

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, 6 January 2009.

PRESENT: Mr C Hibberd (Chairman), Mr W A Hayton (Vice-Chairman), Mr T J Birkett, Mr J R Bullock, MBE, Ms S J Carey, Mr A D Crowther (substitute for Mrs P A V Stockell), Mr D S Daley (substitute for Mr I S Chittenden), Dr M R Eddy (substitute for Mr R Truelove), Mr C G Findlay, Mr R F Manning, Mr J I Muckle, Mr R A Pascoe, Mr A R Poole, Mr R Tolputt and Mrs E M Tweed.

IN ATTENDANCE: Mrs C Bruce (Interim Director Kent Highway Services), Mr D Hall (Head of Transport & Development), Ms L Day (Kent Parking Manager), Mr S Gasche (Public Transport Team Leader), Mr D May (Ringway), Mr J Pearce (Senior Engineer, Road Safety), Mr R White (Transport and Development Business Manager), and the Head of Democratic Services (represented by Mrs K Mannering).

UNRESTRICTED ITEMS

1. Declarations of Interests by Members in items on the Agenda for the meeting
(Item 2)

Further to Minute 1(2) of 11 November 2008, Mr Muckle requested progress on the guidelines being drawn up. Work was continuing on the paper and the Chairman assured Members that he would endeavour to have a report for the next meeting.

2. Minutes - 11 November 2008
(Item 3)

(1) Further to Minute 5(2) of 11 November 2008 – Permanent Lorry Park, Members requested details of the outcome on the award of the contract for the Economic Impact Study. Caroline Bruce undertook to circulate details of progress to Members.

(2) RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting held on 11 November 2008 are correctly recorded and that they be signed by the Chairman.

3. Kent Highway Services - The Director's Update
(Item 4 – Oral report by Interim Director, Kent Highway Services)

(1) The Interim Director gave an oral update on some of the key issues and developments in KHS, as follows:-

(a) Staffing

Members would be aware that since the last HAB, John Hobbs had been unable to continue his work as Director of Highways Improvement for personal reasons.

We were enjoying a period of stability and were starting to reap the benefits of this – staff had welcomed job security and morale was improving. However, she recognised that many staff were still reeling from the significant change over the last four years, and she had some way to go to ensure that **all** staff felt happy and valued. This was understandably one of her key priorities.

(b) Transformation

We were now nearing the end of the implementation of technology planned during transformation – with streetlighting moving from their Mayrise system to the WAMS/Confirm software during January and February. Additionally Job Smart was being implemented and this would improve the programming of maintenance work and visibility of the status of fault repair to KHS staff and the Contact Centre – which would enable us to provide more information to the public about when a fault would be resolved.

A site for the West Kent depot was being actively pursued and she hoped to be able to share more details over the course of the next few months.

(c) Journey times into Maidstone

Anecdotally we had heard from a number of stakeholders - members, traders, bus operators - about the positive effect of the Traffic Management Centre and technology on journey times into Maidstone – and importantly the reliability of those journeys. We now had data to evidence this improvement with journeys taking on average 3.5 minutes per mile in the peak run up to Christmas against a baseline in 2007 of 4.2 minutes per mile.

(d) Winter service

With the cold snap greeting the New Year it was timely to give an update on the winter service, but members would be aware that preparation for winter starts in October and might have seen the press coverage or heard radio interviews with one of the supervisors for the salting teams.

Coverage was on 30% of the road network with 53 salting routes and 64 vehicles carried out salting duties. Salt was kept throughout the county for use by those vehicles. Additionally 250 snow ploughs were held by farmers in rural areas and these had been serviced ready for action.

Salting runs were up by about 50% on this time last year.

As at 5 January, between 10,000 and 12,000 tonnes of salt was held in depots with further deliveries later in the week. Members would also recall that we had started to use pre-wet salt (which basically improved stickability of the salt) and a report on this in the early summer was planned as part of the annual winter maintenance report to HAB which would be brought forward from September.

(e) LED programme

The programme to replace all traffic light heads with LED technology was on track to be delivered by 31 March this year. As at mid December 332 sites had been completed with a further 180 sites remaining and 67 sites having some technical

issues. It was understood this replacement programme was to be a first nationally, and the benefits would be reviewed over the course of 09/10.

