

AGENDA

HIGHWAYS ADVISORY BOARD

Tuesday, 6th January, 2009, at 10.30 am
Council Chamber, Sessions House, County
Hall, Maidstone

Ask for: **Karen Mannering**

Telephone **(01622) 694367**

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

UNRESTRICTED ITEMS

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

1. Substitutes
2. Declarations of Interests by Members in items on the Agenda for this meeting.
3. Minutes - 11 November 2008 (Pages 1 - 10)
4. Kent Highway Services - The Director's Update (Oral report)
5. Jobsmart - Presentation
6. Enforcement by Motorcycle Patrols - One Year Pilot Scheme (Pages 11 - 14)
7. Concrete Roads (Pages 15 - 16)
8. Kent Design Guide - Interim Guidance Notes prepared as a response to the publication of Manual for Streets and Planning Policy Statement PPS3: Housing (Pages 17 - 20)
9. Canterbury Quality Bus Partnership - Targets and Bus Stop Clearways (Pages 21 - 28)
10. Circular Roads 1/2006 Setting Local Speed Limits, Update (Pages 29 - 36)

EXEMPT ITEMS

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

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

Tuesday, 23 December 2008

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

KENT COUNTY COUNCIL

HIGHWAYS ADVISORY BOARD

MINUTES of a meeting of the Highways Advisory Board held in the Council Chamber, Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone on Tuesday, 11 November 2008.

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

ALSO PRESENT: Mr L Christie

IN ATTENDANCE: Mrs C Bruce (Interim Director Kent Highway Services), Mr D Hall (Head of Transport & Development), Ms L Day (Kent Parking Manager), Mr B Haratbar (Head Of Countywide Improvements), Amandeep Khroud (Solicitor), Mr G Mills (Democratic Services), Mr I Procter (Road Safety Manager), Mr P Slaughter (Transportation Engineer), 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 this meeting.
(Item 2)

(1) Further to Minute 3(2) of 16 September 2008, Members discussed the implications for those Members who served on both the Board and the Planning Applications Committee, in particular when matters were presented to both Committees. The clear advice from the Legal Unit was to avoid a conflict of interest and for individual Members to decide at which meeting they wished to speak/vote on the matter, and then absent themselves from the other meeting, at least for the duration of that particular item.

(2) Members were informed that guidelines were being drawn up and would be circulated shortly.

(3) Mr Hayton, Mr Muckle and Mr Poole declared an interest in Item 6 – Permanent Lorry Park – An update on progress as Members of the Planning Applications Committee.

2. Minutes - 16 September 2008
(Item 3)

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting held on 16 September 2008 are correctly recorded and that they be signed by the Chairman.

3. **Dates of Meetings - 2009**

(Item 4)

RESOLVED that the dates of the meetings of the Board for 2009, as set out in the Agenda, be noted.

4. **Kent Highway Services - The Director's Update**

(Item 5 - Oral report by Interim Director, Kent Highway Services)

(1) Prior to presenting the report Caroline Bruce informed Members that she had taken up the post of Interim Director, Kent Highway Services. She would be working closely with Mike Austerberry, Interim Executive Director of Environment, Highways and Waste; and John Hobbs, Interim Director of Highways. A priority would be to bring stability to the Directorate and build staff confidence.

(2) During her report reference was made to:-

- Focus on customer care
- Tracker survey
- The success of the Ashford Depot and the need for a similar depot in the West Kent area
- EDF

5. **Permanent Lorry Park - An update on progress**

(Item 6 - Report by Head of Countywide Improvements)

(1) The report updated Members on progress towards developing a permanent lorry park for overnight lorry parking which could also be used in the event of Operation Stack. The Head of Countywide Improvements gave a verbal update at the meeting.

(2) There were two strands to current activity:-

Economic assessment:

KCC was in the process of commissioning an Economic Impact Study to ascertain the economic impact (in quantifiable terms) of Operation Stack to Kent business & residents and the public sector in its widest sense. Tenders had been issued to be returned by 14 November. It was hoped to award the contract on 1 December and the Study would be complete in approximately six months.

Survey & design:

Land entry had been negotiated on the majority of the land required for surveys – the environmental surveys extended beyond the site of the proposed lorry park itself. A topographical survey was about to start and should be completed by end of December. A preliminary geotechnical survey was planned to start in January.

The site had been visually assessed to scope the extent of the environmental surveys required. Environmental surveys were seasonal and the survey period varied according to species but the first were due to start in February.

(3) A meeting was planned with the Environment Agency because flooding and surface water disposal would be key issues, and talks would continue with key stakeholders such as Eurotunnel, the Port of Dover, the Highways Agency, Kent Police, Kent Fire & Rescue,

South East Coast Ambulance Service etc. to be clear about operational needs that would inform the design layout.

(4) The Board noted the report.

6. Mitigating the effects of HGVs on Leicestershire's Roads

(Item 7 - Report by Head of Transportation and Development)

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

(1) All Members of HAB had been provided with a copy of the Leicestershire County Council report on "Mitigating the effects of HGVs on Leicestershire's roads". The work would be helpful in aiding Kent County Council in shaping its Freight Strategy and revised lorry route plan.

(2) Leicestershire was centrally located within the UK; it had high mineral output and a multitude of industrial estates, particularly in the North West of the County. Increasing levels of HGV movements were generated by the industries resulting in greater use of rural roads to access the motorway and trunk road network. Many of the rural roads were unsuitable for such traffic and Heavy Goods Vehicles (**HGV's**) were causing extensive damage to roads. Problems encountered included: - rural roads/verges, noise, vibration, road safety issues, pollution and dirt on the highway network.

(3) The initial public pressure came from residents in the north-west of the county. North West Leicestershire was home to several of the largest coalmines in England. The majority of the outputs of the sites (pre1990) were transported by rail network. Due to rail strikes in the late 1980's, the cost of railway links to shipping ports was high resulting in the road haulage industry expanding significantly. The modal shift in transport created implications within Leicestershire mainly due to the industrial areas and coal-mines being sited well away from the main trunk roads and motorways. This meant that travel through villages and other small hamlets (**approx 700 a day**) was inevitable as drivers would take the most direct and fuel efficient route to the primary road network.

(4) Public pressure for remedial action to alleviate the HGV situation grew in the late 1980's. As a result, the County Council undertook a review and came up with a proposed area wide 7.5Tonne (Except for loading and unloading) weight restriction, bounded by non weight restricted 'peripheral' routes. The initial scheme was a success resulting in Leicestershire County Council proposing an extension which also proved a success. The scheme now covered the whole of Leicestershire.

Benefits of Lorry Restrictions – Based on Leicestershire County Council's HGV Scheme

* **Improved Road Safety** – decrease in HGV related accident statistics on rural routes within Leicestershire.

* **Improved Environment** – Reduction in HGV result in Lower vehicle emissions within the rural areas.

* **Maintenance Costs** – reduced damage to minor carriageways caused by HGV's resulting in less frequent repair work.

* **Improved Signage** – Signage directing HGV's on certain routes could be coupled with directional signage to smaller villages.

* **Better communication with Highway Authority** – Public relations could improve as dedicated personnel were able to act as a contact to solve Lorry related issues.

* **Improved Image** – Successful Lorry restrictions would enhance the image of the rural nature of roads, offering more protection to both the environment and wildlife in the TRAMP area.

