



AGENDA

HIGHWAYS ADVISORY BOARD

Tuesday, 18th September, 2007, at 10.30 am Ask for: **Karen Mannering**
Council Chamber, Sessions House, County
Hall, Maidstone

Telephone **(01622) 694367**

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

UNRESTRICTED ITEMS

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

1. Membership - The Board is asked to note that Mr I S Chittenden replaces Mr D S Daley
2. Substitutes
3. Declarations of Interests by Members in items on the Agenda for this meeting.
4. Minutes - 10 July 2007 (Pages 1 - 16)
5. Transformation Update (Oral report)
6. Transportation and Safety Package Programme 2008/09 (Pages 17 - 24)
7. A New Tree Policy for Kent Highway Services (Pages 25 - 36)
8. Progress Report on Major Capital Projects (Pages 37 - 46)
9. A228 Snodland Bypass Dualling - Red Lion Public House (Pages 47 - 50)
10. KHS Winter Service Review (Pages 51 - 66)
11. The Traffic Management Act - Awnings and Light Canopies Overhanging the Highway (Pages 67 - 82)
12. Local Public Service Agreement 2 (Road Safety) (Pages 83 - 86)
13. KHS Road Safety Position Statement on Minibus Driving within Kent County Council (Pages 87 - 98)

EXEMPT ITEMS

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

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

Monday, 10 September 2007

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.

10 July 2007

KENT COUNTY COUNCIL

HIGHWAYS ADVISORY BOARD

MINUTES of a meeting of the Highways Advisory Board held on Tuesday, 10 July 2007 at Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone.

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

IN ATTENDANCE: Mr G Harrison-Mee, Director, Kent Highway Services; Mr D Hall, County Transportation Manager; Mr J Farmer, Regeneration and Projects Manager; Mr M Sims, Divisional Manager, East Kent; Mr I Procter, Road Safety Manager; and the Head of Democratic Services (represented by Mrs K Mannering).

Prior to the commencement of the meeting the Chairman referred to the Tour de France. Around two million people lined streets and villages in Kent on Sunday, 8 July 2007, to watch the 126 mile race pass through the County. The Board wished to place on record its thanks and appreciation to all the KHS staff involved in making the event such an enjoyable success.

UNRESTRICTED ITEMS**1. Membership**
(Item 1)

The Board noted that Mr T J Birkett and Mr R Truelove had replaced Mr R J E Parker and Mr K Sansum.

2. Minutes
(Item 3)

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting held on 1 May 2007 are correctly recorded and that they be signed by the Chairman.

3. Presentation on Maintenance Funding, Potholes and an Interim Review of the Asset Maintenance Plan
(Item 5 – Report by Divisional Manager, East Kent)

(1) The presentation from Matthew Sims explained some of the pertinent changes that had been implemented this year to improve KHSs approach to cyclic maintenance. The main points of discussion were a change of approach to street lighting faults, which had already seen a dramatic decrease in outstanding faults; targeting of specific maintenance activities to achieve an approach to maintenance which allowed the optimum balance between the efficiencies of planning work and the need to be responsive to customers. This was primarily in the field of potholes, patching, signs & lines, safety fencing and gully emptying.

- (2) There was also an explanation of the need to target 'safety critical maintenance' as a priority, enabling KHS to provide evidence of a risk based approach to maintenance.
- (3) The need to review the HAB approved policy of highway maintenance would explain the gap between policy statements, available budget and vision of how maintenance should be undertaken. The presentation was a forerunner to a paper at the next HAB which would seek authority for an interim policy on the asset maintenance plan.
- (4) Finally, the presentation explained the issues surrounding potholes and the way in which they occurred and the complexities of repairing. The presentation discussed the issues of materials, traffic management, cost and volume; there was also a look at the possible future of pothole repairs.
- (5) Following a question and answer session, Mr Sims undertook to circulate copies of the slides used to Members of the Board.
- (6) The Chairman thanked Mr Sims for a very informative presentation.

4. Sittingbourne Northern Relief Road – Objections to Statutory Orders *(Item 6 – Report by Capital Programme Manager)*

(1) In December 2005, the Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Supporting Independence took the decision, following public consultation, to progress the scheme known as Alternative Route B. The Officer recommendation was for Alternative Route A and Members of the Highways Advisory Board were split equally in their views between the two options. The adopted route was strongly opposed by M-Real New Thames Ltd and M-Real Sittingbourne Ltd, who owned Kemsley Mill, and the adjacent and associated private sector interests of Fletcher Challenge Industries, Rexam Property Developments and Kemsley Fields Ltd who were now all directly affected (all referred to for ease in the report as 'the Mill'). They saw no basis for departing from the established proposals and affecting their existing and future interests to the benefit of residents of new housing development in the Recreation Way area.

(2) The adopted scheme had been progressed and it achieved planning consent in September 2006. The Mill retained their strong opposition to the scheme. The Compulsory Purchase Order, Side Roads Order and the S106 Scheme for the Milton Creek Crossing were published in February 2007. The Mill again retained their objections to the Compulsory Purchase Order and Side Roads Order and submitted formal statutory objections. There were 27 objections to the S106 Scheme.

(3) The normal process would now be for the Secretary of State to instruct a Public Inquiry following the advice of the County Council on a suggested venue and dates. At the Inquiry the County Council would present evidence to convince the Inspector, appointed by the Secretary of State, of the merits of the scheme. This could be done and a robust case could be presented. However, there were a number of aspects that needed to be considered in view of the continued and sustained objections of the Mill. These could be summarised as follows:-

- The Mill was a long standing major employer and contributor to the economy of the town.
- A key purpose of the scheme was to support existing businesses and future regeneration.

10 July 2007

- The scheme reduced the length of storage available for in-bound HGV's on the approach to the Mill and the weighbridge.
- The scheme took land from that designated in the Local Plan for a possible future paper making mill – while the land take was relatively small, paper mills were long linear production lines and any loss of land was considered significant by the Mill.
- The Scheme encroached onto land that the Mill was seeking to have designated in the Local Plan for commercial development.
- The route of the Relief Road was long established and pre dated residential development in the immediate area and particularly Recreation Way.
- Owners of the houses would have acquired the properties in the knowledge of the proposals for the Relief Road.
- The Officer recommendation was for Alternative Route A.

(4) Officers had maintained contact with the Mill to better understand the operation of the mill, their objections and to challenge their validity. While their initial reaction to the chosen route was understandable, the objections had not lessened with time. Many of the objections could be tested by simple inspection and others were related to the history of the Relief Road and local development. The issue of the impact on a future paper making mill was harder to judge without a concept design, however, it could not be denied that the site was constrained by a pylon to the north and Ridham Avenue to the south and any loss of land however small could be a concern.

(5) The availability of compulsory powers of acquisition was a powerful facility available to local authorities. Compulsory Purchase Orders were not confirmed lightly and there was stringent scrutiny where there were statutory objections. As part of the process at Inquiry, an Inspector might reasonably ask if there was a compromise solution. In view of the sustained objections from the Mill and in anticipation of the public inquiry, investigations had been carried out.

(6) The fundamental objectives were to see if an amended junction arrangement was possible at Ridham Avenue that would:-

- Avoid landtake from the site identified for a future paper making mill.
- Maximise the length of road available for the storage of HGV's entering the Mill.
- Keep the basic alignment of the Relief Road route on the east side of the overhead electric power line to try and maintain distance from the houses in Recreation Way that was a key reason for the Cabinet Member's decision to adopt Alternative Route B.
- Reduce the landtake where the Mill had commercial development aspirations.

(7) Three options had been considered:-

Option A – Relocating the roundabout and centred on the pylon. – Drawing no. 4568/WD/86RevA and Fig. 2.

This avoided critical land take and increased HGV storage. It was a conventional roundabout layout.

10 July 2007

Option B – Extending the existing roundabout into a lozenge shape enclosing the pylon - Drawing no. 4568/WD/87RevBO and Fig 3.

This avoided critical land take and maximised HGV storage. It lengthened the junction which would probably be a concern to residents. Its unconventional layout was a slight concern with the risk of faster traffic on the straight sections.

Option C – Extending the existing roundabout along Ridham Avenue into a lozenge shape – Drawing no. 4588/WD/88RevO and Fig. 4.

This option involved the least change from the current scheme but was not favoured. It still required land from the future mill site and was physically constrained by the power line pylon making it difficult to achieve the Relief Road and Mill entrance link connections in the space available.

(8) If an amended scheme was to be proposed then it was a choice between Option A and Option B. Option A was to be preferred because it was a conventional layout and had least increased impact on residents of Recreation Way. There would be a slight increase in noise levels although a noise bund topped by a noise fence would help to mitigate the effects. In noise assessment terms 3 properties were predicted to have a noise increase of just over 3dB(A) but still well below the 68dB(A) threshold whereby noise insulation would be offered.

(9) If an amended scheme was promoted then the residents of Recreation Way in the immediate area of the relocated roundabout could be expected to be concerned. If such a scheme was pursued then they might object to the revised planning application that would be required and in due course might become non-statutory objectors to subsequent statutory Orders.

(10) The Mill supported the concept of the Relief Road and were frustrated that they felt obliged to object to the current scheme in order to protect their operational, financial and commercial interests. In 'without prejudice' discussions they had indicated that while they continued to believe that Alternative Route A should have been adopted and would argue this at Inquiry, they would be willing to support Option A because it goes a significant way to addressing their concerns. Support for Option A was however conditional because they were very concerned about the potential Land Compensation Act Part 1 liability in respect of the Kemsley Fields element of the Relief Road that required to take account of the future use of the full Relief Road. This was a difficult issue to resolve and for now only a commitment to discuss this concern with them to see if there was any equitable solution that could be considered could be given. Despite this issue, it was not directly related to the fundamental operational and land use objections and it was considered that there would be more confidence in defending the compromise layout offered by Option A at any future Public Inquiry.

(11) In regard to other issues, if the land south of the Mill was accepted by the Local Plan Inspector for commercial development then under any scheme scenario it was unlikely that access would be acceptable off Ridham Avenue. In that eventuality it was accepted that access would be required from a 'T' junction directly off the Relief Road. In the event that the retained land between the Relief Road and Recreation Way had development potential then under any scheme scenario it would be possible for access to be provided from the roundabout as a fourth arm.

(12) Swale Borough Council was keen for the Relief Road to proceed to support the immediate need and on-going regeneration of the town. It had informally indicated that it would support a compromise scheme and preferably Option A.

(13) The S106 Scheme provided for a fixed link bridge and an air clearance of 4.2m above Mean High Water Spring tide levels. The proposal had been the subject of public consultation and was reported to the Board in January 2006. Of the 27 objections, 17 were from individuals with boating interests and 7 were from representatives of boating organisations. The objections were generally that an opening bridge should be provided because the fixed link would deny access to yachts, limit the regeneration and tourism opportunities and fail to acknowledge the key role that Milton Creek played in the history of Sittingbourne.

(14) The reality was that the Creek was little used and an opening bridge had a high extra-over capital cost and in particular an annual ongoing operation and maintenance revenue cost. Up until now, these had been subjective statements based on experience and objectors had expressed concern that these had not been substantiated. It was acknowledged that further research would be required in any event to present as evidence at an Inquiry and that this would be shared with objectors. Our consultant, Jacobs, had produced a draft Report that indicated that an opening bridge would have an increased capital cost of between £3.5 – 4.0m and a revenue cost of between £30,000 - £90,000, depending on the number of openings per annum, that would equate to an equivalent extra-over commuted sum provision of £0.8m to £2.3m. The maintenance costs of a fixed link were relatively negligible in this context.

