultation was still appropriate, the four local Members present gave their unanimous support to seeking approval to overturn the JTB decision.

(3) Over the last 3 years, there had been a protracted debate locally about plans to improve the South Street area to cater for the various competing needs, particularly buses. A number of options had been subject to public consultation previously and the latest proposals had been drawn up, taking into account all the comments from the previous consultations. It was considered that the new proposals provided the best practical balance between the various needs of South Street, and thus the original report to the JTB recommended approval to go to public consultation to share this openly with the public and all interested parties.

(4) Most of the JTB Members who commented on the proposal expressed some concern about various aspects of them, acknowledging the difficulty in satisfying all the competing needs, thus concluding that it would probably be better to "do nothing". One local District Member representing Deal felt that the scheme promoted a sensible arrangement to enable progress towards introduction and was

openly disappointed at the lack of support in just seeking the public's view at this stage.

(5) It remained particularly important to improve interchange facilities here for the new "Diamond" buses that had been introduced earlier this year as a result of a successful 'Kickstart' bid. It would also demonstrate support for the proposed Quality Bus Partnership in Dover that was to be progressed following the approval of the Dover JTB at their most recent meeting on 13 November 2006.

(6) The opportunity to implement the scheme this financial year had now gone. The associated timescales with the progression of a consultation could now be slightly more relaxed in recognition of the concern that was expressed at the JTB. A bid for funding an improvement to South Street as an Integrated Transport Measure for implementation in 2007/8 was being made.

(7) The complex use of South Street and the current layout still gave significant cause for concern and the identified need to make improvements had not gone away. Despite the challenge of trying to find an ideal solution it was important that the position reached was shared openly with the local community and that their assistance was gained in a final endeavour to develop and promote a scheme that on balance provided the improvement that County and District Members, the Town Council and the wider public all recognised the need for at the outset of consideration some three years ago. The new proposal attempted to balance up the various hopes, aspirations and concerns in a way that achieved the optimum scheme to enable progression. If this did not emerge now, then disappointingly the JTB recommendation could be duly enacted.

(8) Member approval was now sought to approaching the Cabinet Member for Environment, Highways and Waste with a view to concluding the formal process to overturn the JTB recommendation and thus undertake a formal public consultation.

(9) The Board agreed **not** to support the proposal for recommendation to the Cabinet Member for Environment, Highways and Waste that a public consultation on the improvement scheme proposal for South Street be undertaken, contrary to the advisory recommendation of the Dover Joint Transportation Board.

## **7. A251 Safety Improvements - the need for appropriate speed limits** *(Item 11 - Report by Mid Kent Transportation Manager)*

(1) As part of the safety improvements proposed for A251 between Ashford and Faversham, a study was undertaken, which showed that a reduction of the speed limit through the villages of North Street, Badlesmere and Sheldwich from 50 mph to 40 mph and the sections between from 60 mph to 50 mph could be achieved. This was based upon speed surveys, which established the 85<sup>th</sup> %ile speeds and the injury crash record.

(2) In line with the latest Government guidance on the setting of speed limits (1/2006), the existing speed limits on all 'A' and 'B' roads would be reviewed during the next 5 years to ensure that those posted limits were still appropriate and met with the criteria. If they failed to comply, they would be changed in accordance with the criteria. It was possible that some limits could be increased as well as reduced to comply with the requirements. The criteria for the latest guidance now used '**mean**' speeds rather than the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile in determining appropriate limits. In this particular case as the safety improvements for A251 were already in the Integrated Transport programme expectations had been raised that the scheme

would happen and there was concern that to delay further, pending the full review of all A and B roads, would be unwelcomed by local residents, local members and the Parish Councils.

(3) Table 1 of the report set out the **mean** speeds that were recorded as part of the speed assessment. This showed that the latest criteria could be met and justified the implementation of a 40 mph speed limit through the Villages shown.