We were looking at the potential for LED streetlights in due course, but this was something we would need to evaluate over the course of the next few years.

(f) Reactive maintenance work

Along with improving staff morale, this was a key priority – getting the basics right. It would be fair to say that the new technology and working practices we had implemented had taken longer to bed down than was originally thought, and this had led to a loss of confidence by some in the service. We were all working very hard to turn this round, and the massive commitment that teams were demonstrating day in day out was acknowledged.

Members and parish colleagues had started to see the benefits of the community liaison officers and the direct contact that many had with them. Members were urged to report routine faults through the Contact Centre so that the liaison officers had time to support them for JTBs, parish work or when issues needed to be escalated.

In terms of fault resolution, we aimed to resolve basic faults such as potholes, signage and so on within 21 days of the fault being reported. In many district areas we were delivering well on this. In two or three areas more faults were being raised and there was a small backlog. We were receiving about 800 fault reports per week from the public which were being resolved alongside the faults picked up through the routine safety inspections.

Overall, there were currently 3,500 jobs still outstanding over 21 days, against a high of 7,500 in October. Many of the outstanding jobs had in fact been completed and there was a big push to update the systems. Job Smart would again help with this as the system would update automatically once a job had been completed.

Operational performance data was reviewed weekly by team leaders and managers on a weekly basis at team and service group level.

(2) The Board:-

(a) noted the report;

(b) agreed that, in future, a written report be submitted; and

(c) requested an occasional report from the Cabinet Member for Environment, Highways and Waste.

4. Jobsmart - Presentation

(Item 5 – Report by David May, Ringway)

(1) Mr May gave a presentation on Jobsmart having circulated a detailed diagram of the system.

JobSmart - What did it do?

- A way of electronically scheduling jobs to gangs effectively and efficiently
- A way of letting people know what was going to happen
- A way of getting clear job instructions to the gangs in the field
- A way of monitoring the live progress of things as they happened in the field
- A way of letting people know what had happened and storing records

JobSmart - How was it Smarter, Better, Faster?

- Live feedback of quality information to those who needed to know (informed Customers)
- Effective scheduling of work leading to improved efficiency (value for money)
- Creating realistic targets and ensuring delivery (meeting Customer expectations)
- Passing on accurate information to gangs out in the field (safe and right first time)
- Capturing and exchanging data electronically (less paper, accessible records)

(2) Following a detailed question and answer session, Mr May invited Members to visit Jobsmart. The Chairman thanked Mr May for a very informative presentation.

5. Enforcement by Motorcycle Patrols - One Year Pilot Scheme

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

- (1) The 12 Kent District Councils were responsible for the practical application of parking policy within a framework set by the County Council. The requirements of the Traffic Management Act 2004 and the associated Network Management Duties had placed a responsibility on KCC as the Highway Authority to provide a more efficient and economic civil enforcement package. There was an expectation that local authorities would provide a universal level of enforcement across the highway network with a concentrated presence in areas of increased risk, such as school sites.
- (2) There was a general concern that vehicles parked outside schools on legally enforceable school keep clear markings were causing a potential safety issue in many parts of the County.
- (3) Traditional enforcement patrols consisted of one Civil Enforcement Officer in a van. To regularly enforce school keep clear markings, the patrol must negotiate town centre traffic during the two busiest times of the working day, resulting in the possibility of only one school receiving enforcement per day. As an example, Thanet District contains 54 school keep clear markings and effectively, a regular patrol might take upward of eight weeks to complete an enforcement circuit of the District.
- (4) Although the possibility remained of using more than one enforcement patrol to visit the schools, this had serious repercussions on the enforcement of the remainder of the District on a day-to-day basis.
- (5) There was also a concern that more rural areas and those locations where there were few waiting restrictions were not being enforced as rigorously as

other localities and that illegal parking might cause safety issues. Although the sites were included within regular enforcement beats, they were often not enforced as frequently as the busier town centre and residential areas.