(15) The concerns of the objectors were well known and understood but existing use was minimal and any recent increased use had probably been generated by the threat of the proposal. Future potential use was not really supported by local policy framework or emerging development proposals. The Relief Road was an expensive scheme and could not support the increased median cost of about £5.0m.

(16) The conclusion had to be that the proposed S106 Scheme for the fixed link should continue to be promoted. In any event, it would be desirable to republish the S106 Scheme because of a technical error in the Order drafting.

Proposed Way Forward – Compulsory Purchase Order and Side Roads Order

- (a) The Board support the concept of a compromise junction arrangement at Ridham Avenue with a preference for Option A.
- (b) The Mill and the other private sector interests be consulted with the expectation that they would give conditional support to Option A.
- (c) The residents of the Recreation Way area be informed about the reasons for the change to the proposals and invited to make comments.
- (d) The Cabinet Member for Environment, Highways and Waste then be invited to take a formal decision.
- (e) On the presumption that the decision was for a compromise junction arrangement an amended or new planning application would be submitted.
- (f) Subject to achieving planning consent, revised Orders would then be published.

Proposed Way Forward – S106 Scheme

- (a) The Board note the draft Bridge Report and the view that the proposed scheme for a fixed link should continue to be promoted.
- (b) The objectors to the Scheme be invited to a briefing on the draft Bridge Report and given the opportunity to make further comments.

- (c) The Cabinet Member for Environment, Highways and Waste be invited to take a formal decision on the form of the bridge crossing prior to the republication of the S106 Scheme.

(17) The local County Members had been consulted on the Report and particularly the compromise option aspects at Ridham Avenue. They would also have the opportunity to comment before the Cabinet Member took the decision.

(18) The Relief Road was an important scheme for Sittingbourne and it was important that progress was made quickly and any further slippage avoided. It would be the objective for the consultation on the compromise layout at Ridham Avenue to be conducted by letter with a response time of two weeks so that the Cabinet Member was in a position to take a decision at the end of July.

(19) There were no immediate financial implications. The works costs of a compromise junction were comparable to the proposed scheme. The land costs could be expected to be less with a compromise scheme that had the support of the private sector although this would be offset in part by likely increased Land Compensation Act Part 1 liability to residents of the Recreation Way area.

(20) Clearly if any decision was taken to promote an open bridge crossing of Milton Creek then this would have significant cost and funding implications.

(21) The Board supported the proposal for recommendation to the Cabinet Member for Environment, Highways and Waste that the proposals outlined above under 'The Way Forward' be approved.

5. Proposed Safety Camera, Loose Road, Maidstone *(Item 7 – Report by Director of Kent Highway Services)*

(1) The report was for Members' information and referred to the proposed introduction of a new safety camera housing on the A229 Loose Road in Maidstone. A previous proposal for narrowing of the carriageway and construction of a pelican crossing was withdrawn and other means of addressing local concern about the creation of a safe crossing point had subsequently been investigated.

(2) This was a very busy section of the A229 Primary Route, and there had been considerable discussion at the Maidstone Joint Transportation Board about highway problems in the area. The concern was based on the desire to protect pedestrians crossing the wide, four lane carriageway, and to prevent vehicles from approaching the sharp bend into Sheals Crescent at high speeds, the road was subject to a 30mph speed limit.

(3) Pedestrian crossing movements were dominated by students heading for the Maidstone Boys Grammar School in Barton Road in the morning, and parents/children heading to and from Southborough Primary School. Although there was a pedestrian bridge near the Primary School, it had long approach ramps and steps at the top, so many pedestrians chose to cross at ground level. The speeding issue also caused concern to residents of Sheals Crescent, who had seen the crash barrier at the bend struck and damaged.

(4) Other means of speed management were investigated. The A229 being a primary route and four lanes wide, did not allow traffic calming measures to be implemented. The possibility of an interactive bend warning sign was considered, but the alignment of the road would make it difficult to locate a sign to give drivers adequate warning of the bend,

without placing it so far away that vehicles would have time to build up speed again before the turning into Sheals Crescent.

(5) An additional speed camera housing was therefore considered, as the stretch of road lay between two other existing sites. It would therefore be seen as an additional measure on a road already subject to camera enforcement where crashes continued to be reported.

(6) A site meeting was held to look at the potential location for a safety camera on Loose Road just south of Sheals Crescent. The most suitable location for a camera to reduce speeds approaching the sharp bend was in the entrance of the former vehicle access to Southborough School. This would encourage drivers to approach the bend at a lower speed than currently occurred reducing the risk of crashes. There would be some requirement for ancillary works in association with the camera, including kerb protection for the camera post, setting back of the guardrails within the school access, removal of one road sign, and some new carriageway surfacing in which to bed the detector loops. It was also felt that the lay-by area offered a suitable and safe location from which to carry out camera maintenance.

(7) The crash record supported the use of an additional camera bid. In the last five years there had been four serious and three slight crashes between the footbridge and Sheals Crescent junction and also one serious and three slight crashes prior to the footbridge. Three crashes involved pedestrians of which two were children. Three other crashes involved loss of control due to speed, two of which hit the Armco barrier on the bend.

(8) In September/October 2005 a week long speed survey was carried out at a location just prior to the new camera position opposite Heather Drive. An average figure was taken for the whole week with an 85% speed of 37.6mph and a mean speed of 32.8mph with slightly higher figures at the weekend. Throughout the week 28% of vehicles were exceeding 35mph, this was on average 3435 vehicles per day.

(9) Local consultation had been carried out by Councillor Mrs Wilson, the local Borough Council Member. The general response had been favourable to the proposed location. It was therefore the wish to proceed on the basis that this was the final option available and pursue the installation of a camera housing at this location in the current financial year.

(10) The cost of the works would be some £33,000 and the money could be available from within the budget allocation for safety cameras. The addition of the site to the schedule of sites administered by the Kent and Medway Safety Camera Partnership would not trigger the need for a bid for a new camera itself.

(11) After considering all options available including narrowing of the carriageway, a pelican crossing and an interactive bend sign all of which were deemed not feasible, therefore a safety camera was seen as the most suitable and effective mechanism to reduce speed and injury crashes on this stretch of road.

(12) During debate the Chairman referred to the receipt of a letter from Mr Gidley, resident of Loose Road. Mr Hall undertook to contact Mr Gidley. *(Since the meeting, Mr Gidley had met with the Cabinet Member for Environment, Highways and Waste).*

(13) The Chairman expressed concern as to why, if it was a fait accompli and the decision had already been made, the report had been submitted to the Board.

(14) The Board noted the introduction of an additional safety camera.

6. Safety Cameras

(Item 8 – Report by County Transportation Manager)

(1) The Kent and Medway Safety Camera Partnership (K&MSCP) was launched in 2002. The partnership operated across the Kent Police area covering both Kent and Medway and its sole purpose was to reduce road crash casualties.

(2) The K&MSCP produced an annual report for each Partner organisation setting out progress to date and challenges for the future. Each year the report was presented to the Board as Appendix 1, and considered six issues associated with safety cameras in the county and the Kent Police area as a whole:-

- An overview of the partnership and its structure
- Funding
- Operations during 2006/07
- Casualty reduction
- Communications
- Future activity and funding arrangements

(3) In recent years road crash casualties in Kent had reduced overall. The success was due to a variety of factors involving many areas of work undertaken and supported by the various partners and stakeholders. However, the contribution of the work of the Kent and Medway Safety Camera Partnership should not be underestimated. The partnership had been in existence for five years, during this time its work had reduced casualties at camera sites, consistently performing at above the national average. To fulfil KCC's commitment to reducing all seriously injured (KSI) casualties by 40%, by December 2007, 478 fewer KSIs were needed, 69 had already been achieved by safety cameras alone.

(4) The Board acknowledged the annual report of the Kent and Medway Safety Camera Partnership.

7. 2006 End of Year Crash and Casualty Numbers and Progress Against National 2010 Casualty Targets

(Item 9 – Report by County Transportation Manager)

(1) The crash records for 2006 for Kent were finalised in May. The totals were used in establishing best value performance indicators, government targets and establishing trends. In 2006, 89 people were killed on roads in Kent (excluding Medway), 658 received serious injuries and 5748 were slightly injured. There were 4752 crashes. Appendix 1 of the report showed crashes and casualties by severity for 2006.

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

- A 40% reduction in the number of people killed or seriously injured in road accidents (KSI) – KCC as part of PSA2 intended to achieve the target by the end of 2007.

10 July 2007

- A 50% reduction in the number of children killed or seriously injured.
- A 10% reduction in the slight casualty rate expressed as the number of people slightly injured per 100million vehicle kilometres (MVKm). Kent did not have a traffic model appropriate for KCC roads. Therefore a simple 10% reduction in slight casualties had been used to set targets in Kent.

(3) Appendix 2 of the report showed that compared with the 2010 target KSI, casualties on Kent roads including motorways and trunk roads were 3% above the 2010 target. Child KSI casualties were just below the 2010 target. Slight casualties showed a reduction of 3%. Appendix 3 of the report showed that on the roads for which KCC was responsible, the 2010 targets had been achieved. Casualties on roads for which the Highway Agency was responsible had increased in 2006 compared with the previous year. However individual year on year figures were volatile and the overall trend provided a better indication than individual years. The overall year on year trends were shown in Appendices 4, 5 and 6 of the report.

(4) Appendix 2 of the report also showed that on Kent roads child KSI casualties increased from 47 in 2005 to 74 casualties in 2006, however the 2006 figure compared with the 2004 figure of 87, showed a decrease of 15%, indicating 2005 was abnormally low. The variable nature of year on year totals were shown on the trend graph from 1990 for child KSI casualties. The 2006 total KSI casualties on Kent roads showed a 1.3% reduction compared with 2005, which might indicate a flattening out of the overall downward trend. 2006 slight casualties on Kent roads showed a 1.5 % reduction compared with 2005.

(5) Overall KCC's performance was good and well placed to meet and maintain the 2010 KSI targets. The trend in casualties continued the well established downward pattern albeit that it did appear to be flattening out. It was vital that programmes of work aimed at both improving the road infrastructure and road user behaviour continued to be delivered. Focused and stronger casualty reduction links with the Highway Agency, Police, Fire and Rescue and the other partners were being progressed to sustain the downward trend countywide. This year was crucial, as the target of reducing KSI casualties, including those on motorways and trunk roads, by 40% compared with the 1994-1998 average, needed to be met and sustained by the end of 2007 to achieve PSA2. Based on the long term influence on casualty reduction to date by the County Council and its partners, there was confidence that the target could be achieved.

(6) The Board noted the contents of the report.

8. Priority Vehicle Lanes for HGV's, Buses and Other Vehicles

(Item 10 – Report by County Transportation Manager)

(1) At the meeting of the Board in May 2007, Members requested a report on the feasibility of bus lanes in Tunbridge Wells operating at peak times only and allowing HGV's access. As there were bus lanes elsewhere in Kent, consideration of the issue should be on a countywide basis. The report outlined options under consideration both nationally and locally for the use of bus lanes by other vehicles and on a part-time basis.