* **Less damage to vehicles** – Taking HGV's off of unsuitable routes reduced maintenance costs on the carriageway.

* **Improved/Safer environment** – Restricting roads within rural areas would improve the environment for residents within the affected villages.

Negatives of Lorry Restrictions based on Leicestershire County Council's HGV Scheme

* **Concentration of HGV movements through villages** – residents would be pleased with lorry ban on their route/road, however, the problem was not alleviated, effectively, the HGV traffic was simply moved onto a neighbouring route resulting in a problem for somebody else.

* **Capital Cost** – initial outlay of the cost, TRO's, Signage, and Diversion Routes. Leicestershire was smaller than Kent, to date, the cost of the Lorry ban was £2 million solely on signage.

* **Additional Staff** – FT employment would need to be undertaken to control the Lorry restrictions. Leicestershire had at one time a team consisting of 5 F/T employees dealing with the work. There were 2 F/T employees covering the Lorry Ban today.

* **Additional Fuel Costs** – Due to the fact that drivers could no longer take the 'shortest route' to join onto the major road network, fuel costs might increase due to excessive mileage undertaken to do this. This also posed damage to the surrounding environment as drivers would in fact be covering more miles than need be.

* **Removal of Freedom of Routes** – Many local residents would feel restricted to join major routes as these would predominantly be served for HGV purposes.

* **Greater Route Planning Required** – Easy task for local drivers who were familiar with local routes. Potential hazard for foreign lorry drivers, who were dependant of Satellite Navigation Systems.

* **Prosecution** – Enforcement was initially imposed by Leicestershire CC's Trading Standards dept. reporting to Haulage companies of driver activity. This proved unsuccessful due to letters being ignored. LCC now paid local Police £60k annually to enforce the ban.

(5) The Leicestershire work was clearly an example of good practice and this would be used in the Freight Strategy work being undertaken by the County Council's Transport Strategy team. The key issue in Leicestershire was 700 HGV movements daily travelling from the NW of the County mainly in a westerly direction to join onto the M1. These HGV's were travelling to/from a busy national/international industries located in a fixed place within the county.

(6) Leicestershire's costs were in the region of £2 million purely for signage; this did not include the maintenance costs. The £2 million had been contributed over 15 years and was still using public funding to date. Kent was larger in scale compared to Leicestershire so funding would be a key issue in this regard.

(7) An issue evident in Leicestershire was higher vehicle emissions due to extra mileage on diversion routes. In some cases the routes were in excess of 15 miles. This needed careful thought in a Kent context.

(8) During debate the following issues were referred to:-

- The report was pertinent to Kent – benefits outweighed dis-benefits – look at pilot in Kent
- Would Leicestershire's project work in Kent – higher percentage of foreign drivers/signage implications
- Need policy and need to include rail freight
- Question of managing restrictions; added problem of sat navs
- Width an added problem. Lorries should be told which route to take
- Look at on area basis, not individually

(9) The Board noted the contents of the report, and advised that the contents should be used during the preparation of the KCC HGV policy document.

7. KCC Permit Scheme Application and Implementation

(Item 8 - Report by Permit Scheme Project Manager)

(1) The report sought to update Members on progress in implementing the Permit Scheme. The second consultation with external stakeholders concluded on 19 September 2008. In total there were nearly 300 responses from 8 sources. The comments had been reviewed and assessed and the Permit Scheme and application were being developed in consideration to these.

(2) To date, the Department for Transport (DfT) had only received one Permit Scheme application. The application was from the London Authorities under a common scheme named the "London Permit Scheme".

(3) In discussions with the DfT it had become apparent that they required clear substantiation of any proposed permit scheme, including cost benefit analysis, how objectives would be realised, and detailed operational information. Kent had taken many of the comments from the DfT into consideration and the Permit Scheme application was being developed accordingly.

(4) The project was still on track to submit a Permit Scheme application to the Secretary of State (SoS) in early November. The DfT required up to 4 months to review the application, so it was estimated that, if KCC was successful, the legal order to operate the scheme would be received in February 2009. At that point Kent would issue a communication to all works promoters stating the intent to introduce operational permitting from April 2009.

(5) Whilst waiting for approval by the SoS, KCC would be progressing with developing the resources for operational permitting, including recruiting and training staff, developing systems and engaging with external stakeholders. Initially Kent would be operating permitting within the KHS Alliance for its own work. As there was no associated permit fee to the operation, Kent were not constrained by the SoS Permit Scheme approval to introduce the new way of working. Based on the current project schedule, permitting of KHS' own work should commence in February 2009.

(6) The period between own works permitting (Phase 1) and full Kent operational permitting (Phase 2) would provide an opportunity to review and embed permitting working practices; organisational capability and systems. This would ensure KHS was operationally

stable to commence permitting with external works promoters and any initial operational issues were highlighted and resolved. In addition Kent would conduct a *readiness review* with external works promoters to ensure a successful transition into operational permitting was achieved.

(7) An operational permit scheme provided KHS with an increased level of control in relation to disruption within the network, but also represented the introduction of constraints to the works promoters whose primary concern was to maintain their supply of services. KHS currently had a positive relationship with works promoters and the National Joint Utility Group (NJUG). The works promoters acknowledged that KHS intended to apply and run a permit scheme and were in support of the open approach.

(8) A communications strategy to maintain and build on the positive relationship with the works promoters was underway. As part of the implementation KHS would be developing working practices with the work promoters and sharing experiences and knowledge from the Phase 1 own works permitting. In addition, the Chair of NJUG was a member of the Project Board.

(9) The business case and associated application for the Permit Scheme contained very clear strategic objectives to be realised from the implementation of operational permitting:-

- To ensure safety – for those, living or working in the street, including those engaged in activities controlled by the Scheme;
- To minimise inconvenience and disruption caused by activities to people using the streets;
- To protect the structure of the street and integrity of apparatus in it.

KHS had produced a detailed benefits matrix, including methods of measurement, to provide analysis and data to justify and validate the implementation and continued operation of a Permit Scheme. The high level method and measurements for realising the objectives were set out in Appendix 1 of the report.

(10) The report had been produced to provide information in relation to the progress of the Permit Scheme application and associated implementation.

(11) The Board noted the report and recommended that work should proceed as soon as possible.

8. Maidstone District Casualty Numbers and Progress against National 2010 Casualty Targets

(Item 9 - Report by Head of Network Management)

(1) The number of people killed or seriously injured in Kent had shown an overall downward trend compared with recent years. Kent had recorded a 40% reduction in killed or seriously injured (KSI) casualties for 2007, compared with the 1994-1984 average and was on line to meet the Government' 2010 target.

(2) However, against the 40% county reduction, Maidstone District had shown only a 15% reduction in KSI casualties compared with the 1994-98 average. Dover and Tunbridge Wells also indicated upward trends, and Dartford and Sevenoaks had less well defined trend patterns which would need to be monitored. The remaining districts did not indicate an upward trend and were below or on target for a 40% reduction in KSI casualties by 2010.

(3) In response to concerns regarding the 2007 KSI casualty record in Maidstone and in particular, concerns regarding an increase in fatalities in 2007, a summary report which looked at all injury casualties was produced; and formed the basis of discussions with the Maidstone Borough Council's Assistant Technical Director, Regulatory and Environmental Services, to agree a joint action plan to tackle identified issues.