- (6) There were often telephone calls received from members of the general public reporting illegal and unsafe parking both at school sites and in more remote locations. If an enforcement officer was despatched, the vehicle had more often moved on by the time the patrol was able to reach the location.
- (7) Kent County Council officers had agreed to operate a one-year motorcycle enforcement pilot scheme in partnership with Thanet District Council to provide high level enforcement at all schools within their District along with a rapid response to more remote locations. The scheme would commence, following a publicity campaign to local schools, on 1 April 2009. The pilot scheme would be closely monitored in order that all results could be analysed at the end of the 12 month period.
- (8) Kent County Council was to provide funding of approximately £40k to purchase one motorcycle, one staff member, all equipment and full training. Thanet District Council would provide all insurance costs, vehicle running costs and maintenance. They would employ the necessary staff member under their terms and conditions for a 1 year period.
- (9) Similar motorcycle enforcement schemes elsewhere in England had been successful in reducing the problems caused by inconsiderate parking outside schools and in more remote locations.
- (10) Patrols by motorcycle would significantly increase enforcement outside schools during opening and closing hours and reduce the risks of accidents. There would also be a highly visible enforcement presence at the areas of increased risk.
- (11) There would be an increase in a rapid response service to enforce more remote and rural areas, especially during those times of the day when congestion occurred within town centres making it difficult for a conventional patrol to reach the sites.
- (12) As a consequence of the highly visible, reactive service there should be a resulting increase in positive publicity and public confidence, and fewer accidents.
- (13) The Board:-
 - (a) supported the pilot scheme in principle; and
 - (b) recommended that the Cabinet Member review the situation at the end of the 12 month period.

6. Concrete Roads

(Item 7 – Report by Interim Director, Kent Highway Services)

- (1) Further to Minute 3 of 8 July 2008 concerning Magnolia Avenue, Cliftonville, and the need for KHS to consider an approach to maintaining the Authority's minor

concrete roads asset, the report updated members on progress in assessing the County's concrete estate roads.

(2) The condition assessment of Kent's minor roads was achieved by a visual survey carried out on a two year cycle. Six Districts were surveyed one year and the remaining six the following year. The six Districts being surveyed this year were: Maidstone, Canterbury, Gravesham, Shepway, Thanet and Tunbridge Wells. In order to complete an assessment of the condition of the concrete road asset, this year's survey will be extended to cover concrete roads in the other six Districts that the local Highway Inspector considered were in need of attention. The report would be followed up with a further report in April to promote a programme of repairs.

(3) This year's visual survey was being enhanced to record the particular types of deterioration exhibited by concrete roads to enable a comprehensive assessment of the needs for maintaining that part of the roads asset. Therefore, the concrete road survey data would be separately analysed to develop a specific programme of repairs for the County's concrete estate roads.

(4) A further report would be presented to the May meeting of the Board to consider the needs for investment in the concrete roads asset. The report would make use of the enhanced survey and analysis used to compile a proposed programme of works.

(5) The Board noted:-

- (a) the progress being made in identifying the need for investment in the County's concrete estate roads; and
- (b) that a further report would be submitted post April 2009.

7. Kent Design Guide - Interim Guidance Notes prepared as a response to the publication of Manual for Streets and Planning Policy Statement PPS3: Housing

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

Prior to consideration of the report Members received a presentation from Mr White, Transport & Development Business Manager.

(1) The publication of the "Manual for Streets (Department for Transport, Communities and Local Government & Welsh Assembly Government, March 2007)" had necessitated a review of the Kent Design Guide. Furthermore, the publication of Planning Policy Statement PPS3: "Housing (Communities & Local Government, November 2006)" heralded a shift in guidance concerning residential parking 'standards' such that local planning authorities were required to produce residential parking policies for their areas. Kent's District Councils asked Kent Highway Services to use its considerable knowledge and growing evidence base on the subject to produce a response to PPS3.

(2) The public realm arm of the Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment, Space, facilitated an external review of the Kent Design Guide that gave it a relatively clean bill of health. However, the visibility guidance in

the Guide had been superseded, the Quality Audit ‘concept to completion’ process needed to be enlarged upon and the guidance in respect of residential parking needed to be emphasised. The latter also satisfied the need to replace the residential parking element of Kent and Medway Structure Plan Supplementary Planning Guidance SPG4 (Vehicle Parking Standards) to accord with PPS3.