(2) A priority vehicle lane was an area of carriageway reserved, using a Traffic Regulation Order, for the use of buses, bicycles, goods vehicles and taxis. In addition to conventional bus lanes, a number of other models of priority vehicle lanes had been trialled in the UK and the report identified the benefits of each approach. The Road Traffic

Regulation Act 1984 allowed local authorities to introduce experimental Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO's) without public consultation.

(3) A bus lane was an area of carriageway reserved, using a Traffic Regulation Order, primarily for use by buses and coaches during the advertised hours of operation. Unless the bus lane had a 24 hour restriction, outside of these hours, all traffic was permitted to use bus lanes. In Kent, bicycles and Hackney carriages were also permitted to use the lanes but not Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGV's) or Light Goods Vehicles (LGV's). Private Hire taxis were also excluded from using bus lanes. The concept of using designated lanes for buses was well understood and widely used by highway authorities in urban areas where bus services were adversely affected by traffic congestion. The introduction of priority measures in Kent (for example bus lanes) had played a significant role in generating the 17% increase in bus usage achieved during Kent's first Local Transport Plan (LTP), through increasing the profile of services as well as improving reliability.

(4) Bus priority measures were designed and introduced to help achieve easier and more consistent journey times through congested areas, particularly in towns and cities. Reliability was also very important in assisting operators to meet the standards set down by the industry regulator, the Traffic Commissioner. The challenge of operating 95% of all services within a "window" of 1 minute early and 5 minutes late was becoming increasingly difficult as traffic conditions worsened and congestion increased. Without assistance from the Highways Authority, the costs of catering for congestion would lead to a reduction in more marginal routes which were currently operated without financial support.

(5) Reliable bus services were also important to passengers. In almost every survey about bus services, reliability was one of the most important issues for bus users. Unreliable bus services led to declining bus patronage, increasing congestion on already busy roads. Providing bus priority measures such as bus lanes were also important in generating operator investment in new buses through Quality Bus Partnership agreements. In Canterbury, Stagecoach introduced 18 new low floor double-decker buses following the provision of bus lanes on the outskirts of the city centre.

(6) The hours of operation of any bus lane would need to consider:-

- the hours of bus service operation and frequency
- the extent and timing of traffic congestion and its impact on bus reliability
- the method for enforcing bus lanes

(7) Bus lanes generally operated for one of the following periods:-

- 24 hours
- 12 hour period (usually 7am – 7pm)
- peak hours only (usually 7-10am and 4-7pm)

(8) Some local authorities outside London did use 24 hour operation of bus lanes. However as most bus services did not operate between the hours of 12pm and 6am such a restriction was excessive and many such authorities were reverting to a 12 hour period.

(9) Although bus services derived most benefit from bus lanes at peak periods, such peak periods were spreading (for example in Canterbury) and traffic patterns were becoming less predictable due to changing employment patterns (e.g. shift work and call centres). With this in mind, many local authorities had reverted from a peak-hour operation to a 12 hour period of operation (i.e. 7am – 7pm).

(10) Many local authorities had found that the most appropriate hours of bus lane operation to include in Traffic Regulation Orders was 7am – 7pm. This made such measures self-enforcing and reduced the need for camera enforcement and the issuing of Penalty Charge Notices. The majority of bus lanes in Kent operated between these hours and experienced relatively low levels of abuse by other traffic despite the absence of camera enforcement. Within Tunbridge Wells, there was little potential benefit to motorists from entering bus lanes during the off-peak period. The cost of changing the signage was £10,000 and this could provide better value for money spent on other appropriate schemes.

(11) A Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) was defined as a vehicle with a maximum gross weight in excess of 7.5 tonnes and were identified through yellow and orange striped rear marking plates. At present the DfT had not produced any specific guidance on the use of bus lanes by HGV's.

(12) There were concerns amongst bus operators about the use of bus lanes by HGV's. It was not clear whether HGV use encouraged other vehicles such as Light Goods Vehicles, for example white vans and delivery vehicles, or other traffic to use bus lanes which could undermine bus reliability. There was also concern about HGV's, particularly non-UK lorries, parking or waiting in bus lanes and causing an obstruction or making slow turning movements into side streets, further delaying bus movements. It was recommended that more work was undertaken in consultation with the DfT before making a decision on this in Kent.

(13) DfT note 2/07 provided guidance on the use of bus lanes by motorcycles. A number of experimental Traffic Regulation Orders had been made permanent allowing motorcyclists to use bus lanes. Research conclusions suggested both potential benefits and drawbacks. The main drawback of such an approach was the potential conflict between motorcyclists and other users, such as pedal cycles and pedestrians. Motorcycles tended to travel at faster speeds than buses, cycles and HGV's and this could have safety implications. DfT guidance suggested consultation with other road user groups before making a permanent TRO. In London, cycling groups strongly opposed the introduction of motorcycles into bus/cycle lanes as part of a pilot scheme, citing an increase in road accidents. Motorcycles had been permitted to use bus lanes in Northern Ireland since 2004. Motorcycles were easily distinguishable from other vehicle types using existing detection techniques so technical issues with enforcement were unlikely.

(14) A High Occupancy Vehicle lane was an area of carriageway restricted under a Traffic Regulation Order to allow cars with multiple occupants to use it. HOV lanes had been backed in Traffic Advisory Leaflet 3/06 from the Department for Transport. It stated that "HOV lanes are a method of utilising spare capacity in existing bus lanes". Car sharing organisations such as Liftshare supported the extension of bus lanes to HOV status.

(15) One of the few trials of HOV lanes had taken place on Stanningley Road in Leeds which was introduced in 1998. The lanes were available to buses, coaches, other vehicles carrying two or more people, motorcycles and pedal cycles. HGV's over 7.5 tonnes were not permitted to use them. The HOV lanes operated in the morning and evening peak periods (07:00 – 10:00, 16:00 – 19:00 on Mondays to Fridays). Monitoring data had shown increases in average car occupancy and bus patronage as well as big improvements in journey time reliability for people using both modes.

(16) The application of an HOV lane was most suited to heavily trafficked corridors, particularly during peak times, where a Local Authority wanted to encourage car sharing and discourage single occupancy car traffic. There were at present no HOV lanes in Kent

and with no means of camera enforcement at present it would be difficult to ensure that such lanes were not being abused.

(17) There were a range of priority vehicle lanes that had been piloted across the UK with varying degrees of success. Any measure needed to be appropriate to the local conditions but clearly understood by motorists and other road users. The vast majority of the travelling public understood which vehicles were permitted to use conventional bus lanes, without referring to each individual sign or marking. Bus lanes provided priority through congested urban areas which helped to ensure bus reliability.

(18) The Board:-

- (a) supported the proposal for recommendation to the Cabinet Member for Environment, Highways and Waste that bus lanes in Kent continue to be operational between the hours of 7.00am and 7.00 pm; and
- (b) did not support further investigations being undertaken to establish the benefits and disbenefits of HGV's using bus lanes.

9. Bus Roadside Publicity and Infrastructure Unit

(Item 11 – Report by County Transportation Manager)

(1) The report outlined the current arrangements for providing bus timetable information and infrastructure at bus stops in Kent. The Transport Act 2000 provided a duty for each Local Transport Authority in England and Wales to ensure that adequate information was provided by local bus operators. It also empowered them to make arrangements as necessary to plug any gaps in the provision of information, recharging the costs to the appropriate bus operator. Transport Authorities set out their proposals in an Information Strategy which formally came into effect in April 2002.

(2) Kent County Council's Public Transport Information Strategy was first published in 2001 and reviewed by a specialist independent consultant in 2006. The consultants report recommended that greater attention was given to the arrangements for and funding of the provision of information at bus stops. The Strategy (2001) concluded that:-

“Roadside information for bus service users is poor in many parts of Kent and the County Council in partnership with Arriva has developed a Roadside Infrastructure Unit which is responsible for the display of up-to-date information on bus services throughout the County. This scheme was initially introduced on a trial basis during 1999 and the County Council has agreed a formal two-year arrangement with Arriva.”

(3) The consultants review in 2006 concluded that:-

“These arrangements are still in place today, but the procedures and resources for providing roadside information must be reviewed if it is to meet the desired target level of 75% of bus stops in the County. Also improvements must be made to the design standards to ensure the public find the publicity easy to understand and it improves the image of public transport services in the County.”

(4) The Roadside Infrastructure Unit was formed in 1999 through a fixed cost contract with the main bus operator in West and Mid Kent, Arriva, to provide timetable publicity and information at bus stops and interchanges. Arriva post timetables and other relevant information at bus stops giving information on all bus services in Kent ran either on a commercial basis or under contract to Kent County Council. KCC currently spent £7

million per annum on procuring “socially necessary” bus services across Kent. Approximately £200,000 of this budget was spent on promoting and advertising the services. The only exception to the arrangement was that Stagecoach, who opted out of the countywide scheme, maintained all stops in areas where they were the sole or principal bus operator. This covered most Districts of East Kent and some areas of Mid Kent such as Ashford town.

(5) The Roadside Infrastructure Unit officers carried out a number of functions:-

- they sought to ensure that timetables for all commercial and Kent County Council funded bus services were accurate, up-to-date and readable;
- they resolved or reported to the relevant authority, cases of vandalism, graffiti and traffic damage to bus stops;
- they dealt with a large number of enquiries from members of the public acting as the agent of Kent Highway Services, aiming to respond to reports of dangerous bus stops within 24 hours and 48 hours for less urgent enquiries;
- they helped to distribute timetables to outlets across Kent; and
- they provided roadside information about short term changes to bus services caused by roadworks.

(6) There was now a need to review the arrangements currently provided by Arriva under contract to Kent County Council. Between 1999/2000 and 2005/2006 the Roadside Infrastructure agreement remained virtually unchanged with only minimal inflationary price rises to cover the bus operators cost increases. However the value of the contract increased from £30,000 in 2005/06 to £40,000 in 2006/07 to reflect Arriva’s proposal to expand the team from two to three officers, with the aim of providing a more responsive service to the public and higher quality information at bus stops and interchanges.

(7) To maintain consistency with the procurement of local bus services, the current arrangements needed to be put out to tender from April 2008. This would give all interested bus operators and other organisations such as Kent County Council’s Commercial Services Department the opportunity to tender for the work, thereby ensuring best value for the County Council and the highest possible level of service to the public.

(8) The Board supported the proposal for recommendation to the Cabinet Member for Environment, Highways and Waste that approval be given to putting the Roadside Infrastructure agreement out to tender with the new contract starting in April 2008.

10. Sustainable Travel to School Strategy

(Item 12 – Report by County Transportation Manager)

(1) A key requirement of the Education and Inspections Act 2006 was for Kent to produce a Sustainable Travel to School Strategy. The report sought Member approval for a consultation draft of the strategy. The Education and Inspections Act 2006 placed a general duty on local authorities to promote the use of sustainable travel and transport on the journey to school. Section 508A of the Act, in force from April 2007, required local education and transport authorities to develop a strategy for the sustainable travel and transport infrastructure within the authority so that the travel and transport needs of children and young people were better catered for.

(2) The strategy comprised a statement of the authority’s overall vision, objectives and work programme for improving accessibility to schools. The accessibility strategy should build on, and be developed in the context of the authority’s community strategies and

Local Transport Plan (including its accessibility plan and bus strategy). The strategy was intended to be an important source of information to parents on the travel options available to them when expressing their preferences for particular schools in the admissions round.