(4) A report outlining the need to set appropriate speed limits was presented to the July 2006 meeting of the Board and was approved. This was then the subject of a report to Swale JTB in September 2006. The proposal to reduce the speed limits through the A251 was the subject of a separate report to this meeting of the Swale JTB. It was explained that 30 mph limits through the above villages did not conform to the previous guidance (Government Guidance Note Circular 1/93), the latest guidance (circular 1/2006) or the resolution of HAB in respect of appropriate speed limits and that a 40 mph limit was the most appropriate. The Police concurred with this view. Members of Swale JTB recommended that a 30 mph speed limit through the above villages should be pursued.

(5) In setting any limit both the Police and the County Council were seeking limits that fostered compliance and as much self-enforcement as possible. This could only be achieved if the criteria were strictly applied and that the majority of drivers 'believe' in the posted limit and understood why it was there. Speed limits were likely to be at their most effective where it reflected the local environment.

(6) There was also a risk that by implementing an inappropriate limit, i.e. one that did not relate well to the 'natural' road environment, could encourage driver frustration, bunching, potential for shunts and overtaking manoeuvres which could serve to introduce a new safety problem and actually worsen the existing crash record rather than reduce it.

(7) Kent Police's Senior Forensic Collision Investigator believed that setting inappropriate speed limits might 'inadvertently encourage dangerous manoeuvres', because if a large number of motorists failed to comply with the reduced limit, then they were more likely to try and overtake those in the minority who did. There was a risk of encouraging that particular manoeuvre if the road in question did not suit a lower speed limit which could lead to serious head on collisions. Such a situation arose on the A228 (administered by Medway Council). Although a different class of road, a lower limit was introduced against the wishes of the Police and the safety record worsened, rather than improved, as a result of the manoeuvres described.

(8) The introduction of an inappropriate limit was likely to breed contempt, lack of compliance and lack of respect for the law and place undue pressure upon the Police. Once there was a realisation among the local community as to the ineffectiveness of the limit, pressure was likely to be placed upon the County Council to introduce traffic calming measures. This would have to take its place in the queue for funding and, alongside the necessary signing thus risks urbanisation of the countryside as well as increasing the financial burden upon the Authority, including the on-going maintenance costs.

(9) Speed limits had to be appropriate to the local environment, existing traffic speeds and crash record if they were to bring any benefit in terms of improved road safety. It was therefore paramount that we dealt with actual problems rather than the perception of a problem. The views of the Police were paramount in this regard.

(10) The Board supported the proposal for recommendation to the Cabinet Member for Environment, Highways and Waste that a 40 mph speed limit be

introduced on the A251 through the villages of North Street, Badlesmere and Sheldwich with a 50 mph speed limit for the remainder of the road.

## **8. KHS Tour de France 2007**

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

*(Consideration of this item was deferred at the November meeting. As a result paragraphs (15)-(18) below were an update on the original report)*

(1) The report outlined the latest position on delivering the Grand Départ for Tour de France 2007. The Tour de France was the premier event in the world cycling calendar. It was the most popular annual spectator event in the sporting world. The race was organised by the Amaury Sports Organisation (ASO). However the location, route and facilities were provided by the host city.

(2) In August 2003 Transport for London (TfL) submitted a proposal on behalf of the Mayor of London, Ken Livingstone, to host the start of the Tour de France 2007 in London. The start, Grand Départ, included an opening ceremony, prologue time trial and Stage 1 of the Tour.

(3) TfL approached Kent County Council to facilitate Stage 1 of the Tour. A letter of understanding was signed on 3 August 2005 highlighting KCC's commitment to the Tour and briefly outlined the expected responsibilities and outputs. TfL signed contracts with the ASO on 9 February 2006 at a press launch held at the Excel Centre, London. Kent signed a contract with TfL on 6 April 2006 to be a key stakeholder and facilitate hosting Stage 1 of the Tour.

(4) The Tour was expected to generate approximately £16million for Kent's economy. However, this was considered to be a conservative estimate and was likely to be higher. In addition up to 3million spectators were expected to travel to Kent to enjoy the event.

(5) TfL's bid was to host the following:-

- Opening Ceremony – Trafalgar Square on the evening of Friday 6 July 2007. This ceremony presented the riders and their teams to the public.
- Prologue Time Trial – 7.9km course around central London during the daytime of Saturday 7 July 2007. This was a short individual time trial which established who would be wearing the leader's yellow jersey on Stage 1.
- Stage 1 – 209km race route through London's and Kent's roads during the daytime of Sunday 8 July 2007.