- (3) The Kent Planning Officers Group (KPOG), as ‘client’ for the Kent Design Initiative, had overseen preparation of and consultation on the resulting Interim Guidance Notes. They had been approved by KPOG and were to be offered for adoption, for Development Control purposes, by Medway Council and Kent’s District Councils. Formal approval by Kent County Council would encourage such adoption.

Interim Guidance Note 1 – Quality Audits

- (4) The Kent Design Guide promoted collaborative working (“the Development Team approach”) on all developments involving the creation of new streets and places. Manual for Streets developed the idea into Quality Audits. These enabled the Development Team to balance a range of complimentary and competing factors to arrive at the best overall development.
- (5) The Quality Audit Note established the way that Quality Audits should work, with reference to the Building for Life standard that was being recommended for use by all those involved in designing, assessing and building new housing.
- (6) The Note also drew upon survey work conducted by Kent Highway Services, in conjunction with the Kent Design Initiative, into residents’ views on recently completed developments.

Interim Guidance Note 2 – “Visibility”

- (7) The ‘visibility standards’ contained in the Kent Design Guide had been superseded by the guidance contained in Manual for Streets. The Interim Guidance Note explained the changes and related them to good design.

Interim Guidance Note 3 – Residential Parking

- (8) Parking was by far the biggest cause of dissatisfaction among residents of recently completed developments. In spite of the guidance contained in the Kent Design Guide, discredited ideologies on the location, design and number of spaces were still being imposed. PPS3 sought a design-led approach that took account of expected levels of car ownership, having regard for the most efficient use of land and assisting with demand management at appropriate locations.
- (9) The Interim Guidance Note draws on national guidance on the design of and appropriate amounts of parking, interpreting both through the substantial evidence base gathered from residents in recently completed developments. It satisfied the aims of PPS3, offering development partners and elected members an opportunity to design, approve and build streets and places in which parking would not cause neighbour disputes, inconvenience to pedestrians and danger (perceived and actual) to all users.

- (10) Two aspects of the Note which might prove to be controversial were worth highlighting. Firstly, the growing evidence base showed that only about half of garages provided as part of the parking provision were used for that purpose, even when non-use results in inappropriate parking. The Interim Guidance Note recommended that where there were no on-street parking controls, garages should be additional to the appropriate amount of parking for vehicles. Secondly, where there were no on-street controls, the recommended amounts of parking were expressed as “minimum”. False limitations on amounts of parking had resulted in problems for residents, and had not always been in the interests of good design.
- (11) It was important that new and updated guidance should be made known to all those who were expected to use it. Furthermore, training was often needed to help practitioners make use of new approaches to their work. The Interim Guidance Notes would be the subject of training and awareness-raising within Kent Highway Services and among Kent’s District Councils as part of the ongoing partnership aimed at delivering design excellence and Putting Kent First. They would also figure in training that was being formulated by the Kent Design Initiative.
- (12) The preparation of the Interim Guidance Notes, their adaptation for inclusion on the Kent Design Guide website and the training and awareness-raising necessary to bring them into widespread use were part of the work of the Kent Design Initiative. No additional resources were needed.
- (13) The Interim Guidance Notes satisfied the requirements of updating the Kent Design Guide to bring it in line with Manual for Streets and provided an evidence based response to PPS3. They maintained and enhanced the Kent Design Initiative’s commitment to design excellence.
- (14) Dr Eddy queried whether any part of the proposed recommendations to the Cabinet Members should first appear in the Forward Plan. Officers undertook to look into the matter.
- (15) Subject to the outcome in paragraph (14) above, the Board:-
- (a) agreed that the Cabinet Member for Environment, Highways and Waste and the Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Supporting Independence be informed that :-
 - (i) the three Interim Guidance Notes were needed to reflect changes in national guidance since the Kent Design Guide was published in 2005;
 - (ii) a thorough consultation had been undertaken using the Kent Design Initiative network. Representations had been embraced where appropriate; and
 - (iii) the Notes had been approved by the Kent Planning Officers Group as updates to the Kent Design Guide and, in the case of Residential Parking, also as an appropriate response to Planning Policy Statement PPS3: Housing; and
 - (b) supported the proposal for recommendation to the Cabinet Member for Environment, Highways and Waste and the Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Supporting Independence that the Quality Audit and

Residential Parking Interim Guidance Notes be approved for adoption by Kent County Council; and for recommendation for adoption by Kent's District Councils;

- (c) noted the "Visibility" Interim Guidance Note, which updated guidance contained in the Kent Design Guide.