(3) In developing its strategy, the local authority should consider how improvements could help to deliver other objectives, including environmental improvements (from reduced levels of congestion and pollution), health benefits (from increased levels of walking and cycling) and enhanced child safety and security. The strategy should be evidence-based, including an assessment of the accessibility needs and problems of the local authority's area and demonstrate how a range of interventions could address the problems. The strategy should set out the accessibility priorities over a time frame that fitted the LTP cycle.

(4) The Education (School Information) (England) Regulations 2002, amended with effect from 1 June 2007, required local authorities to publish their Sustainable Travel to School Strategy on their web-site by 31 August each year, starting in 2007. Local authorities must monitor the implementation of their strategy and revise these annually as they felt necessary.

(5) In response to the requirement, Kent Highway Services had established a Steering Group, including representatives from CFE and Commercial Services to oversee the development of a Consultation Draft of the Kent Sustainable Travel to School Strategy. This would be consulted on internally during July and August 07 and would be published as a draft for external consultation on the kent.gov site in time for the DfES deadline of 31 August 2007. The September 2008 revised version, would therefore constitute the final strategy.

(6) Subject to the deletion of Section 4.4.2 on page 30 of the Strategy, the Board:-

- (a) supported the development of Kent's Sustainable Travel to School Strategy;
- (b) agreed that the Strategy be finalised in draft form for consultation under delegated powers; and
- (c) agreed that the Strategy be published as a draft at the start of the new school year in September 2007, as required by the Act.

11. The Draft Local Transport Bill Consultation

(Item 13 – Report by County Transportation Manager)

(1) The report outlined the provisions in the recently published draft Local Transport Bill and their implications for Kent. The Bill was intended to help tackle congestion and improve public transport. The consultation would close on 7 September.

(2) Many of the measures proposed were aimed at major urban areas or modified provisions in the Transport Act 2000 that local authorities had not chosen or been able to use. The legislation was also updated to allow local authorities to take forward local road pricing schemes should they choose. The proposals most relevant to Kent were those that:-

- provided new powers enabling local authorities in non-Metropolitan areas to set up Passenger Transport Authorities (PTAs).
- made the implementation of Quality Contracts with public transport operators a realistic option in areas where it was in the public interest for local authorities to take greater control over bus services. This could provide a

10 July 2007

mechanism to secure the delivery of Smartlink in Ashford and future phases of Fastrack in Kent Thameside.

- provided a new regime to deliver improved bus punctuality, holding local authorities as well as bus operators to account for their contribution to punctuality performance. Local Authorities were required to provide the Traffic Commissioner with information connected with the performance of their network management duties under the Traffic Management Act 2004 (TMA). Should Kent be found not to be identifying and addressing the causes of poor punctuality the Secretary of State might choose to issue an Intervention Notice under the TMA.
- supported further development of the community transport sector than was currently permitted. Kent had a mix of such community transport schemes across the county and this should ease the development of new and expanded schemes and would provide an opportunity to review the provision of services to rural areas.

(3) Whilst the elements of the draft legislation set out above had the potential to be of use to Kent, and would feature in the response to the consultation, most of the proposals related more to large metropolitan areas. Indeed Kent was already making good progress with delivering improvements to bus services through voluntary Quality Bus Partnerships with operators. In contrast to much of the country, Kent had managed to sustain a year on year 2% growth in bus patronage. In 2005/06 there were 45.7 million trips made in Kent and in 2006/07 there were 47.1 million trips. Members would be aware of Fastrack in Kent Thameside where passenger numbers were 50% over projections and included 19% of people who would have previously used their car. There were similar examples in Thanet and Canterbury. This would form the basis of the response to Government. In the context of the developing Kent Thameside and Ashford areas, consideration would be given to the potential benefits of applying for PTA status in order to access additional Government funding.

(4) Given the timing of the consultation, where responses were being asked for by 7 September, the Board agreed that a response, along the lines of that set out above, be produced and sent to the DfT under delegated powers.

07/exe/hab/0710Minutes

This page is intentionally left blank

Transportation and Safety Package Programme 2008/09

A report by the Head of Transport & Development Planning to the Highways Advisory Board on 18 September 2007.

Introduction

1. Kent County Council's (KCC) local transport funding for 2008/09 was determined by the Department for Transport (DfT) in December 2006 as part of its assessment and settlement announcement regarding Kent's transport strategy, the Local Transport Plan (LTP). This funding has been provided to support local transport schemes that deliver the LTP, which itself sets out the County Council's approach to achieving a number of key transport objectives, including:
 - Improve access to key services by sustainable modes of transport;
 - Tackle the occurrence of peak hour congestion, particularly in larger urban areas;
 - Improve road safety by reducing the number of people killed or seriously injured on Kent's roads;
 - Improve local air quality, particularly in designated Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs).

Funding - 2008/09

2. Kent's LTP funding for 2008/09 includes a capital allocation of £12.883M, which consists of borrowing approvals and grant and is specifically for the implementation of Integrated Transport (IT) schemes. As a Floor Authority, KCC has determined that this allocation should be capped at a level to which the borrowing element can be fully supported. Therefore, the actual funding allocation for 2008/09 has been determined by the County Council's Medium Term Financial Plan and is subsequently set at £9.1M for 2008/09. Whilst this lower allocation represents a shortfall when compared to the Government's initial LTP settlement for 2008/09, it does represent a significant increase in scheme funding for Kent when compared to previous years; in 2007/08, funding was set at £7.3M.
3. This report provides a summary of the 126 schemes that make up the proposed Transportation and Safety Package Programme for 2008/09 and provides details of how Kent's £9.1M investment programme will be allocated across the County. The schemes proposed for 2008/09 are presented in order of District and include the individual PIPKIN Score, Scheme Priority Rating and Scheme Rank (out of 126 schemes) and are shown in **Appendix 1**.

Scheme Prioritisation (PIPKIN)

4. The proposed Transportation and Safety Package Programme for 2008/09 represents a significant milestone in determining Kent's local transport priorities and establishing local investment programmes in that it has been devised using Kent's Scheme Prioritisation Methodology, PIPKIN.

Transportation and Safety Package Programme 2008/09

5. A report outlining the principles and a proposal to implement PIPKIN was presented to the Highways Advisory Board (HAB) in July 2006, and was approved by the Cabinet Member for Environment, Highways and Waste on the strength of the recommendations of this Board. The introduction of PIPKIN has determined that all scheme proposals must be subjected to a formal assessment and be prioritised in accordance with their likely impact and wider contribution towards Kent's strategic and local transport objectives. PIPKIN also provides the County Council with the ability to assess an infinite number of schemes and between February and May 2007, the County Council formally assessed and prioritised a list of 286 scheme contenders. The cumulative build cost of these schemes equates to more than £20M. The proposed Transportation and Safety Package Programme for 2008/09 includes the top priority schemes from the initial list of 286 schemes.
6. Following the formal scheme assessment phase the initial outputs of PIPKIN were subjected to a process of validation and moderation. In June 2007, a team of PIPKIN users was tasked with validating the inputs and outputs of the model to ensure the accuracy of each scheme assessment and to ensure that schemes were prioritised in a consistent manner. In July 2007, the proposed list was presented to the Cabinet Member for Environment, Highways and Waste and to the Director of Kent Highway Services (KHS) for their initial comments.
7. A further benefit of the PIPKIN process is that it is closely aligned to the Transforming KHS programme delivery timetable. The emerging delivery timetable requires the annual Transportation and Safety Package Programme to be presented to this Board earlier in the scheme concept, design and build process. Therefore the proposed programme for 2008/09 is presented to this Board in September 2007, rather than in March 2008.

Priorities for Funding

8. Kent's scheme priorities for 2008/09 provide ongoing investment in urban traffic management measures, including UTMC in Maidstone and Canterbury and support for local public transport services, particularly in Quality Bus Partnership (QBP) areas. The proposed schemes also include an evidence based programme of Casualty Reduction Measures (CRMs) and support for continued investment in sustainable transport measures including Smarter Choices initiatives.
9. The proposed programme includes:
 - Continuation of Kent's pilot **UTMC** project, which has already delivered the County's Traffic Control Centre in Maidstone. (Funding in 2008/09 - £500K).
 - Phase 1 of improvements to the Maidstone **Bridge Gyrotory System**. (£300K).
 - Phase 1 funding for improvements to the **A2 Slip Roads** in Canterbury. (£650K).
 - Public Transport Infrastructure improvements to provide **bus priority** in Ashford, thereby supporting the delivery of the Warren Park and Ride site and delivery of SMARTLINK. (£250K).
 - Funding for the development of **UTMC across Kent** and targeted funding to support the evolution of UTMC in Canterbury. (£250K, Countywide) and (£400K, Canterbury).
 - Investment in **Quality Bus Partnership** (QBP) initiatives in Ashford, Canterbury, Maidstone and Thanet and Tunbridge Wells. (c.£1.5M).

Transportation and Safety Package Programme 2008/09

- Improved access to key services by **sustainable transport** modes, including; improved bus and pedestrian access to QEQM Hospital, Thanet, improved access to schools through a countywide programme of Safer Routes to Schools and Smarter Choices initiatives. (c.£1M).
- Investment in **road safety** initiatives through a targeted programme of Countywide Casualty Reduction Measures (CRMs). (£360K).

Conclusion

10. The proposed Transportation and Safety Package Programme for 2008/09 represents a balanced programme of investment for Kent. The schemes presented above demonstrate the strategic nature of the proposed programme. A key strength of the PIPKIN process and therefore the programmes of investment derived from it, is that whilst PIPKIN recognises the need to tackle strategically important issues it also recognises the genuine need to tackle local priorities. This feature has enabled KCC to provide ongoing investment to improve access to local services and promote and support local sustainable travel initiatives; including public transport, walking and cycling. This approach also enables Kent to prioritise local safety schemes using local data relating to personal injury crashes.

Recommendations

11. Subject to the views of this Board, it is proposed to recommend to the Cabinet Member for Environment, Highways and Waste that:
- (i) the proposed Transportation and Safety Package Programme for 2008/09 (as shown in Appendix 1) be approved;
 - (ii) this Board provides on going support for the development and application of Kent's Scheme Prioritisation Model, PIPKIN;
 - (iii) the Joint Transportation Boards receive a report on the approved schemes for their area.,

Accountable Officer: David Hall 01622 221081

Background Papers:

HAB 11 July 2006. ITEM 10.