(6) KCC were required to provide the following:-

- Allow the use of the highway for the race riders and to provide a route that met with ASO approval.
- Provide traffic management of the route including publication of road closures and the provision of public information.
- Ensure planned works did not conflict with the event.
- Provide appropriate barriers, cones, and signage for technical and safety reasons for the race riders and spectators.

- Ensure the road surface was clean, free from damage and obstacles or obstructions. This might require repair work where necessary.
- Grant licences or permissions required for the event and supporting events.
- Carry out all post-event cleaning and restorative works.

(7) The cost of staging the Tour de France on the Kent Highway network was estimated at £400,000. This would be funded through sponsorship from, for example, Transport for London, District Councils and SEEDA.

(8) To ensure successful delivery of the event, KHS had developed a structure that sat within the overall KCC structure. TfL had contracted Innovision, Event Management Company, to deliver all aspects of the Tour in the Greater London area and ensure that partners outside of the area delivered the outputs they had been contracted to provide.

(9) KCC had identified the major risks by holding such a prestigious event in Kent. This could be seen in Appendix B – TdF Business Risks, of the report. Amanda Lumley was appointed in August 2006 as KCC's Tour de France Project Manager. Amanda was responsible for co-ordinating the event for KCC. Key priorities had been identified to create a cycling legacy for Kent which included:-

- Communication of the race and its route to key stakeholders ready for the major press launch on 26 October 2006 in Paris.
- Co-ordination of events for a promotional campaign running for 2007, 'Year of the Cycle'.

(10) KHS had been working with public transport partners to encourage spectators to travel by public transport wherever possible over the weekend of 6, 7 & 8 July 2007 and facilitate managing traffic volume and movement on the highway network. Ideas that had been discussed included combined ticketing, car share, park and ride etc.

(11) KHS had identified a route through the county that would require a minimum amount of work to ensure it met the ASO requirements for the road race. Stage One would start in central London and enter Kent at Dartford, proceeding through Gravesham, Medway, Maidstone, Tonbridge, Tunbridge Wells and Ashford before reaching the Stage Finish in Canterbury. The ASO had inspected the route in mid October 2006 ready for the major press launch in Paris.

(12) Stakeholder meetings had been co-ordinated between KHS, Emergency Services, Emergency Planning Officers, Public Transport Operators, Medway Council, TfL, Districts and Borough Councils and KCC Officers. At the meetings timely distribution of information to stakeholders, businesses and residents had been highlighted as a key to ensuring the race had minimum impact to the day-to-day lives in Kent, management of people and traffic movement in a safe and effective manner.

(13) The success of the event represented an opportunity to show Kent as an international stage for World-class sporting events. The event would demonstrate on the world stage the ability of Kent to host complex international sporting events and demonstrate our capacity for hosting Olympic events and training camps.

(14) The Tour would also create a legacy to generate a long-term increase in interest and participation in cycling for sport and for recreation and transport.

(15) The Tour de France Stage 1 race would commence from Central London with the Publicity Caravan (235 vehicle procession) leading the race at a start time of 08:40. The race peleton (200 cyclists plus support vehicles) would start at the same place at 10:25. The race peleton officially started the stage 1 race from the official start line (Depart Reel) at Greenwich at 11:00 hours. The Publicity Caravan and race peleton would arrive in Canterbury at the finish line at approximately 17:00.

(16) KCC would be sending out a detailed press release which would show the race route and a detailed list of streets affected and contact details at KHS for additional information.

(17) The revised contract for TdF between TfL and KCC was in the process of being finalised in terms of the fine detail and it was anticipated that this would be signed off by the end of January 2007. The contract would build upon the existing contract that was signed back in April 2006. It would provide clarity on what was expected of KCC on the day of the event.

(18) With only six months of planning left KHS were getting into the final stages of organising the event. The final route assessment giving full details of road closure timings and resources required for staging the event would be completed by end of January 2007.

(19) The Board noted the report.