(4) The casualty data indicated that young car drivers and passengers aged 17-24 years; motorcyclists riding 500cc and above bikes; and 12-16 year old pedestrians had trends significant to Maidstone. The fatal record for Maidstone over the past decade was also reviewed and no trend or pattern was identified. Data available for this year showed that the number of fatalities for the Jan to June 2008 was five – fewer than half the number of fatalities for the same 6-month period in 2007.

Proposed Joint Action Plan MBC and KCC :-

Road user Influences:

(5) To influence the road user groups identified at a greater risk, and **in addition to** the countywide education, publicity and enforcement initiatives, specifically for Maidstone it was proposed that KCC would:-

- Increase the current activities by re-inviting Maidstone schools, which had previously not responded, to have a young driver education course in their school.
- Deliver 3 road safety campaigns, during December 2008 and early 2009, aimed at the three identified road user groups: young drivers and passengers (17-24yrs); 500cc and above motorcycle riders; 12-16 pedestrians.
- In addition to the normal county wide tours of road safety 'Theatre in Education' activities in schools, it was proposed to have an extra week in Maidstone of an anti drink/drug driving play aimed at young drivers, and a specific week for each of the child pedestrian performances – 'The Smart Brothers' (primary schools) and 'It's Up To You' (lower secondary school).
- Maidstone was one of only six districts where a "Small steps" programme was provided within infant schools aimed at pedestrian safety.
- Maidstone was most commonly the base for county wide campaign launches involving the media, which may have added benefit for Maidstone.
- MBC to assist with road safety messages via LED signs Lock Meadow at car parks and park and ride sites.

. Physical measures

(6) Maintain the methods of physical remedial works for casualty reduction and in addition to reporting to the Maidstone Joint Board locations with the potential for casualty reduction measures included; all locations reviewed as part of the Annual cluster site review.

Road safety awareness

(7) It was proposed to host a joint Maidstone Borough Council/KCC event where members and others could come to form a common understanding of the road safety within Maidstone and mitigations, and to provide an opportunity for constructive debate.

Roles and Liaison

(8) KCC Road Safety would lead and progress road safety activities, acting as a liaison between Police and other emergency services and involving others as appropriate. MBC's Assistant Director would lead on organising a members' road safety awareness event.

(9) It was considered that physical interventions must continue to be introduced where appropriate. However, to achieve significant casualty reductions for 2010, it was essential to influence road user behaviour.

(10) The Board:-

(a) continued to support Road Safety as a high priority; and

(b) supported the proposed joint action plan between KCC and Maidstone Borough Council.

9. Downs Road and Hog Lane, Northfleet

(Item 10 - Report by Head of Transport and Development)

(Mr L Christie was present for this item)

(1) A report on Downs Road and Hog Lane, Northfleet was considered by the Board on 8 May 2008. These were narrow country lanes linking the hamlet of Northfleet Green and Istead Rise (south of A2) with the Pepperhill and Painters Ash estates in Northfleet; linking residents with the primary school at Painters Ash and local shops and doctors surgery.

(2) The section of the route from Northfleet Green Road (just south of the Channel Tunnel Rail link) had been closed since August 2006 and under the A2 widening permission it was due to reopen later in the year with no restrictions as to its use. It had been thought that the road would reopen in October but works had taken longer in that area than previously expected.

(3) The temporary closure of the road was an opportune time to carry out Public Consultation as to its future use. There were marginally more people wanting the road closed to motorised vehicles than those wishing it to be kept open for cars, vans and motor cyclists. However, the route had been a public highway for well over 100 years, was more convenient and shorter for local people and avoided the need for them to tangle with main road traffic. It was particularly important for residents of Northfleet Green who would otherwise have to use a blind junction onto New Barn Road to go to Painters Ash. On the other hand the lanes were used recreationally by walkers, cyclists and horse riders.

(4) The decision resulting from the earlier Board meeting was a compromise in that the road should be kept open for vehicles less than 7 ft wide which would be enforced by physical width restrictions; the use of the road would then be monitored for a year after reopening and the restrictions reviewed.

(5) Traffic Regulation Orders for the road, for a '30 mph speed limit', 'No stopping' and '6 ft 6" width restriction' (to be enforced by 7 ft wide physical measures at either end of the road) were advertised towards the end of September. The closing date for Objections to the Orders was 13 October and resulted in one Objection from the Highways Agency and, although not a formal objection to the Orders, two letters from residents of Downs Road, one from a resident of an adjacent road and a 107 signature petition from a mixture of other residents of Downs Road and mainly walkers against reopening the road.

(6) The letters and petition contrast the 148 signature petition reported to the Board in May from local residents who wanted the road to remain open as it was their most convenient link for facilities.

(7) The Board agreed that with opposing views remaining as to whether the road was reopened or not, a year's trial period with the road open appeared to still be the best compromise.

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

- (a) the Traffic Regulation Orders for a '30 mph speed limit', 'no stopping' and '6ft 6inch width restriction' on the sections of Hog Lane and Downs Road between Northfleet Green Road and just north of old A2 be confirmed for a trial period of 12 months; and
- (b) the appropriate signing and physical width restrictions to be in place on the reopening of the road later in the year.

10. Decriminalised Parking: The Traffic Management Act 2004 Changes to legislation and revision of the District/Borough Agency Agreements
(Item 11 - Report by Kent Parking Manager)

(1) The Traffic Management Act 2004 (Part 6) Civil Enforcement of Parking took effect in April 2008, introducing new legislation and statutory requirements for all local authorities in England and Wales. Within Kent, the 12 District/Borough and City Councils were responsible for the practical application of parking policy within Agency Agreements negotiated between the County Council and the 12 District/Borough authorities. The report summarised the current situation with regard to the Agency Agreements and the management of parking and provided information as to the future arrangements between the 12 District/Borough Councils and Kent County Council.

(2) Currently, the 12 District/Borough Councils carried out the functions for on-street parking on behalf of the County Council under 12 individual Agency Agreements. However, under new legislation contained within the Traffic Management Act 2004, Kent County Council were now fully liable and responsible for meeting the requirements of the Traffic Management Act and may be audited by the Department for Transport with regard to meeting the necessary obligations under the new legislation.

(3) The current Agency Agreements were negotiated with each individual District/Borough Council between 1997 and 2001, dependent upon when each District/Borough Council took on powers under decriminalisation and were written under previous legislation relating to The Road Traffic Act 1984 and The Road Traffic Act 1991.

(4) As a result of the changes in legislation due to the advent of the Traffic Management Act 2004 and the associated Network Management Duties, the 12 current Agency Agreements were no longer legally fit for purpose and may leave both the County Council and the District/Borough authorities open to challenge by a Member of the Public, possible judicial review or potential intervention by the Department for Transport acting on behalf of the Secretary for State. It was therefore necessary to fully review the current Agency Agreements with all the 12 District/Borough authorities.

(5) Although all District/Borough Councils across Kent worked closely together with regard to best practice, there still remained a wide variation in the way parking was enforced across the County of Kent. This caused unnecessary confusion for the general public, residents and visitors to the County. Coupled with the new statutory responsibilities of Kent County Council brought about by the Traffic Management Act 2004, it was proposed that the current Agency Agreements were renegotiated with all 12 District/Borough Councils to allow the opportunity for consistent management procedures

with regard to parking requirements in Kent and to ensure that Kent County Council met all statutory requirements necessitated by the Traffic Management Act 2004.