This page is intentionally left blank

APPENDIX 1: TRANSPORTATION AND SAFETY PROGRAMME FOR 2008/09

No.	Scheme Title	Scheme Description	District	Cost(£K)	Score	Priority	Rank (126)
1	Newtown Road, Bridge	Modify bridge to allow improved bus, pedestrian and cycle access.	Ashford	200	100	High	1
2	Warren Park & Ride	Bus priority measures to assist delivery of Park and Ride	Ashford	250	94	High	2
3	A251 Faversham Road	Link existing cycle route to a school	Ashford	80	69	High	28
4	Footway AU19	Provide sustainable link between residential and key services	Ashford	5	65	High	43
5	Footway AU 39	Improvement to footpath link to town centre and amenities	Ashford	3	58	High	80
6	Ash 212 Bethersden	Improvements to signing and extend speed limit to south west	Ashford	8	55	Medium	112
7	Boys Hall Road - Cycleway	Cycleway extension	Ashford	80	55	Medium	120
District Programme Total (£K)				626			

No.	Scheme Title	Scheme Description	District	Cost(£K)	Score	Priority	Rank (126)
1	Canterbury to Folkestone Quality Corridors	Bus infrastructure improvements to support bus operator investment	Canterbury	100	81	High	6
2	Urban Traffic Management & Control	Provision of Variable Message Signs and UTM Co-ordination	Canterbury	400	78	High	14
3	A2990 Chesfield Road - CRM 1383	Provide alternative cycle route via slip road, convert pelican to toucan	Canterbury	40	70	High	22
4	Shallock Road, Broad Oak - CRM 1385	Installation of centre line studs	Canterbury	10	68	High	31
5	A2 Slips, Canterbury	Initial phase of slip road improvement	Canterbury	650	60	High	68
6	Public Footpaths CW15 & CW17 - Whitstable	Pedestrian links, two all weather links between residential areas	Canterbury	24	59	High	72
7	Implementation of Canterbury Bus Strategy	Bus priority measures, infrastructure and RTI (part of QBP)	Canterbury	300	58	High	86
8	Public Footpath CW52 - Whitstable	Reconstruction of public footpath, upgrade to all weather surface	Canterbury	29	56	Medium	97
9	Chartham Down Road/Ifin Lane - CRM 1384	Provide kerb built outs, re-site and improve signing	Canterbury	5	55	Medium	108
10	A28/Shalmsford Street - CRM 1382	Re-site junction signing and extend high friction surface	Canterbury	5	55	Medium	109
11	Seasalter to Whitstable - new cycleway/footway	New cycleway/footway and improvements to NCR1.	Canterbury	60	55	Medium	119
12	Connect 2 - Kent Contribution (Phase 1)	Kent contribution toward Connect 2 project	Cant/Thanet	100	80	High	8
District Programme Total (£K)				1722			

No.	Scheme Title	Scheme Description	District	Cost(£K)	Score	Priority	Rank (126)
1	Dartford Rail-Bus Interchange	Integration of Dartford station and Fastrack and other local bus services	Dartford	20	79	High	10
2	Swanscombe & Greenhithe Cycle Imp	Improve walking/cycling routes. Inc. Swanscombe and Ebbs Station	Dartford	50	73	High	17
3	Farningham Road Station - Interchange Imps	Bus/Rail interchange improvements, improved pedestrian access	Dartford	50	71	High	20
4	Urban Traffic Management & Control	Installation of UTM to manage Ring Road traffic	Dartford	50	69	High	24
5	Green Travel Plans	Improvements to transport facilities as a result of Green TPs	Dartford	50	69	High	25
6	Real Time Passenger Information	Provision of RTPI at bus stops in rural Dartford	Dartford	50	68	High	33
7	Sedleys & Langafel Schools - PROW	Improvements to pedestrian routes linking to schools	Dartford	30	66	High	37
8	Watling Street - Toucan Crossing	Installation of Toucan Crossing on A296, Watling Street	Dartford	50	66	High	39
9	SRTS - Dartford	Improvements to walking and cycling routes from schools	Dartford	100	66	High	41
10	B2174 Princes Road - Footway/cycleway	Installation of footway/cycleway from Lowfield St to Crayford Rd	Dartford	150	66	High	42
11	Longfield Station - Interchange Imps	Bus/Rail interchange improvements and related access works	Dartford	25	64	High	47
12	Darent Valley Accessibility Imps	Promotion of non-car modes to Darent Valley; cycleway imp	Dartford	25	64	High	48
13	Princes Road/Shepherds Lane - Toucan Crossings	Provision of Toucan crossing at Princes Rd/Shepherds Lane	Dartford	70	64	High	50
14	Ped Crossing Imps - Dartford	Undertake improvements to pedestrian crossings to enhance access	Dartford	50	63	High	56
15	Oakfield Junior School - PROW	Improvement to footpath linking to Oakfield Junior School	Dartford	12	61	High	59
16	Dartford Grammar School - PROW	Improvement to footpath linking to Dartford Grammar School	Dartford	15	61	High	60
17	A225 Lowfield St/Cranford Rd - CRM 1410	Improve signing and lining and lighting at Cranford Rd and Phoenix Place	Dartford	30	60	High	65
18	A225 Princes Road/Park Road - CRM 1409	Install high friction surface and carriageway realignment A296 at Park Rd	Dartford	35	58	High	81
19	Pedestrian links to Bluewater	Install pedestrian crossing on B255 Bean Road at Mount Rd	Dartford	150	58	High	85
20	NW Dartford Town Centre - Traffic Mgmt	Signing improvements to enhance traffic management	Dartford	50	55	Medium	117

21	Highcross Road/Betsham Road - CRM	Improve lighting and road markings and provision of high friction surface	Dartford	40	54	Medium	124
				District Programme Total (£K)			
				1102			

No.	Scheme Title	Scheme Description	District	Cost(£K)	Score	Priority	Rank (126)
1	Dover Priory Railway Station	Contribution towards improving station, inc. public transport interchange	Dover	100	88	High	3
2	Bus Stop Infrastructure Improvement Programme	Bus infrastructure improvements, mainly on Dover Diamond Route	Dover	100	69	High	29
3	Deal Cycle Routes (phase 3)	New cycle route linkin Sholden to town centre/seafront	Dover	75	66	High	40
4	Deal Cycle Routes (phase 4)	New cycle route, including installation of Toucan crossing	Dover	130	64	High	52
5	River Dour Cycle Route	Footway/cycleway connection to link residential and town centre	Dover	353	64	High	54
6	A258 Queen Street, Deal - CRM 1387	Modifications to pelican operations	Dover	10	56	Medium	91
7	Public Footpath ED46, Hawkshill Down	Enhance existing footpath to provide more suitable all weather surface	Dover	18	56	Medium	95
8	B2011/Plough Hill, Church Hougham - CRM 1390	Improvement to junction signage	Dover	5	55	Medium	107
9	A258/Ringwood Rd, Ringwood - CRM 1388	Installation of high friction surface on southbound carriageway	Dover	8	55	Medium	111
10	A257/Mill Road, Wingham Green - CRM 1386	Modifications to signage, provision of high friction surface	Dover	15	55	Medium	114
				District Programme Total (£K)			
				814			

No.	Scheme Title	Scheme Description	District	Cost(£K)	Score	Priority	Rank (126)
1	Urban Traffic Management & Control	Improve travel information, linked to UTMIC development	Gravesham	100	76	High	15
2	Northfleet Tech - walking/cycling route	New foot/cycleway linking Northfleet Tech. College to local residential	Gravesham	60	69	High	27
3	Hall Road Crossing at Pepper Hill	Improved crossing facility at Hall Road, between A2 and roundabout	Gravesham	60	68	High	34
4	Darnley Road/Dashwood Road - Imps	Improve Pedestrian crossing facilities at Darnley Rd/Dashwood Rd	Gravesham	75	68	High	35
5	SRTS - Gravesham	Improvements to walking and cycling access to schools	Gravesham	50	66	High	38
6	Pedestrian Crossing Imps	Improve access for pedestrians and mobility impaired	Gravesham	25	64	High	46
7	Extension of Cycle Route - Istead Rise	Provide off-carriageway cycle route from south Gravesend to Istead Rise	Gravesham	80	64	High	51
8	B261 Old Road West/A227 Wrotham Road - CRM 1408	Relining/signing work to reduce right turn crashes	Gravesham	30	60	High	64
9	SRTS - NG14 - Singwell	Surface improvement to existing public footpath	Gravesham	14	59	High	71
10	St Georges Secondary School - PROW	Improvement to footpath linking to St Georges Sec. School	Gravesham	6	55	Medium	110
				District Programme Total (£K)			
				500			

No.	Scheme Title	Scheme Description	District	Cost(£K)	Score	Priority	Rank (126)
1	Refurb of Chequers Bus Station	Improvements to bus infrastructure at Chequers Centre bus station	Maidstone	50	84	High	5
2	Maidstone Urban Traffic Management & Control	Continuation of UTMIC pilot project	Maidstone	500	80	High	9
3	Maidstone Quality Bus Partnership	Improvements to bus infrastructure to support operator investment	Maidstone	100	78	High	11
4	Maidstone Cycle Network	Install Toucan crossing - New Cut Rd/Ashford Rd	Maidstone	20	70	High	21
5	Bredhurst 20mph	Installation of Street furniture to reduce vehicle speeds in village	Maidstone	75	63	High	58
6	Maidstone Bridge Gyratory	First phase of capacity enhancement to A229 n/bound traffic	Maidstone	300	59	High	78
7	KB18 & 19 - Public Footpath, Palace Wood to Maidstone H	Provide amenity path for pedestrians inc. hosp. school and residents	Maidstone	60	58	High	84
8	Maid Bends - CRM 1405, Headcorn Rd, Staplehurst	Enhance signing and chevrons. Provide road markings	Maidstone	2	55	Medium	104
				District Programme Total (£K)			
				1107			

No.	Scheme Title	Scheme Description	District	Cost(£K)	Score	Priority	Rank (126)
1	Integrated Access Route - SR49 - Olford Station	Upgrade surface of existing path	Sevenoaks	12	60	High	61
2	Darent Valley Accessibility (phase 1)	Promotion of non-car modes to leisure centre, inc cycle infrastructure	Sevenoaks	25	60	High	62
3	Crockham Hill, phase 2	Phase 2 of speed management measures in village centre	Sevenoaks	25	60	High	63
4	Station Road Bus Stop - Swanley	Bus stop improvement on B2173 High Street	Sevenoaks	15	56	Medium	93
5	SRTS - SU4/DR165 Seal	Upgrade surface of existing path	Sevenoaks	25	56	Medium	96
6	Community Access Route - SB83	Realign path, upgrade surface	Sevenoaks	60	54	Medium	125

District Programme Total (£K) **162**

No.	Scheme Title	Scheme Description	District	Cost(£K)	Score	Priority	Rank (126)
1	Support School Travel Plans	Improvements to school access	Shepway	30	64	High	49
2	Bridleway HR1.1, Surface Improvement	Provide off-road multi-purpose surface	Shepway	30	59	High	74
3	Hawkinge Traffic Management	Pedestrian safety measures, traffic calming (Phase 2)	Shepway	60	59	High	75
4	Folkestone West Parkway	Car/Rail/Bus interchange and local traffic management measures	Shepway	50	58	High	79
5	A20/Alkham Valley Road - CRM 1392	Redesign advance roundabout sign and improve markings	Shepway	2.5	56	High	87
6	Dover Hill, Folkestone - CRM 1393	Provide additional chevron signing and white lining. Providing hatching	Shepway	3.5	55	Medium	106
7	M20/A20(Q12) Eastbound Slip, Cheriton - CRM 1394	Junction modifications	Shepway	40	55	Medium	116
8	Support Walking in Folkestone	Improvements to pedestrian access to town centre	Shepway	80	54	Medium	126
District Programme Total (£K)				296			

No.	Scheme Title	Scheme Description	District	Cost(£K)	Score	Priority	Rank (126)
1	Sheppey Way	Installation of cycling facilities along Sheppey Way	Swale	15	68	High	32
2	ZR 532 Boughton Street	Footpath improvements linking housing and public transport stops	Swale	3	56	High	88
3	ZR 523 - Boughton Street	Provide link between residential and schools and amenities	Swale	11	56	Medium	92
4	Cycle Network - Sheerness	New cycle route, Sheerness/West Sheppey	Swale	70	56	Medium	101
5	Cycle Network - N Sittingbourne & Iwade	New cycle route, North Sittingbourne and Iwade	Swale	90	56	Medium	103
6	London Road, Sittingbourne - CRM 1401	Extend high friction surface	Swale	4	55	Medium	105
7	ZS14 - Minster	Improved footpath to provide link between residential area and facilities	Swale	20	55	Medium	115
District Programme Total (£K)				213			