## **9. Kent and Medway Considerate Contractor Scheme** *(Item 7 - Report by Director, Kent Highway Services)*

(1) Public perception of Highway Authorities' control over roadworks was generally predicated on a lack of influence around poor workmanship and traffic delays. The report outlined the latest on the proposal to introduce a Considerate Contractor Scheme into Kent and for the approval to proceed with launching such a scheme which would encourage a higher standard of works and safety consistently across Kent's roads.

(2) Corporation of London started up the original Considerate Contractor Scheme in 1987. Considerate Contractor Schemes were now recognised by the construction industry. There was also a degree of public recognition and with the introduction of more schemes around the country this was bound to grow and become a national initiative.

(3) Equally important was the approval and support being given by the Tidy Britain Group and the Health and Safety Executive. Both organisations realised that the schemes were a significant step towards furthering broader environmental, health and safety objectives.

(4) The aim of the scheme was to introduce a reward system for high performing contractors who considered all highway users during the works. Through offering coveted Awards based on the condition of the interface between construction sites and the public, the Scheme induced a spirit of pride and excellence in the workforce. The scheme was also designed to flag up those contractors who were not performing adequately. This would give KCC a better opportunity to monitor performances for all contractors signed into the scheme and deal with them promptly to improve standards.

(5) The scheme would be a development and improvement from the current Highways Authority & Utilities Committee (HAUC) Joint Site Safety surveys and the Kent Highway Services (KHS) Divisional site safety checks. There would probably be willingness by Utilities and a contractor to be a member of the scheme, as to opt out almost showed a “don’t care attitude”. The winning of a high achievement award could be displayed on company vehicles (sticker) and jealously guarded and fought for the following year.

(6) The Kent and Medway Considerate Contractor Scheme aimed to encourage all contractors working on the highway to carry out their operations in a safe, consistent and considerate manner by:-

- Fostering a joint initiative to demonstrate the spirit of co-operation,
- Improving Standards,
- Ensuring that anyone coming along the highway from any direction would understand exactly what was happening and what was expected of them,
- Give constructive feedback and praise to develop continuous improvement.

(7) The scheme comprised of a Code of Good Practice, which included the requirements of “Safety at Street Works and Road Works”, using four categories; Safe, Clean, Considerate and Co-operative. Sites were judged against a checklist that took into account safety, cleanliness, considerate behaviours, co-operation and environmental considerations. It was by following the code of practice that the standards of works would be raised, rates of progress maximised and the condition of the highway would be improved.

(8) Members of the public passing works on the highway were invited to comment on the conditions of the site using the Kent Contact Centre. Callers would point out infringements of the Code, but were also encouraged to provide any constructive feedback.

(9) The successful operation of the scheme relied upon sufficient site inspections being made. Senior representatives from each of the participating bodies as detailed below would undertake inspections:-

- Site safety surveys (HAUC) – 84 sites inspected per year
- JUG (4 reps from SU’s) - 48 sites inspected per year
- Kent & Medway Divisional Offices - 150 sites inspected per year
- Ringway and Jacobs - 48 sites inspected per year

(10) A working party would be set up to manage most aspects of the scheme. This included site inspection, records, award recommendations, correspondence, outline responses, site counselling and co-ordinating public relations activities.

(11) Accurate written site records were essential, as they provided the basis for Awards judgements. Also photographic evidence was essential, especially in the case of sites which failed to meet the correct standards and examples of exemplary practice for the awards ceremony and publicity.

(12) All sites were judged according to the standards set out in the Code of Good Practice. There were three categories of award:-

- **Gold Award** - Organisations which showed a consistent and high degree of compliance with the requirements of the Code of Good Practice.
- **Considerate Contractor** - Organisations which regularly met the requirements of the Code of Good Practice.
- **Individual Awards** - Companies or operatives that had excelled. This category could also be contractor and gang of the year if merited.

(13) An adjudicating panel of representatives would be appointed. The panel would include independent members from outside the industry. The panel allocated awards on the basis of the evidence provided by the working party.

(14) The scheme would be run as cost neutral. An annual joining fee would be charged to the contractor/utility companies. This was to cover the cost of the awards ceremony, the initial supply of information and regalia, and the in-house resources to run the scheme. However there would be a minimal amount of set up staff time which would be recovered from the scheme.