A formal vote was not taken but Dr Eddy requested that his abstention be recorded.

8. Canterbury Quality Bus Partnership - Targets and Bus Stop Clearways
(Item 9 – Report by Interim Director, Kent Highway Services)

- (1) The report set out the current position concerning the provision of bus stop clearways in the Canterbury district, and recommended that the Cabinet Member approved the original recommendation of the report considered by the Canterbury Joint Transportation Board (JTB) on 25 November 2008 that all present and future bus stop clearways should be restricted for 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.
- (2) The Department for Transport (DfT) set out its guidelines on the provision of bus stop clearways in DfT circular 02/2003: The Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions (TSRGD) 2002. Paragraphs 24-32 set out the new regulations which were designed to enable buses to pull up level with the kerb at bus stops in order to facilitate easy access and egress for bus passengers. In addition, the regulations foresee the legally binding requirement of the Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) 2004, which required all buses to be DDA compliant by 2017. This meant that wheel-chair users must be able to access and egress low-floor buses *at all times of operation, including evening and early morning services*. To restrict access by bus to able-bodied passengers only during those times by restricting the times of operation of bus stop clearways would be contrary to the requirements of the DDA, and would therefore require further changes to the bus stop infrastructure when the whole bus fleet was converted to low-floor access by 2017.
- (3) Paragraph 29 of TSRGD was particularly relevant to the issue of the period of time for which the restrictions should apply to vehicles other than buses stopping at bus stop clearways. It stated: *".. and that the hours of operation and enforcement should take account of the hours when buses are operating"*. As buses operated on all the principal inter-urban routes serving Canterbury between 0600 and 2400, and on most of the city centre routes between 0630 and 2330, and as the DfT guidelines permitted the restriction to apply 24 hours a day, it was recommended that this provision be applied to all present and future bus stop clearways in the Canterbury district. The reason for the uniform approach was that, where a timed restriction applied, vehicles frequently parked during the evening and were not removed until after the morning peak period had commenced, causing serious problems for access and egress at bus stops when they were blocked by parked vehicles.
- (4) The development and improvement of the bus network was dependent on a constructive working partnership between the bus operator, the City Council and the County Council. This had been exemplified in Canterbury by the operation of a Quality Bus Partnership (QBP), which sought to promote improvements to bus services through understanding and co-operation between the parties to the QBP. The extension of bus stop clearway

restrictions so that they applied all day every day was an essential pre-requisite for the success of the QBP, as it would be indicative of a serious commitment by KCC to the support of the existing bus network and to its future development for the reasons set out in the report.

- (5) The following comments from Mr M Northey, Chairman of the Canterbury JTB, had been circulated to Board Members prior to the meeting:-

“I should be grateful if the Board would consider the following and not reverse the Canterbury JTB recommendation. We debated it thoroughly, did not come lightly to our conclusion and it was passed with a comfortable majority. We believe that HAB will take great account of this.

The officer paper makes some good arguments for the bus stop clearway -- but only for those hours when the bus is running. There is no merit at all in denying the public highway to parking of other vehicles -- which form the overwhelming majority - when there are no buses needing a clearway. We really must not anticipate what the national government may or may not do in ten years' time. Lessons of the past few months have shown us how uncertain the world is.

Why restrict liberty for road users a) when there is no need to b) because what may or may not happen in the far future?

The correct course is proper enforcement at times when that is necessary - not blanket restrictions at other irrelevant times, which will anyway not be observed by the careless but will inconvenience the responsible”.