No.	Scheme Title	Scheme Description	District	Cost(£K)	Score	Priority	Rank (126)
1	Broadstairs Traffic Management Plan	Proposals to discourage through traffic and improve pedestrian access	Thanet	75	80	High	7
2	QEOM Hospital Entrance	Junction improvements inc. traffic signals to assist bus and pedestrians	Thanet	210	78	High	12
3	Turner to Dickens - strategic walking route	Completion of strategic walking route	Thanet	90	73	High	18
4	Cecil Sq/Cecil St, Margate - CRM 1395	Improvements to pedestrian crossing facilities	Thanet	50	71	High	19
5	Victoria Traffic Lights (phase 2)	Modification to existing traffic signals to optimise traffic flow	Thanet	75	70	High	23
6	Harbour Parade, Ramsgate - CRM 1396	Extension of guard railing and kerb alignment	Thanet	10	68	High	30
7	Dane Valley Cycle Routes (phase 4)	Network of cycle route links between Dane Valley and town centre	Thanet	100	68	High	36
8	A254 QEOM to Westwood cycle route link	Cycle route connecting QEOM hospital to Westwood Cross and network	Thanet	125	65	High	44
9	Viking Coastal Trail	Improved cycle link between VCT and Margate train station	Thanet	28	64	High	45
10	A254 Margate Road (westwood/Northwood)	Provision of improved pedestrian facilities	Thanet	72	63	High	57
11	Bus Stop Infrastructure Improvement Programme	Bus stop infrastructure improvements	Thanet	100	60	High	67
12	A254 inter-urban corridor imp	Improvements to A254 inter-urban corridor improvements	Thanet	80	59	High	76
District Programme Total (£K)				1015			

No.	Scheme Title	Scheme Description	District	Cost(£K)	Score	Priority	Rank (126)
1	A20 Bus Priority (phase 1)	Installation of a bus lane and general capacity improvement	T&M	193	64	High	53
2	SRTS/Community Access Route	Improved footway linking SRTS/Community Access Route	T&M	25	59	High	73
3	Ped link East Malling to West Malling	Installation of footways to improve access to W Malling Station	T&M	40	58	High	82
4	Community Access Route	Improvement to access route	T&M	10	56	Medium	90
5	SRTS/Community Access Route	Improvement to access route	T&M	18	56	Medium	94
6	Medway Valley Initiative	Improved access measures for public transport, walking and cycling	T&M	10	55	Medium	113
7	Tonbridge Station Interchange	Improved interchange facility at station	T&M	40	55	Medium	121
District Programme Total (£K)				336			

No.	Scheme Title	Scheme Description	District	Cost(£K)	Score	Priority	Rank (126)
1	SRTS High Friction Surfacing	Improvements to bus infrastructure to support operator investment	Tunbridge Wells	125	76	High	16
2	SRTS Footway Link	New footway link to improve access to school	Tunbridge Wells	20	63	High	55
3	Badsell Road Footway	Provision of footway connecting Five Oak Green to Paddock Wood	Tunbridge Wells	50	60	High	66
4	A26 St. John's Road Cycle Lanes	Upgrade to existing cycleway	Tunbridge Wells	10	59	High	69
5	Community Access Route	Improvements to community access route	Tunbridge Wells	10	59	High	70
6	OBP (phase 2)	New bus infrastructure in town centre to Longfield Road bus route	Tunbridge Wells	100	59	High	77
7	Ped Facilities Audit (phase 3)	Improvements to pedestrian facilities around the town centre	Tunbridge Wells	40	58	High	83
8	SRTS - WC257 - Frittenden	Provide improved links to footpath linking to local school	Tunbridge Wells	5	56	Medium	89
9	Paddock Wood Cycle Links	Provide cycle links to schools/sports centre and local facilities	Tunbridge Wells	80	56	Medium	102
10	Royal Tunbridge Wells & Southborough HGV Signing	Improved signing for HGV restrictions	Tunbridge Wells	50	55	Medium	118
11	SRTS - High Friction Surfacing	Junction improvement to enhance road user safety	Tunbridge Wells	20	54	Medium	122
12	SRTS - WC368 - Couston Road, Cranbrook	Improvements to footpath linking to school	Tunbridge Wells	20	54	Medium	123
District Programme Total (£K)				530			

No.	Scheme Title	Scheme Description	District	Cost(£K)	Score	Priority	Rank (126)
1	Traffic Management Centre Development	Development of UTM technologies and information across Kent	Countywide	250	85	High	4
2	Public Transport Information	Improvements to the provision of bus roadside information	Countywide	250	78	High	13
3	Countywide Bus Stop Programme	Improvements to bus stop access and bus stop infrastructure	Countywide	50	69	High	26
4	Interactive Signs Countywide	Implementation of Interactive Speed Sign programme	Countywide	35	56	Medium	98
5	Install DDA Friendly Dropped Kerbs	Provision of works to improve footway access	Countywide	50	56	Medium	99
6	Package of non programmed quick win CRMs	Implementation of responsive CRM programme, unplanned	Countywide	50	56	Medium	100
Programme Total (£K)				685			

Countywide Programme Total (£K) 9106

A New Tree Policy for Kent Highway Services

A report by Alan Riley, Technical Director, Kent Highway Services, to the Highways Advisory Board on 18th September 2007

1. Kent Highway Services is responsible for maintaining and developing the highway network in Kent and ensuring the safety of its users. As part of Kent County Council it has a wider role in managing and enhancing the environment and, as part of its commitment to safety and to the environment, it aims to sustain a balanced and healthy highway tree population. These roles can on occasion lead to conflict largely as a result of misunderstanding the necessity of essential tree safety maintenance, the motives behind the work or in some cases the delay in carrying out works.
2. This policy sets out the strategic objectives on which KHS will base the management and enhancement of the highway tree stock. It will be reviewed annually and when there are significant changes in legislation or best practice recommendations.
3. Arising from the objectives is a set of operational processes which define how they are to be met on a day to day basis. The highest priority for funding is to ensure the safety of the highway. Other objectives will be met or worked towards as budgets permit.
4. The policy recognises the need to develop an inventory of all highway trees and information arising from data collected and managed in this inventory will inform future management decisions and help plan future funding to meet those objectives.
5. The new policy for trees is set out in Appendices 1 and 2 of this report.

Recommendation

6. Subject to the views of this Board, it is proposed to recommend to the Cabinet Member for Environment, Highways and Waste that the tree policy set out in Appendices 1 and 2 be adopted.
-

Accountable Officer: Alan Riley, Jacobs 01622 666456

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 Kent is often referred to as 'The Garden of England'. Land use is predominantly agricultural and the countryside is a mosaic of fields, with trees and small pockets of woodland. The highways are often lined and defined with trees and shrubs leading into adjacent woodland. Trees are an asset which needs special consideration when integrated into the built environment. It is necessary to balance their ecological and aesthetic advantages against the restrictions imposed by modern development. Trees and the built environment can co-exist but each is capable of damaging the other. Getting the balance right is important and Kent County Council together with a number of partners has produced 'The Kent Design Guide'. Good design adds environmental, economic, social and cultural values – it enriches our lives. The document aims to create desirable places that reinforce Kent's distinctive character. The following policy objectives seek to develop areas of consideration both in the planting of new and the maintenance of existing trees and will follow recommendations in the document.
- 1.2 Kent Highway Services (KHS) acknowledges that trees play an important role in the county and contribute to the visual amenity of both rural and urban landscapes and help to mitigate the impact of the highway. The perception of the role and importance of trees in the environment has changed dramatically in recent years and there is now a greater appreciation of the value of trees, particularly in the urban environment. In addition to their visual role, trees can remove a range of atmospheric pollutants, provide shelter and shade, reduce glare, stabilise banks, reduce perception of noise, have ecological and conservation value and produce timber. Against these benefits are the problems associated with the obstruction of lighting, signs and vision, the physical obstruction to both vehicles and pedestrians, root damage to the highway and adjacent properties and the danger of falling limbs or whole trees.

2.0 The Highway

- 2.1 The highway is defined as a road, bridleway or footpath over which the public has a right of access. Generally the highway includes the adjacent verges and the land up to, but not necessarily including, the boundary. The boundary, whether it is a fence, ditch, hedge or other physical marker, is generally the responsibility of the adjacent landowner.

3.0 The Tree

- 3.1 Trees are complex living organisms and are subject to pests and diseases and to climatic and site changes. Many species, because of their ultimate size or characteristics, can be considered unsuitable for urban or roadside planting but have been planted because of the suitability of their other characteristics e.g. toleration of air pollution. In order for these species to be used effectively they may require regular maintenance or sufficient growing space to avoid impacting on the highway.
- 3.2 Some species have characteristics that are undesirable and difficult to manage by regular maintenance and consideration has to be given as to whether suitable planting locations exist for them. Unfortunately many undesirable characteristics do not exhibit themselves until the tree is mature or, more usually, over-mature. KHS has been left with a legacy of problems as a result of well intentioned planting scheme undertaken some 40 or more years ago. Typically, these problems include root suckering, blocking of vision splays by basal growth, size of tree inappropriate for location and problems associated with root damage both to the highway and to adjacent properties. The effect of these problems is more noticeable today due to increased traffic volumes, a reduced tolerance to safety infringements and to property damage.

4.0 The Asset

- 4.1 In order to manage trees effectively KHS needs to understand the tree asset across the county. The asset inventory needs to include at the very least the number of trees, the species distribution, the age classes, the tree condition and the tree location. Information on these factors will help determine whether a particular species or location requires special management intervention and will aid future programming of inspection and work frequencies as well as budget requirements. The asset data will be managed using specialist tree management software, Confirm, in conjunction with other asset features within KHS.

5.0 The Inspection

- 5.1 The maintenance and care of the trees that grow in the highway is generally the responsibility of KHS. Trees growing on land adjacent to the highway or in the boundary are the responsibility of the adjacent landowner and for the purposes of this document will be referred to as private trees.
- 5.2 Tree safety inspections are undertaken on all highways and the frequencies are currently determined by the road classification with major roads, strategic roads and locally important roads being inspected every two years and minor roads every five years. All inspections and resultant tree works are recorded to provide an auditable trail. This inspection regime, carried out by qualified arboriculturist teams, meets the recommendation in 'Well Maintained Highways' (Roads Liaison Group 2005). Future inspection frequencies will be determined by the analysis of data from the tree management software. It may well be that certain tree species in certain locations will in future be assessed as requiring an annual inspection. Other locations could have the inspection frequency extended from two to five years. In any event the frequency will always meet any national standard or recommendation. All inspections and actions will be in accordance with this policy and with KHS practice notes. KHS will regularly review the processes for highway tree management to ensure they are robust and defensible. The adherence to a process and the prioritisation of works against available budgets is considered sufficient to meet KHS's duty of care.
- 5.3 All safety works arising from the inspections will be prioritised to a series of timescales recommended by the inspector. Urgent safety works will always be undertaken with lower priority works being subject to budget availability. Works that can be included as necessary for highway safety are removal of deadwood, felling of dangerous trees and clearance of obstructions to carriageways, footpaths and vision splays. In the case of damage to property or other structures KHS will combine arboricultural advice with advice from appropriate specialists such as structural or highway engineers.
- 5.4 Private trees may affect the highway and, unless the inspector considers immediate action is required, their owners will be recommended to seek competent professional advice to determine the works required and the appropriate timescale. KHS will liaise with the owners to ensure that appropriate action is taken to remove any hazard to users of the highway. KHS monitors private owner responses and in urgent cases or where an owner cannot be contacted or is unwilling to undertake the minimum required safety works KHS ultimately has the power to enter the adjacent land to undertake the works and to recover the associated costs from the owner of the land.
- 5.5 Regular maintenance and non safety issues caused by existing trees will, where possible, be controlled by a maintenance regime subject to available budgets. Maintenance works will be based on priorities that consider the growth characteristics of the trees, their location and the need for maintenance. For example quick growing trees along a school bus route will need a higher maintenance frequency than the same trees growing along a wide urban street with infrequent use by high sided vehicles.