(6) It was proposed that the new Agency Agreements would operate alongside a Local Operating Agreement containing required policies, procedures and actions which would allow Kent County Council to meet its statutory requirements under the Traffic Management Act 2004 as well as allowing for new innovations to be put into place to assist in the efficient enforcement of on-street parking controls across the County.

(7) Any future changes to legislation would only require the rewriting of the Local Operating Agreement. This would prevent unnecessary delays in renegotiating the Agreements and no longer leave the County Council or any of the 12 District/Borough authorities in a position where they might be subject to a legal challenge whilst negotiations took place.

(8) Due to changes in legislation it was necessary to commence immediate renegotiations of the 12 Agency Agreements between the County Council and the District/Borough authorities. A report was submitted to the Leaders and Chief Executives of the 12 District/Borough authorities on 22 September 2008 requesting agreement to the full renegotiation of the current Agency Agreements and the introduction of a Local Operating Agreement within each District/Borough Council. The 12 District/Borough Leaders and Chief Executives instructed Kent County Council to commence negotiations with no further delay.

(9) The Board:-

(a) noted the content of the report; and

(b) recommended to the Cabinet Member that paragraph (8) above should commence as soon as possible.

By: Interim Director, Kent Highway Services
To: Highways Advisory Board – 6th January 2009
Subject: **Enforcement by Motorcycle Patrols – One Year Pilot Scheme**
Classification: Unrestricted

Summary: This report advises Members of the forthcoming Motorcycle Enforcement Pilot Scheme being introduced by Kent County Council in partnership with Thanet District Council under the current Decriminalised Parking Agency Agreement.

This will be a rapid response patrol unit to serve school and rural enforcement providing a highly visible and reactive service.

Introduction

1. The 12 Kent District Councils are responsible for the practical application of parking policy within a framework set by the County Council.
2. The requirements of the Traffic Management Act 2004 and the associated Network Management Duties have placed a responsibility on KCC as the Highway Authority to provide a more efficient and economic civil enforcement package. There is an expectation that local authorities will provide a universal level of enforcement across the highway network with a concentrated presence in areas of increased risk, such as school sites.

Background Information

3. There is a general concern that vehicles parked outside schools on legally enforceable school keep clear markings are causing a potential safety issue in many parts of the County.
4. Traditional enforcement patrols consist of one Civil Enforcement Officer in a van. To regularly enforce school keep clear markings, this 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 may take upward of eight weeks to complete an enforcement circuit of the school keep clears within the District.
5. Although the possibility remains of using more than one enforcement patrol to visit the schools, this has serious repercussions on the enforcement of the remainder of the District on a day-to-day basis.

6. There is also a concern that more rural areas and those locations where there are few waiting restrictions are not being enforced as rigorously as other localities and that illegal parking may cause safety issues. Although these sites are included within regular enforcement beats, they are often not enforced as frequently as the busier town centre and heavy residential areas.
7. There are 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 is despatched, the vehicle has more often moved on by the time the patrol is able to reach the location.

Future Proposals

8. Kent County Council have agreed to operate a one-year motorcycle enforcement pilot scheme in partnership with Thanet District Council to provide high level enforcement to all schools within their District along with a rapid response to more remote locations. This scheme will commence, following a publicity campaign to local schools, on 1 April 2009.
9. The pilot scheme will be closely monitored in order that all results can be analysed at the end of the 12 month period.

Financial Implications

10. Kent County Council are to provide funding of approximately £40k to purchase one motorcycle, one staff member, all equipment and full training. Thanet District Council will provide all insurance costs, running cost and maintenance. They will employ the necessary staff member under their terms and conditions for a 1 year period.

Benefits and Conclusions of the Pilot Scheme

11. Similar motorcycle enforcement schemes across the Country have been successful in reducing the problems caused by inconsiderate parking outside schools and in more remote locations.
12. Patrols by motorcycle will significantly increase enforcement outside schools during opening and closing hours and reduce the risks of accidents outside these sites. There will also be a highly visible enforcement presence at these areas of increased risk.
13. There will be an increase in a rapid response service to enforce more remote and rural areas, especially during those times of the day when congestion occurs within town centres making it difficult for a conventional patrol to reach these sites.
14. As a consequence of this highly visible, reactive service there should be a resulting increase in positive publicity and public confidence.

Accountable Officer: Lorna Day, Kent Parking Manager, KHS Network Management
Tel: 01622 693718 E-mail: lorna.day@kent.gov.uk

Background Documents: None

This page is intentionally left blank

By: Interim Director, Kent Highway Services
To: Highways Advisory Board - 6th January 2009
Subject: **Concrete Roads**
Classification: Unrestricted

Summary: The report provides a short progress update in relation to condition assessment and analysis of concrete roads in Kent.

Introduction

This report follows on from the last report to HAB on the 8th 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 purpose of this report is to update HAB on progress in assessing the County's concrete estate roads.

Condition Assessment

The condition assessment of Kent's minor roads is achieved by a visual survey carried out on a two year cycle. Six Districts are surveyed one year and the remaining six the following year. The six Districts being surveyed this year are: Maidstone, Canterbury, Gravesham, Shepway, Thanet and Tunbridge Wells.

In order to complete an assessment of the condition of Kent's concrete road asset, this year's survey is being extended to cover concrete roads in the other six Districts that the local Highway Inspector consider are in need of attention. This report will be followed up with a further report in April to promote a programme of repairs.

Change in Analysis

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

Further Report to HAB

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

Conclusion

HAB is asked to note the progress being made in identifying the need for investment in the County's concrete estate roads and to await a further report post April 2009.

Accountable Officer: Kim Hills

Tel: 01622 605866 E-mail: kim.hills@kent.gov.uk

Background Documents: None

By: Interim Director of Kent Highway Services.

To: Highways Advisory Board - 6th January 2009

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

Classification: Unrestricted.

Summary: The publication of national guidance on the planning, design and maintenance of new residential streets and spaces, Manual for Streets, and the Planning Policy Statement in respect of Housing, PPS3, have necessitated a review of the Kent Design Guide and the residential element of Kent and Medway Structure Plan Supplementary Planning Guidance on Vehicle Parking Standards (SPG4).

Three Interim Guidance Notes have been prepared:

1. Quality Audits – how development partners should work together to achieve design excellence.
2. “Visibility” – new guidance on sight lines for drivers at junctions and along streets.
3. Residential Parking – planning for adequate and properly laid out parking in residential developments.

These Interim Guidance Notes have been the subject of consultation through the Kent Design Initiative network and have been approved by the Kent Planning Officers Group for use by Medway Council, Kent’s District Councils and Kent County Council (including Kent Highway Services). The “Visibility” Note interprets national guidance and is already in use. However, adoption of the Quality Audit and Residential Parking Notes by Kent County Council will represent a strong recommendation to its Kent Design partners that the Notes should be adopted for Development Control purposes.

This report therefore **Seeks Approval**, through the appropriate Cabinet Members, and therefore adoption for development control and development planning purposes, of Interim Guidance Notes 1 and 3 and **Informs** Members of Interim Guidance Note 2, which supersedes particular guidance contained in the Kent Design Guide.