(15) Enough site surveys were already being carried out to give meaningful results, with an existing collation system. Also the Joint Utilities Group (JUG) representatives and Highways Authority & Utilities Committee (HAUC) representatives would also contribute towards the management of the scheme. Medway Unitary Authority had historically had close links with KCC and discussions were taking place to finalise Medway's involvement with the scheme. Should Medway decide not to join then the scheme would only need to be re-branded prior to the launch.

(16) The proposal was to launch a Considerate Contractor Scheme in Kent at the start of 2007. This should be a high profile launch with a media representation. KCC would benefit publicly for launching such a scheme and stood to improve public perception of works on the highway and gain safer and cleaner streets as a result.

(17) The Board noted the report.

## 10. **The Traffic Management Act 2004 (TMA) - An Update** (Item 8 - Report by Director, Kent Highway Services)

(1) The report provided an update on the progress of the Traffic Management Act (TMA) which gained Royal Assent in 2004 and the accompanying Intervention Criteria which might be used by the Secretary of State and the Department for Transport should a local authority be seen to be failing in its duties under the TMA.

(2) The following list was a summary of the main report highlighting the key areas to be aware of:-

- The TMA required that the whole local authority, not just the highways department, to be aware of and take account of the implications of the duty.
- The Network Management Plan would be reviewed and reported upon every year in line with the reporting process for the LTP.
- If an authority failed to perform its network management duty, then the Act provided for the Secretary of State and the DfT to intervene and appoint a "Traffic Director".

- Permit Schemes were designed to give LA's further control over works on the highway.
- Permit Schemes would be designed to run as 'cost neutral'. Estimated figures indicated that income from a Permit Scheme might run to £2 million per annum.
- Non-refundable cost of managing KHS works through a Permit Scheme would be in the region of £850k per annum.
- The DfT would give LA's a six-month period to establish the permit process.
- KCC did have an option of concentrating on EtoN noticing to improve works co-ordination rather than adopting a Permit Scheme.
- The introduction of Fixed Penalty Notices (FPN) would bring financial penalties to works promoters for incorrect information that adversely affected roadworks co-ordination.
- The FPN's would also be applied to local authority roadworks. The penalties would be recorded against performance indicators and would not be a financial restraint.
- DfT had completed its consultations for the FPN scheme and had indicated that the regulations were expected to come into force during mid - late 2007.
- The Act required local authorities to commence the noticing of their own roadworks. This would increase notices by 40% to over 70,000 per annum.
- Estimated that KHS would require 12 roadwork co-ordinators to manage the notices to ensure the scheme operated to its full potential.
- It might be possible to improve the processing of notices by investing in technology such as hand held equipment for the Highway Inspectors.
- DfT had indicated that guidelines for a FPN offence would not be issued and had indicated that legal procedures could be through Magistrates Courts.

(3) It was estimated that 5% of notices might attract an FPN. With effective management, an annual income of £640,000 could be achieved.

(4) The cost of a Permit Scheme for Kent, estimated at £2.83m, would be self-funding. It might be necessary, however, to "pump prime" start-up costs which would be recoverable once the scheme was operational.

(5) Until the Regulations pertaining to Permit Schemes and Fixed Penalty Notices had been placed before Parliament, it was not possible to provide exact budget figures. However, from consultation documents released by the DfT and examination of current procedures, it would be necessary to provide both budget and staff resources if KCC wished to run a Permit Scheme.

(6) The introduction of FPN's which were likely to come into force in Mid-late 2007 would also require investment in staff resources. Without this investment, KCC would fail in their Network Management Duties and might face the prospect of Intervention procedures by the Secretary of State and the DfT. Although an income

stream would become available to balance out the requirements it was likely that both the workload and the income would be higher within the first year of operation.

(7) Monitoring systems and procedures along with close communication and liaison links must be established with the local District/Borough Authorities in order that close supervision could be carried out with regard to their Civil Enforcement operations. This would be essential to prevent KCC being affected with regard to the TMA 2004 and the associated Network Management Duties.

(8) Members were asked to consider the preliminary conclusions and offer their views in order to prepare for the release of the regulations relating to the TMA and the associated Network Management Duties.

(9) The Board noted the report.