- 5.6 A great deal of research has been undertaken into risk management and maintenance techniques including timing of operations. They are all aimed at ensuring a tree is retained in a sound and healthy condition, is free from serious defects and, in the longer term, benefits from the work carried out. Appropriate management techniques include crown thinning and crown reduction and can all be used effectively on highway trees. Felling is undertaken where there is an overriding safety consideration or where a tree's condition is considered to be beyond reasonable repair.
- 5.7 Inspection of trees will be carried out by a suitably qualified professional and any work undertaken will be based on the observations and recommendations of the inspector within an appropriate timescale.
- 5.8 Regular maintenance work, for example pollarding, should be carried out at intervals to maintain the character of the road concerned. The frequency of pollarding will be decided for each road giving regard to the location, species and condition of trees concerned. Regular maintenance cycles and strategies are desirable where site conditions indicate that maintaining trees at a reduced size is necessary to mitigate claims, particularly subsidence claims, against KHS.
- 5.9 Managing an aging tree population can mean that managers have to make what on the face of it seem drastic management decisions. Data from the asset inventory will be used to develop management plans. These are often used in forestry and arboriculture. The aim of a management plan in commercial forestry for example can be to plant the right species on the right site and to harvest the crop at a point in time where maximum timber value can be obtained. This will often mean felling healthy trees when they are actively growing. In many highway situations, particularly in urban areas, management plans will consider whether it is appropriate to allow trees to become too big or to age to a point where constant expenditure is required to retain them in a safe condition. It may also be that the existing tree stock detracts from the character of an area through the use of inappropriate species or planting patterns. A management plan will define a process of tree removal, management and replacement and will, over time, generate a street scene comprising trees of varying ages and sizes appropriate to the character of an area. The maintenance of formal avenues will take into account the need to manage the avenue as a feature rather than the individual trees forming the avenue. The impact of removing a small number of trees at any one time will be less than a scenario where all the trees in one location, of a similar age and size, need removing over a short period of time. Cherry species for example are popular in urban locations but experience has shown that beyond 40 years old they can decline rapidly. If cherry is considered an appropriate species, a management plan should not allow any cherry to grow beyond 40 years old. A better approach would be to remove and replant one quarter of the trees at year 10, another quarter at year 20 and so on. This will ensure a street always has a good stock of trees to provide an amenity feature.
- 5.10 Management plans and maintenance programmes will, over time, aid predictability of spend and help to smooth out budget spend profiles.

Objective 1
To ensure the safety of the users of the highway.
Action
KHS will arrange for the inspection of highway trees and trees adjacent to the highway using suitably qualified inspectors. Safety works will be prioritised

and, subject to budgetary constraints, will be undertaken within the timescale recommended by the inspector. The felling of trees will be undertaken where other maintenance techniques have failed or are impractical due to the condition of the tree.

The processes guiding the inspections and tree works implementation will be reviewed at least annually to ensure they meet current legal and duty of care standards.

The inspection frequency will always meet any national standard or recommendation. Currently, August 2007, major roads, strategic roads and locally important roads are inspected every two years and minor roads every five years.

Owners of private trees will be advised of the need to have their trees inspected by a competent person and to undertake works recommended by that person. Where work is not carried out and a tree or trees represent a danger to users of the highway KHS can, and will, use legal powers to ensure private owners comply with the recommendations of an inspection.

KHS will review tree management processes and policy against changes in national policy and recommendations for best practice.

6.0 The Site

- 6.1 It does not necessarily follow that a site used for tree planting some years ago is suitable for replanting. Many factors have changed in the intervening years; there is a greater volume of traffic, traffic flow is often faster and the utility companies have increased their service provision. These factors tend to make more sites less suitable for tree planting.
- 6.2 During the course of the tree safety audit, a record of all trees removed for safety reasons is maintained. The arboriculturist will, at the time of inspection, record whether the removal of a tree has a significant impact on the locality in line with the following table;

Replanting Priority (1 Highest → 5 Lowest)

Planting Site	Criteria
1	Protected tree (TPO or Conservation Area)
2	Significant single tree that by reason of its species, age, stature or historical connection contributes significantly to the local amenity.
3	Tree forming part of a significant feature e.g. avenue that contributes significantly to the local amenity.
4	Trees forming part of a street scene of mixed tree species and age classes.
5	Individual trees of no particular significance.

- 6.3 The impact will be defined by the status of the tree i.e. the size and species of the tree and its location, or whether it is afforded protection in any way. For example, a particular road may be defined by an avenue of a single tree species and, over time, the removal of trees within the avenue would detract from its amenity value. It would be appropriate in this situation to replace trees removed to ensure that in the long term the amenity of the area is maintained or enhanced.
- 6.4 Before replanting can be undertaken many site specific aspects will require input from engineering and arboricultural specialists. There are numerous constraints that may make a site unsuitable for planting, see Appendix 1, and it may be that a site is considered unsuitable for planting despite the previous existence of trees there. In some situations it may therefore not be possible to replace trees within a particular feature on a like for like basis.
- 6.5 The choice of planting species will be appropriate to the site and to recommendations within The Kent Design Guide. Given the long term nature of trees the choice of species for a difficult site may need to reflect possible climate change issues.
- 6.6 The planting season extends from November to March and in order to meet this timescale it will be necessary to identify and overcome the site constraints well in advance. Planting Sites 1 – 3 inclusive will be assessed immediately they are identified as it may take up to two months to gather the necessary information to confirm that planting can go ahead. Depending on the timing of the tree safety audit it is inevitable that some sites will miss the planting window and they will be carried over to the next season. From a practical point of view deferring these sites until the following season will ensure the best availability of planting stock and the best likelihood of their survival.
- 6.7 The replanting of Planting Site 1 will be subject to consultation and agreement with the local district or borough council. Where replanting is required in a specialist site such as a Roadside Nature Reserve KHS will liaise with the manager of the site or obtain ecological or landscape advice in advance of planting.
- 6.8 Replanting recommendations aimed at maintaining or enhancing the character of an area will be in line with recommendations in 'The Landscape Assessment of Kent' (2004 KCC)
- 6.9 KHS is aware that funding may be available from a number of sources including local authority initiatives, memorial tree planting schemes and other local initiatives and will

work with the sources to enhance any tree planting opportunities on the highway. All replanting will include a maintenance regime to ensure successful establishment.

- 6.10 Where replacement planting cannot be achieved due to site constraints KHS will liaise with District and Parish councils and local groups to determine whether other local sites can be used.

Objective 2

To maintain and enhance the highway tree stock and to ensure that tree species are appropriate to specific site requirements in line with recommendations in 'The Kent Design Guide' and 'The Landscape Assessment of Kent'.

Action

Where appropriate, KHS will undertake the replanting of trees removed for safety reasons.

KHS will seek professional engineering and arboricultural advice as to the suitability of each site for tree planting and the appropriate tree species for that site.

KHS will obtain specialist advice before planting on sites such as Roadside Nature Reserves.

KHS will seek appropriate alternative sites and funding opportunities where site constraints and budgets prevent replanting.

7.0 Arboricultural Contractors

- 7.1 Trees can be permanently damaged as a result of poor workmanship and this damage may increase future maintenance needs and costs. The scale of the work, the skill of the contractor and the health of the tree are among some of the factors that can affect them.
- 7.2 Arboricultural contractors require specialist knowledge and skills to properly undertake maintenance work. Contractors should, at the very least, have appropriately trained staff, the correct equipment with maintenance records, a trained person to undertake risk assessments, a staff training programme and a stated Health and Safety policy. This is in addition to the financial and insurance requirements of working for KHS. The contractors working and office practices will be subject to regular review by KHS.
- 7.3 KHS will define minimum standards and will work with arboricultural contractors in developing training programmes to ensure their staff meet the standards.
- 7.4 Arboricultural work can generate a high volume of green and woody residues. Most of this is chipped on site and disposed of by contractors for a variety of end uses. KHS will monitor the overall volume of the residues and will work with contractors to identify and coordinate a sustainable end use policy for Kent (Wood pellets for sustainable boiler facilities).

Objective 3

To maintain and enhance the stock of highway trees.

Action

KHS will use specialist arboricultural contractors when undertaking tree maintenance. All works will be to the appropriate British Standard.

KHS will help develop and sustain preferred arboricultural contractors and ensure that their workmanship and competency meets required standards. Contractors failing to meet the standards will be removed from the preferred list.

KHS will work with contractors to implement a sustainable end use policy for residues arising from arboricultural works.

8.0 Highway Improvements and Utility Services

- 8.1 KHS will ensure internal communication procedures are in place and that arboricultural advice is sought for highway improvement schemes that may affect trees.
- 8.2 The cutting back of trees from overhead cables is the responsibility of the utility company and not KHS.
- 8.3 Where the installation or maintenance of underground services is concerned the utility company is required under The New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 (NRSWA) to give advance notice of its proposals to KHS. During the period of notice KHS will consider the effect of the proposals on highway trees. Various codes of practice under NRSWA and guidelines issued by the National Joint Utilities Group (NJUG) contain advice on the working practices to be adopted when working near trees and the utility companies are expected to comply with the minimum recommendations in the guidelines. NRSWA makes provision for the utility companies to pay compensation to KHS for damage or loss suffered as a direct result of their street works.

Objective 4

To minimise the damage to highway trees caused by highway improvements or essential service maintenance or installation.

Action

KHS will liaise with the utility companies to ensure they comply with relevant codes of practice and guidance notes when working near trees.

Where damage occurs to trees the utility companies will be required to undertake or fund remedial tree surgery or replacement replanting.

9.0 Nuisance

- 9.0 Nuisance is often difficult to define. Screening by trees may be acceptable to one person and shading caused by the same trees may not be acceptable to the next door neighbour.
- 9.1 Trees typically are often viewed as a nuisance because of, amongst other things, leaf fall, seed drop, shading, branch overhang and honeydew (secretions from aphids feeding on foliage) deposition. In terms of providing a long term solution these problems are difficult if not impossible to deal with short of removing a tree. With many tree species, problems can be worsened by poor maintenance; the shading from regrowth following pruning can be worse than the original shading problem. There is no legal requirement for an owner of a tree to carry out works to abate this type of nuisance. Activities such as clearing up fallen leaves or seeds are seen as normal household maintenance operations and while they clearly are a burden to some people they are just a fact of life, particularly when weighed against the benefits that trees provide to the environment and the wider community.
- 9.2 Certain types of nuisance fall into the category of legal nuisance and the owner of a tree must, if advised of the nuisance or the likelihood of a nuisance developing, take steps to abate the nuisance. The problems associated with root damage fall into this category and it is difficult for an owner to declare ignorance of this problem as it is now well documented and advice and research data is widely available, even to the layman. The tree owner's insurers will require suitable preventative action to be taken well in advance of the likelihood of a claim being made against them.
- 9.3 Whether or not work is needed to reduce nuisance will be judged on an individual tree basis. Works can include cutting back (even complete removal) from adjacent property to prevent damage (actual or potential). Works over and above that needed to maintain the tree in a safe and or healthy condition will only be considered in the severest cases of nuisance.
- 9.4 Works will not be undertaken on a tree to reduce shading, overhang of an adjoining property, to reduce leaf and fruit fall, to improve television signal reception or to stop honeydew deposition.