Introduction

1. (1) The publication of Manual for Streets (Department for Transport, Communities and Local Government & Welsh Assembly Government, March 2007) has 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 are 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 this subject to produce a response to PPS3.

(2) CABE 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 has been superseded, the Quality Audit 'concept to completion' process needs to be enlarged upon and the guidance in respect of residential parking needs to be emphasised. The latter also satisfies 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, has overseen preparation of and consultation on the resulting Interim Guidance Notes. They have been approved by KPOG and are to be offered for adoption, for Development Control purposes, by Medway Council and Kent's District Councils. Formal approval by Kent County Council will encourage such adoption.

Interim Guidance Note 1 – Quality Audits

2. (1) The Kent Design Guide promotes collaborative working ("the Development Team approach") on all developments involving the creation of new streets and places. Manual for Streets develops this idea into Quality Audits. These enable the Development Team to balance a range of complimentary and competing factors to arrive at the best overall development.

(2) The Quality Audit Note establishes the way that Quality Audits should work, with reference to the Building for Life standard that is being recommended for use by all those involved in designing, assessing and building new housing.

(3) The Note also draws 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"

3. (1) The 'visibility standards' contained in the Kent Design Guide have been superseded by the guidance contained in Manual for Streets. The Interim Guidance Note explains the changes and relates them to good design.

Interim Guidance Note 3 – Residential Parking

4. (1) Parking is 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 are still being imposed. PPS3 seeks a design-led approach that takes account of expected levels of car ownership, having regard for the most efficient use of land and assisting with demand management at appropriate locations.

(2) 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 satisfies the aims of PPS3, offering development partners and elected members an opportunity to design, approve and build streets and places in which parking will not cause neighbour disputes, inconvenience to pedestrians and danger (perceived and actual) to all users.

(3) Two aspects of the Note which may prove to be controversial are worth highlighting. Firstly, the growing evidence base shows that only about half of garages provided as part of the parking provision are used for that purpose, even when non-use results in inappropriate parking. The Interim Guidance Note recommends that where there are no on-street parking controls, garages should be additional to the appropriate amount of parking for vehicles. Secondly, where there are no on-street controls, the recommended amounts of parking are expressed as “minimum”. False limitations on amounts of parking have resulted in problems for residents, and have not always been in the interests of good design.

Training and Awareness-Raising

5. (1) It is important that new and updated guidance should be made known to all those who are expected to use it. Furthermore, training is often needed to help practitioners make use of new approaches to their work.

(2) The Interim Guidance Notes will 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 will also figure in training that is being formulated by the Kent Design Initiative.

Implications

6. (1) 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 are part of the work of the Kent Design Initiative. No additional resources are needed.

(2) The Interim Guidance Notes satisfy the requirements of updating the Kent Design Guide to bring it in line with Manual for Streets and provide an evidence based response to PPS3. They maintain and enhance the Kent Design Initiative’s commitment to design excellence.

Recommendations

7. Subject to the views of this Board it is proposed to recommend to the Cabinet Member for Environment, Highways and Waste and the Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Supporting Independence that :

(1) The three Interim Guidance Notes are needed to reflect changes in national guidance since the Kent Design Guide was published in 2005.

(2) A thorough consultation has been undertaken using the Kent Design Initiative network. Representations have been embraced where appropriate.

(3) The Notes have 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.

(4) The Quality Audit and Residential Parking Interim Guidance Notes is approved for adoption by Kent County Council and for recommendation for adoption by Kent's District Councils. Members are also asked to take note of the "Visibility" Interim Guidance Note, which updates guidance contained in the Kent Design Guide.

Background Documents:

Kent Design Guide

<http://www.kent.gov.uk/publications/council-and-democracy/kent-design-guide.htm>

Manual for Streets

<http://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/sustainable/manforstreets/>

Planning Policy Statement PPS3: Housing

<http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/pps3housing>

Author Contact Details

Bob White

Transport & Development Business Manager

Kent Highway Services

✉ bob.white@kent.gov.uk



0771 545 5956

By: Interim Director, Kent Highway Services
To: Highways Advisory Board – 6th January 2009
Subject: **Canterbury Quality Bus Partnership – Targets and Bus Stop Clearways**
Classification: Unrestricted

Summary: This report outlines the problems arising following the refusal of the Canterbury Joint Transportation Board to agree to the recommendation that all bus stop clearways in the Canterbury district should be converted to 24/7 restriction

Introduction

1. This report sets out the current position concerning the provision of bus stop clearways in the Canterbury district, and recommends that the Cabinet Member approves 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.

The Canterbury JTB Report

2. The Canterbury JTB considered a report at their meeting held on 25 November 2008 (*see appendix 1*). This report 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 endures. This causes serious problems for buses needing to provide level kerb access and egress for all bus passengers during the evenings and early mornings, and also sends out a message which is contrary to the published policy of Kent County Council which supports the development of sustainable transport and promotes travel by public transport in particular wherever possible. This report therefore recommends that the Highways Advisory Board reverses the recommendation of the Canterbury JTB and makes provision for 24 hours a day, 7 days a week restrictions for all bus stop clearways in the Canterbury district.

The Legislation

3. 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 (*on display*). 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 requires all buses to be DDA compliant by 2017. This means 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 these 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 is converted to low-floor access by 2017.

4. Paragraph 29 of TSRGD is 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 states: “.. and that the hours of operation and enforcement should take account of the hours when buses are operating”. As buses operate 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 permit the restriction to apply 24 hours a day, it is recommended that this provision be applied to all present and future bus stop clearways in the Canterbury district. The reason for this uniform approach is that, where a timed restriction applies, vehicles frequently park during the evening and are not removed until after the morning peak period has commenced, causing serious problems for access and egress at bus stops when they are blocked by parked vehicles.

Conclusion

5. The development and improvement of the bus network is dependent on a constructive working partnership between the bus operator, the City Council and the County Council. This has been exemplified in Canterbury by the operation of a Quality Bus Partnership (QBP), which seeks 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 apply all day every day is 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 this report.

Recommendation

6. Subject to the views of this Board, it is proposed to recommend to the Cabinet Member for Highways, Environment and Waste that the recommendation from the Canterbury JTB not to extend bus stop clearway orders for 24 hours per day is not supported.

Contact Officer: Stephen Gasche 01622 221995
Public Transport Team Leader (East Kent)

Background Documents: **Appendix 1** – Canterbury JTB report (25 November 2008)
The Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions (TSRGD)
2002 (DfT circular 02/2003) - **on display**

JOINT TRANSPORTATION BOARD

25 NOVEMBER 2008

- Subject:** Canterbury Quality Bus Partnership – Targets and Bus Stop Clearways
- Director/Head of Service:** KCC Head of Transport and Development
- Decision Issues:** These matters are within the authority of the Kent County Council
- Decision:** Non-key
- CCC Ward/KCC Division:** All
- Summary:** *The report sets the background for the Quality Bus Partnership.*
- To Recommend** That bus stop clearway markings should apply at all times on those bus stops which serve routes which operate during the hours of 7pm to 7am
- To Note** Members are requested to support the working targets of the QBP in Appendix 1
- Classification:** THIS REPORT IS OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Introduction

1. The Canterbury Quality Bus Partnership between Kent County Council, Canterbury City Council and Stagecoach East Kent was signed in September 2004 with the aim of improving bus services throughout Canterbury district as an important traffic management tool to relieve congestion in the area and to improve access for everyone. A number of bus improvement measures had been carried out prior to the inception of the QBP, but the partnership set out the responsibilities and aspirations of the three partners to improve the bus quality and reliability and to provide bus priority measures and bus stop infrastructure improvements.