- (6) The Canterbury JTB considered a report at its meeting on 25 November 2008 which recommended that all bus stop clearways be restricted for 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Its recommendation was rejected, and the present policy of bus stop clearway restrictions applying only between 0700 and 1900 remained. This caused serious problems for buses needing to provide level kerb access and egress for all bus passengers during the evenings and early mornings, and also sent out a message which was contrary to the published policy of Kent County Council which supported the development of sustainable transport and promotes travel by public transport in particular wherever possible. The KCC officers therefore recommended that the Highways Advisory Board should not accept the recommendation of the Canterbury JTB, and should make provision for 24 hours a day, 7 days a week restrictions for all bus stop clearways in the Canterbury district.
- (7) The Board supported the proposal for recommendation to the Cabinet Member for Environment, Highways and Waste that the recommendation from the Canterbury JTB not to extend bus stop clearway orders for 24 hours per day was not supported.

Carried 9 for, 2 against

9. Circular Roads 1/2006 Setting Local Speed Limits, Update
(Item 10 – Report by Head of Network Management)

- (1) The latest results of the work carried out by Jacobs UK on the speed limit review were set out in the report. This was the latest in a series of HAB reports on the speed limit review. It set out the funding implications for the implementation of the demonstration project; gave details of the communication process with the parish council and others on the demonstration area; set out the recommendations of the review of phase 1; and gave details of the programme for the completion of the review.
- (2) The estimated cost of the recommended changes in the demonstration area was £225,621. This covered the signing and lining required to make the limits enforceable and clear to drivers whilst seeking to reduce clutter wherever possible. A detailed breakdown of the costs was set out in Appendix 1 of the report.
- (3) In May 2008 presentations were given to the parish councils in the demonstration area. The presentations included an opening address by Keith Ferrin and he was followed by presentations from Jacobs on how the speed limits were considered; the Kent Police Traffic Unit gave their position; and John Wilson, who had represented all of the parish councils in the demonstration area. In addition to the presentations copies of the Jacobs report were provided and the parish councils were invited to comment on the reports recommendations. Subsequently a number of comments were received along with letters from individual residents, a local Councillor and action groups. The review team, the Kent Traffic Police and John Wilson, reconsidered the comments. A further report was then produced and circulated to all those who wrote to the council giving details of any subsequent changes or giving detailed explanation on why further changes could not be included.
- (4) The review on Phase 1 was now complete and a draft report had been prepared. It covered 11 “A” class roads and 9 “B” class roads (a complete list of roads was set out in Appendix 2 of the report), and 109 parish councils (a complete list of councils was set out in Appendix 3 of the report). The report recommended reductions to 40 speed limits and increased to 13 which represented changes to 19.18% of the total of 267km of road covered within the phase 1 area.
- (5) During discussion Caroline Bruce undertook to provide Members with details of the above changes, following the meeting.
- (6) The programme for the completion of the review of the A and B road network was as follows:-

Financial year	scheme
2009/10	Implement demonstration project Detailed design & communication Phase 1 Review Phase 2
2010/11	Monitor demonstration project Implement Phase 1 Detailed design & communication Phase 2

	Review Phase 3
2011/12	Monitor Phase 1 Implement Phase 2 Detailed design & communication Phase 3
2012/13	Monitor Phase 2 Implement Phase 3
2013/14	Monitor Phase 3

- (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 of the councils within the demonstration area. His role was to reassure the Parish Councils within the area that the county councils approach was robust and fully in line with the Government's guidance. With the review of Phase 1. John Wilson had now been joined by volunteers from three parish councils within the phase 1 area who were now acting in a similar role.
- (8) At present there was insufficient time and funding to also consider "C" and unclassified roads across the county, however, such roads could not be completely ignored. So 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 small improvement's budget, its priority being set by PIPKIN.
- (9) Subject to the Board receiving the information referred to in paragraph (5) above, the Board supported the proposals for recommendation to the Cabinet Member for Environment, Highways and Waste that:-
- (a) the funding of the demonstration area next year 2009/10 be agreed;
 - (b) the continuation of the programme of the speed limit review be agreed; and
 - (c) the recommendations of the phase 1 report be noted and supported.

Adverse Weather Conditions

The Chairman undertook to circulate the following to the staff of Kent Highways Services, on behalf of Board Members:-

"At the meeting of the Highways Advisory Board on 6 January the Members requested that I should record the Board's appreciation of the exceptional work done by staff of KHS during the current period of cold weather.

They are aware that the outdoor staff have endured very cold conditions at inconvenient times and the indoor staff have willingly provided back-up whilst continuing to perform their normal duties."