Targets

2. The QBP comprises of Members and officers from the City and County councils and senior officers from Stagecoach East Kent and meets quarterly to discuss progress on schemes and targets. The targets relate to the efficiency and reliability of the bus service. They are important in a number of ways and rely upon input from the 3 parties in the partnership: the more efficient the bus service is the more people are likely to be attracted to it as a viable alternative to the private car. Stagecoach East Kent invests in high quality buses, but these do not encourage a modal shift unless the service is also perceived to be reliable. Bus lanes, bus priority measures and carefully

designed bus stop infrastructure can all help to improve the reliability of the bus and remove private cars from the roads to reduce congestion. One of the targets relates to a 10% reduction in bus journey times which will be helped by the measures included in the Urban Traffic Management scheme. The working targets and progress towards these are attached in Appendix 1.

Bus Stop Clearways

3.1 One of the problems faced by bus drivers is the difficulty in positioning the bus parallel with and adjacent to the kerb so that the bus is easily accessible from the kerb by people with mobility impairment. The problems can be caused by the bus stop clearway being too short; the raised kerb being poorly sited in relation to the clearway; parked cars within the clearway or the bus stop being sited within a layby which the bus cannot manoeuvre into and out of properly. In the Canterbury district all of the bus stop clearways, which prohibit stopping by any other vehicle, operate between 7am and 7pm. This has caused problems in locations where on-street parking places are under pressure during the evening and overnight as legally parked vehicles in the bus stops prevent the bus being able to pull up near to the kerb. This, in turn prevents the mobility impaired boarding and alighting from buses and we should aim to provide equal access for all regardless of disability.



3.2 This photo illustrates the problem, although it is actually caused by a vehicle loading illegally in a clearway in St Dunstan's in the morning peak hour. A wheelchair user who wished to alight at this stop could not do so, and there is much greater chance that someone who could walk, but found high steps and slippery surfaces difficult, might sustain a fall because of the inconsiderate parking which prevents the bus accessing the kerb. Whitstable High Street suffers from a similar problem of overnight parking obstructing the bus stops.

- 3.3 The original bus stop clearway traffic order dated back to the early 1990s and has been applied to all of the streets with bus stops throughout the district. It is proposed that all of the bus stop clearways that are on routes where buses operate through the evening, overnight or in the early morning should be amended to apply for 24 hours per day, 7 days a week. This should not be particularly restrictive for residents as most of these bus stops are on lengths of street with double yellow lines. It will, however, send a clear message to motorists that bus stops are important and should not be obstructed. The Traffic Signs Regulations 2002 removed the requirement to make a new traffic order for bus stop clearways, so this amendment would only require replacement of the clearway signs. Some bus routes, particularly those in rural areas do not operate overnight and it is therefore not proposed that these should be included. Bus stop clearways in Thanet, Dover and Shepway are enforceable at all times, and in Ashford are enforceable during the times that the bus service operates.
- 3.4 All local service buses and bus stops must be compliant with the Disability Discrimination Act by 2017. Work is ongoing with Stagecoach to improve bus stops with better lead-ins and lead-outs, bus service information and other bus stop infrastructure to achieve this. Changing the clearway signs to operate at all times would be an effective and simple start to this process.

Conclusion

- 4.1 Members are requested to support the working targets of the QBP in Appendix 1;
- 4.2 Members are recommended to agree that bus stop clearway markings should apply at all times on those bus stops which serve routes which operate during the hours of 7pm to 7am.

Contact Officer:

Ruth Goudie KHS 08458 247 800

Attachments :

Appendix 1- Canterbury QBP Working Targets

CANTERBURY QBP WORKING TARGETS

| | | 07-08 | 08-09 | 08-09 | 09-10 | 10-11 |
|-----|---|------------------------------|---|------------------------------|---|---|
| | | ACTUAL | TARGET | ACTUAL | TARGET | TARGET |
| 1. | % of buses operating on time | 90.5 | 93.0 | 93.8% | 95.0 | 95.0 |
| 2. | % of scheduled miles operated | 99.7 | 99.7 | 99.5% | 99.7 | 99.7 |
| 3. | % of miles operated with low-floor access buses | 40% | 40% | 40% | 50% | 55% |
| 4. | Average Fleet Age | 9.1 years | 10.1 years | 10.1 years | 9.1 years | 8.5 years |
| 5. | % of Canterbury drivers with an NVQ Level 2 | 39.1% | 45% | 40% | 50% | 55% |
| 6. | Complaints | 199 (in six months) | To reduce the overall number of complaints by 5% p.a. | 190 (in six months) | To reduce the overall number of complaints by 5% p.a. | To reduce the overall number of complaints by 5% p.a. |
| 7. | Passenger Journeys | 3.9million (6 months) | XXXX million | 4.1million (6 months) | 3% growth | 3% growth |
| 8. | Investment in new/upgraded shelters | 5 | 5 | | 5 | 5 |
| 9. | Improved accessibility at stops | 202 | 252 | | 302 | 342 |
| 10. | Pick up stops with timetable information | 191 | 259 | | 300 | 350 |
| 12. | Passenger satisfaction survey | | | | | |
| 13. | Reduction in enforcement problems by changing bus stop clearway signs to 24/7 and by improving provision of loading bays to | | | | | |

alleviate congestion

| | 07-08 | 08-09 | 08-09 | 09-10 | 10-11 |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| | ACTUAL | TARGET | ACTUAL | TARGET | TARGET |
| 14. Journey Times (min) | | | | | |
| Whitstable – Canterbury via UKC | 46 | 46 | | 46 | 42 |
| Herne Bay Rail Station – Canterbury via Broomfield | 62 | 62 | | 62 | 56 |
| Bridge – Canterbury – Peak hrs | 15 | 15 | | 15 | 14 |

This page is intentionally left blank

By: Head of Network Management
To: Highways Advisory Board - 6th January 2009
Subject: **Circular Roads 1/2006 Setting Local Speed Limits, Update**
Classification: Unrestricted

Summary: The latest results of the work carried out by Jacobs UK on the speed limit review are set out.

Introduction

1. This is the latest in a series of HAB reports (previous reports in September 06, January 07 and January 2008) on the speed limit review. It sets out the funding implications for the implementation of the demonstration project. Gives details of the communication process with the parish council and others on the demonstration area. Sets out the recommendations of the review of phase 1 and gives details of the programme for the completion of the review.

Demonstration area Funding Implications

2. The estimated cost of the recommended changes in the demonstration area is £225,621. This covers 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 these costs is shown in Appendix 1.

Results of the consultations

3. In May of this year presentations were given to the parish councils in the demonstration area. These 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 giving 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 these comments. A further report on this 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.

Phase 1

4. The review on Phase 1 is now complete and a draft report has been prepared. It covers 11 "A" class roads and 9 "B" class roads (see Appendix 2 for a complete list of roads), and 109 parish councils (see Appendix 3 for a complete list of councils). The report recommends reductions to 40 speed limits and increases to 13 which represents changes to 19.18% of the total of 267km of road covered within the phase 1 area.

Future Programme

5. The programme for the completion of the review of the A and B road network is shown below:

| 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 |

Local Communication

6. Local communication with Parish Councils in the demonstration area has 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 has now been joined by volunteers from three parish councils within the phase 1 area who are now acting in a similar role.

"C" class and unclassified roads

7. At this time there is still insufficient time and funding to also consider "C" and unclassified roads across the county however such roads cannot be completely ignored. So where a crash analysis indicates that a lower limit is wholly or partly the measure required to reduce crashes, then a crash remedial report can be produced and funding for that scheme provided through the small improvement's budget its priority being set by PIPKIN.

Recommendations

8. Subject to the views of this Board it is proposed to recommend to the Cabinet Member for Environment, Highways and Waste that :
- the funding of the demonstration area next year 2009/10 is agreed
 - the continuation of the programme of the speed limit review is agreed
 - the recommendations of the phase 1 report are noted.

Accountable Officers: Ian Procter 01622 221285 and Jim Pearce 01622 696857

Appendix 1.

| As at | 27/11/08 | | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------|-----|----------|-------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Road | Description | | Measure | Qty | Rate | Totals | | |
| 1. A26 | Gateway (x 12) | S/E Signs & Posts | no | 24 | £ 150.00 | £ 3,600.00 | £ 20,360.00 | |
| | | Entry Treatment | m ² | 818 | £ 20.00 | £ 16,360.00 | | |
| | | Roundals | no | 16 | £ 25.00 | £ 400.00 | | |
| | | Take Downs | T/D Signs and Posts | no | 44 | £ 15.00 | £ 660.00 | £ 6,285.00 |
| | | Repeaters | S/E Signs & Posts | no | 29 | £ 150.00 | £ 4,350.00 | |
| | | Roundals | | no | 29 | £ 25.00 | £ 725.00 | |
| | | Side Roads | S/E Signs & Posts | no | 2 | £ 150.00 | £ 300.00 | |
| | | Additional lining works (from report) | | sum | | | £ 250.00 | |
| | | EDF Service Works | | no | 4 | £ 500.00 | £ 2,000.00 | £ 2,000.00 |
| | | | | | | | | £ 28,645.00 |
| 2. A228 | Gateway (x 4) | S/E Signs & Posts | no | 8 | £ 150.00 | £ 1,200.00 | £ 10,745.00 | |
| | | Entry Treatment | m ² | 466 | £ 20.00 | £ 9,320.00 | | |
| | | Roundals | no | 9 | £ 25.00 | £ 225.00 | | |
| | | Roundals | | no | 11 | £ 25.00 | £ 275.00 | £ 275.00 |
| | | EDF Service Works | | no | 2 | £ 500.00 | £ 1,000.00 | £ 1,000.00 |
| | | | | | | | £ 12,020.00 | |
| 3. A229 | Gateway (x 10) | S/E Signs & Posts | no | 20 | £ 150.00 | £ 3,000.00 | £ 16,375.00 | |
| | | Entry Treatment | m ² | 650 | £ 20.00 | £ 13,000.00 | | |
| | | Roundals | no | 15 | £ 25.00 | £ 375.00 | | |
| | | Take Downs | T/D Signs and Posts | no | 54 | £ 15.00 | £ 810.00 | £ 7,135.00 |
| | | Repeaters | S/E Signs & Posts | no | 33 | £ 150.00 | £ 4,950.00 | |
| | | Roundals | | no | 33 | £ 25.00 | £ 825.00 | |
| | | Side Roads | S/E Signs & Posts | no | 2 | £ 150.00 | £ 300.00 | |
| | | Additional lining works (from report) | | sum | | | £ 250.00 | |
| | | | | | | | | £ 23,510.00 |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------|------------|-------------|---------------|----------------|
| 4. A262 | Gateway (x 5) | S/E Signs & Posts | no | 10 | £ 150.00 | £ 1,500.00 | £ 11,410.00 |
| | | Entry Treatment | m ² | 488 | £ 20.00 | £ 9,760.00 | |
| | | Roundals | no | 6 | £ 25.00 | £ 150.00 | £ 5,760.00 |
| | Take Downs | T/D Signs and Posts | no | 29 | £ 15.00 | £ 435.00 | |
| | Repeaters | S/E Signs & Posts | no | 27 | £ 150.00 | £ 4,050.00 | |
| | Roundals | | no | 27 | £ 25.00 | £ 675.00 | |
| | Side Roads | S/E Signs & Posts | no | 4 | £ 150.00 | £ 600.00 | |
| | | | | | | | |
| 5. B2010 | Gateway (x 7) | S/E Signs & Posts | no | 14 | £ 150.00 | £ 2,100.00 | £ 10,510.00 |
| | | Entry Treatment | m ² | 403 | £ 20.00 | £ 8,060.00 | |
| | | Roundals | no | 14 | £ 25.00 | £ 350.00 | £ 9,755.00 |
| | Take Downs | T/D Signs and Posts | no | 22 | £ 15.00 | £ 330.00 | |
| | Repeaters | S/E Signs & Posts | no | 37 | £ 150.00 | £ 5,550.00 | |
| | Roundals | | no | 37 | £ 25.00 | £ 925.00 | |
| | Side Roads | S/E Signs & Posts | no | 18 | £ 150.00 | £ 2,700.00 | |
| | Additional lining works (from report) | | sum | | | £ 250.00 | |
| 6. B2015 | Gateway (x 4) | S/E Signs & Posts | no | 8 | £ 150.00 | £ 1,200.00 | £ 5,825.00 |
| | | Entry Treatment | m ² | 225 | £ 20.00 | £ 4,500.00 | |
| | | Roundals | no | 5 | £ 25.00 | £ 125.00 | £ 1,730.00 |
| | Take Downs | T/D Signs and Posts | no | 22 | £ 15.00 | £ 330.00 | |
| | Repeaters | S/E Signs & Posts | no | 8 | £ 150.00 | £ 1,200.00 | |
| | Roundals | | no | 8 | £ 25.00 | £ 200.00 | |
| | | | | | | | |
| As at | 27/11/08 | | | | | | |
| Road | Description | | Measure | Qty | Rate | Totals | |
| 7. B2017 | Gateway (x 2) | S/E Signs & Posts | no | 4 | £ 150.00 | £ 600.00 | £ 1,870.00 |
| | | Entry Treatment | m ² | 61 | £ | £ | |

| | | | | | | | |
|------------------|---------------|---------------------|----------------|-----|--------|-----------|------------|
| | | | | | 20.00 | 1,220.00 | |
| | | Roundals | no | 2 | £ | £ | |
| | | | | | 25.00 | 50.00 | |
| | Repeaters | S/E Signs & Posts | no | 4 | £ | £ | £ |
| | | | | | 150.00 | 600.00 | 700.00 |
| | Roundals | | no | 4 | £ | £ | |
| | | | | | 25.00 | 100.00 | |
| | | | | | | | £ 2,570.00 |
| 8. B2079 | Gateway (x 8) | S/E Signs & Posts | no | 16 | £ | £ | £ |
| | | | | | 150.00 | 2,400.00 | 11,665.00 |
| | | Entry Treatment | m ² | 447 | £ | £ | |
| | | | | | 20.00 | 8,940.00 | |
| | | Roundals | no | 13 | £ | £ | |
| | | | | | 25.00 | 325.00 | |
| | Take Downs | T/D Signs and Posts | no | 18 | £ | £ | £ |
| | | | | | 15.00 | 270.00 | 7,270.00 |
| | Repeaters | S/E Signs & Posts | no | 28 | £ | £ | |
| | | | | | 150.00 | 4,200.00 | |
| | Roundals | | no | 28 | £ | £ | |
| | | | | | 25.00 | 700.00 | |
| | Side Roads | S/E Signs & Posts | no | 14 | £ | £ | |
| | | | | | 150.00 | 2,100.00 | |
| | | | | | | | £ |
| | | | | | | | 18,935.00 |
| 9. B2084 | Gateway (x 1) | S/E Signs & Posts | no | 2 | £ | £ | £ |
| | | | | | 150.00 | 300.00 | 1,390.00 |
| | | Entry Treatment | m ² | 52 | £ | £ | |
| | | | | | 20.00 | 1,040.00 | |
| | | Roundals | no | 2 | £ | £ | |
| | | | | | 25.00 | 50.00 | |
| | Take Downs | T/D Signs and Posts | no | 2 | £ | £ | £ |
| | | | | | 15.00 | 30.00 | 1,555.00 |
| | Repeaters | S/E Signs & Posts | no | 7 | £ | £ | |
| | | | | | 150.00 | 1,050.00 | |
| | Roundals | | no | 7 | £ | £ | |
| | | | | | 25.00 | 175.00 | |
| | Side Roads | S/E Signs & Posts | no | 2 | £ | £ | |
| | | | | | 150.00 | 300.00 | |
| | | | | | | | £ |
| | | | | | | | 2,945.00 |
| 10. B2160 | Gateway (x 5) | S/E Signs & Posts | no | 10 | £ | £ | £ |
| | | | | | 150.00 | 1,500.00 | 12,525.00 |
| | | Entry Treatment | m ² | 540 | £ | £ | |
| | | | | | 20.00 | 10,800.00 | |
| | | Roundals | no | 9 | £ | £ | |
| | | | | | 25.00 | 225.00 | |
| | Take Downs | T/D Signs and Posts | no | 15 | £ | £ | £ |
| | | | | | 15.00 | 225.00 | 5,150.00 |
| | Repeaters | S/E Signs & Posts | no | 23 | £ | £ | |
| | | | | | 150.00 | 3,450.00 | |
| | Roundals | | no | 23 | £ | £ | |
| | | | | | 25.00 | 575.00 | |
| | Side Roads | S/E Signs & Posts | no | 6 | £ | £ | |
| | | | | | 150.00 | 900.00 | |
| | | | | | | | £ |
| | | | | | | | 17,675.00 |

| | | | | | | | |
|------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------|-----|-------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| 11. B2162 | Gateway (x 11) | S/E Signs & Posts | no | 22 | £ 150.00 | £ 3,300.00 | £ 22,765.00 |
| | | Entry Treatment | m ² | 952 | £ 20.00 | £ 19,040.00 | |
| | | Roundals | no | 17 | £ 25.00 | £ 425.00 | |
| | Take Downs | T/D Signs and Posts | no | 29 | £ 15.00 | £ 435.00 | £ 16,835.00 |
| | Repeaters | S/E Signs & Posts | no | 72 | £ 150.00 | £ 10,800.00 | |
| | Roundals | | no | 72 | £ 25.00 | £ 1,800.00 | |
| | Side Roads | S/E Signs & Posts | no | 22 | £ 150.00 | £ 3,300.00 | |
| | Additional lining works (from report) | | sum | | | £ 500.00 | |
| | | | | | | | £ 39,600.00 |
| 12. B2163 | Gateway (x 4) | S/E Signs & Posts | no | 8 | £ 150.00 | £ 1,200.00 | £ 5,120.00 |
| | | Entry Treatment | m ² | 191 | £ 20.00 | £ 3,820.00 | |
| | | Roundals | no | 4 | £ 25.00 | £ 100.00 | |
| | Take Downs | T/D Signs and Posts | no | 10 | £ 15.00 | £ 150.00 | £ 4,100.00 |
| | Repeaters | S/E Signs & Posts | no | 18 | £ 150.00 | £ 2,700.00 | |
| | Roundals | | no | 18 | £ 25.00 | £ 450.00 | |
| | Side Roads | S/E Signs & Posts | no | 2 | £ 150.00 | £ 300.00 | |
| | Additional lining works (from report) | | sum | | | £ 500.00 | |
| | | | | | | | £ 9,220.00 |
| ALL ROADS | | | | | | | |
| | | Traffic Management | Item | | | | £ 5,000.00 |
| | | | | | | Sub Total | £ 205,110.00 |
| | | 10% Contingency | | | | | £ 20,511.00 |
| | | | | | | Estimated Total | £ 225,621.00 |

Appendix 2
A and B roads in Phase 1 area

| A roads | B roads |
|----------------|----------------|
| A2 | B2007 |
| A20 | B2008 |
| A28 | B2067 |
| A229 | B2080 |
| A249 | B2082 |
| A250 | B2086 |
| A251 | B2163 |
| A252 | B2231 |
| A262 | B2244 |
| A268 | |
| A274 | |

Appendix 3
List of Parish councils in Phase 1 area

| Ashford | Maidstone | Shepway | Swale | Tunbridge Wells |
|----------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|------------------------|
| Charing | Aylesford | Snargate | Queenborough in Sheppey | Pembury |
| Egerton | Boxley | Brenzett | Minster on sea | Brenchley |
| Smarden | Bredhurst | Brookland | Eastchurch | Lamberhurst |
| Pluckley | Detling | | Warden | Goudhurst |
| Little Chart | Thurnham | | Leysdown | Cranbrook |
| Challock | Stockbury | | Upchurch | Hawkhurst |
| Molash | Hucking | | Iwade | Sandhurst |
| Chilham | Bicknor | | Lower Halstow | Benenden |
| Westwell | Wormshill | | Bobbing | Frittenden |
| Hothfield | Hollingbourne | | Newington | |
| Eastwell | Bearsted | | Hartlip | |
| Boughton Aluph | Downswood | | Borden | |
| Great Chart with Singleton | Otham | | Sittingbourne | |
| Stanhope | Loose | | Tunstall | |
| Kingsnorth | Boughton Monchelsea | | Bredgar | |
| Shadoxhurst | Linton | | Tonge | |
| Woodchurch | Chart Sutton | | Bapchild | |
| High Halden | Marden | | Rodmersham | |
| Biddenden | Staplehurst | | Milstead | |
| Rolvenden | Sutton Valence | | Lynstead | |
| Newenden | Langley | | Teynham | |
| Wittersham | Leeds | | Norton, Buckland and Stone | |
| Stone-cum-Ebony | Broomfield and Kingswood | | Doddington | |
| Appledore | East Sutton | | Luddenham | |
| Kenardington | Ulcombe | | Oare | |
| Warehorne | Headcorn | | Faversham | |
| Orlestone | Harrietsham | | Ospringe | |
| Tenterden | Frinted | | Newnham | |
| Ruckinge | Wichling | | Eastling | |
| | Lenham | | Throwley | |
| | Otterden | | Leaveland | |
| | Boughton Malherbe | | Badlesmere | |
| | | | Sheldwick | |
| | | | Stalisfield | |