Objective 5

To minimise the likelihood of insurance or other claims against KHS.

Action

KHS will seek appropriate advice from its tree advisors, legal advisors and insurers in respect of action required to mitigate any claim or future claim that may arise.

10.0 Communications

- 10.1 KHS has a duty to ensure the safety of users of the highway; it also has a responsibility to provide information where its actions impact on the local environment or amenity. Many of the complaints and concerns received from members of the public are related to a lack of knowledge of proposed tree works and a lack of understanding of the suitability of different treatment regimes. KHS will provide details of survey work, proposed tree works and replanting to interested parties, including local authorities and tree wardens, on a regular basis. KHS will hold liaison meetings with local authority tree officers on a six monthly basis.

- 10.2 Where significant programmed tree works are proposed that may have an impact on local amenity or environment KHS will, in addition to the above, carry out a letter drop to residents affected by the proposals at least one week in advance of the works. Where contractors are working on site they will display information boards with KHS contact details.
- 10.3 Communications with private tree owners following tree safety inspections will include an information leaflet to assist the owners in understanding how KHS manages highway trees and their own responsibilities as a tree owner. KHS will prepare and disseminate a further information leaflet outlining the objectives contained within this policy and how the objectives will meet customer expectations for tree management. In some cases KHS will take no action to manage trees where there is no safety related issue and it is better that customers are aware of this from the outset.

Objective 6

To communicate tree survey and tree management information.

Action

KHS will provide information on survey progress and tree works to district councils and to parish councils through the tree warden scheme.

KHS will provide programme information through its web site and will provide advisory leaflets on tree management policies.

KHS will hold six monthly liaison meetings with nominated district council officers.

KHS will carry out letter drops to local residents at least one week in advance of undertaking significant programmed tree works in one location.

Planting Constraints

- Site suitability
 - Service runs (underground and above ground).
 - Vision splays and proximity to highway signs.
 - Clearance for pedestrians and vehicles.
 - Clearance for adjacent properties.
 - Objection from adjacent property owner.
 - Lead time for planting season (November – March).

- Species suitability
 - Ultimate size and form.
 - Growth rate.
 - Long term suitability (climate change)
 - Undesirable characteristics (leaf and seed drop, surface rooting and suckering, high water demand etc.)
 - Matching existing species in situ.
 - Different species will only be used if the original is:
 - . Unavailable on the market.
 - . Unsuitable for the location.
 - . Prone to pest & disease attack.
 - . Part of a road containing mixed types.

Useful Reference Documents

BS 5837: 2005 Trees in Relation to Construction.

Tree Preservation Orders - A Guide to the Law and Good Practice.

BS 3998: 1989 Recommendations for Tree Work.

Codes of Practice under the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991.

Guidelines for the Planning, Installation and Maintenance of Services in Proximity to Trees: - NJUG Publication No 10.

Highways Act 1980.

Well Maintained Highways: - Roads Liaison Group 2005

The Landscape Assessment of Kent - Kent County Council 2004.

The Kent Design Guide – Kent Design Initiative and all Kent's local authorities 2005

Progress Report on Major Capital Projects

A report by the Capital Programme Manager to the Highways Advisory Board on 18 September 2007.

Introduction

1. This report provides an update on progress of the major transport and highway schemes following the last report in March 2007. It is understood that the Board welcomes these reports and the intention is to continue to provide them half yearly and when there are important issues to bring to Members' notice.
2. From 1 April 2007, the Major Transport Projects Team rejoined Kent Highway Services and came under the portfolio of the Cabinet Member for Environment, Highways and Waste.
3. The first 6 months of 2007/08 have been dominated by the considerable efforts of the Team in trying to progress the Growth Area schemes in Kent Thameside and Ashford that are constrained by the funding deadline of 31 March 2008.
4. Several schemes have been recognised in various industry awards:

Fastrack

- National Transport Awards 2007 – Winner of the bus category. This is a major achievement as the National Transport Awards are probably the most prestigious of the many transport awards.
- Certificate of Excellence –2007 from HST Integration Project. HST is the Interreg funded initiative for accessibility improvements related to the high-speed train network in Northwest Europe.
- Jacobs Performance Excellence Award 2007 – This is a Jacobs European award and particularly satisfying to the consultant and client team that Fastrack should have been selected from a diverse range of projects.

A228 Leybourne & West Malling Bypass

- Considerate Contractors - Bronze Award

M20J4

- Institution of Civil Engineers Thomas Brassey Awards 2007 – Runner up in Major Schemes Category.
- Considerate Contractors - Silver Award

Progress

5. A progress or status report on Fastrack Thames Way, Fastrack Everards Link Phase 2, Ashford Ring Road, Newtown Road Bridge, Ashford, Rushenden Relief Road, Eurokent Phases 4 & 5, Sittingbourne Northern Relief Road, East Kent Access Phase 1, East Kent Access Phase 2, A228 Leybourne & West Malling Bypass traffic management works, other schemes and Land matters is given in the Appendix to this Report. For brevity, only some of the background provided in previous reports is provided with the focus given to activity in the last half year

Progress Report on Major Capital Projects

6. In the last half year, there has been substantial progress and the key milestones achievements have been:
- Contract award and start of construction for Fastrack Thamesway – completion in November 2007.
 - Contract award and start of construction for Fastrack Everards Link Phase 2 – completion in July 2008.
 - The completion of the first stage of Ashford Ring Road and transformation to 2 way operation on 1 July.
 - The award of contract for public realm improvement of Bank Street, Ashford – completion in March 2008.
 - Tender invitation for the complex innovative public realm next stage of Ashford Ring Road – contract award in September 2007 and completion in July 2008.
 - Advance contract award for Newtown Road bridge Ashford – Contract award in August 2007 and completion July 2008.
 - Tender invitation for Eurokent Phases 4 & 5 – contract award likely in September 2007 and completion October 2008.
 - Tender invitation for Rushenden Relief Road – tenders returned in August 2007.
 - Regain of momentum on Sittingbourne Northern Relief Road.
 - East Kent Access Phase 1 completed – completion in September 2007.
 - Construction of the traffic management works associated with the A228 Leybourne & West Malling Bypass – completion in September 2007.
 - Withdrawal of statutory objections to East Kent Access Phase 2 Orders and a short uncontroversial public inquiry – Public Inquiry held in April 2007.
 - DfT has identified us as an exemplar for having good project management arrangements in place with regard to major schemes and offered us as contacts to other promoters to share good practice and experience.
7. The key problems in this period have been:
- The continued difficulty in progressing Government funded growth area infrastructure projects against the funding deadline of 31 March 2008 and the need to be innovative in trying to keep them on track.
 - The statutory objections to the Compulsory Purchase Order for Sittingbourne Northern Relief Road that have demanded a rethink on the junction layout at Ridham Avenue.

Conclusion

8. Some of the issues referred to are live and matters may have progressed since the time of writing this Report. Where appropriate a verbal report will be given to the Board Meeting.
-

Accountable Officer: John Farmer (01622) 696881

Scheme Contacts

Kent Thameside Fastrack Thames Way – John Turner
Kent Thameside Fastrack, Everards Link – John Turner
Ashford Ring Road – Jamie Watson
Newtown Road Bridge, Ashford – Jamie Watson
Eurokent, Thanet – John Farmer
Rushenden Relief Road – Richard Shelton
Sittingbourne Northern Relief Road – John Farmer
East Kent Access Phase 1 & 2 – Geoff Cripps

Kent Thameside Fastrack Thames Way

The scheme will provide dedicated bus-only lanes adjacent to existing carriageway with priority through the junctions between A226 Overcliffe and Springhead Road towards Ebbsfleet Station. The approved Community Infrastructure Fund (CIF) funding is £8.12m.

SEEDA is in receipt of funding in connection with the HST4i initiative aimed at improving access to the European high speed train network. The County Council is a partner with SEEDA and has been allocated €3,000,000 of European Regional Development Funding (ERDF) which will provide further funding support towards the Fastrack public transport access improvements.

As well as satisfying the CIF time constraints, the ERDF funding suggests that the scheme should be completed in time for a new bus service to run between Gravesend and Dartford via the Ebbsfleet International and Domestic Station from its opening day in November 2007.

A contract was awarded to Fitzpatrick Civil Engineering Ltd and construction commenced at the beginning of April. Good progress is being made and work is on programme to be sufficiently complete to run bus services in time for the full commencement of Eurostar services stopping at Ebbsfleet Station on 19 November. Road closures have been required to allow the work to proceed efficiently and safely and with minimal inconvenience to drivers and local residents.

Kent Thameside Everards Link Phase 2

Phase 2 will provide a link from the bus interchange at Greenhithe Station through to Ingress Park and Swanscombe Peninsula and will become part of the Fastrack riverside route. The scheme interfaces with S106 obligations by Crest Nicholson as developers of the Ingress Park site. The approved Community Infrastructure Fund (CIF) funding is £5.24m.

Everards Link Phase 2 will be a bus-only route with buses every 10 minutes, on a route between Dartford and Gravesend.

Getting the scheme to the construction stage has been a major challenge. Land had to be acquired by voluntary negotiation because the funding deadline did not permit compulsory purchase. A land and funding agreement was also required with Crest Nicholson to cover an extension to the underpass works at the interface between the two schemes.

Negotiations have clearly not been from a position of strength and particularly when time was not of the essence to the private sector. However, sufficient progress was made to allow a contract award to Birse Civils Ltd and work commenced in June. Crest Nicholson has experienced technical problems with the design of their works that has threatened the ability to progress our scheme but I am hopeful that this can be resolved.

Ashford Ring Road 2 Way Transformation

The transformation of the Ring Road to 2-way operation is a top priority for Ashford's Future. The scheme is all about improving the appearance of the town centre, allowing it to expand beyond the boundaries of the old Ring Road, and supporting future developments that will benefit the town as it grows. The objective is to stimulate growth for new business and make Ashford a more attractive place for residents, business and visitors alike. It will also strike a better balance between the needs of motorists, pedestrians and cyclists.

It is a difficult concept in the sense that some traffic capacity and discouragement to traffic movements through the town centre are required to achieve the wider regeneration benefits. Inevitably with a growth area that involves many public and private sector partners, different and time constrained funding streams and uncertain development scenarios it is not always possible to implement infrastructure changes at the ideal time. The issue is always a tension between that of leading and trying to influence or retrospective implementation.

The overall cost of the scheme is some £14m of which £8.3m is from Growth Area Funding (GAF) and the remainder coming from a variety of public and private sector sources.

Stage 1 of the Ring Road transformation has been completed with conventional highway improvements and changes implemented in the north and east sectors. Although any town centre highway works will be disruptive every effort was made to be responsive to traffic impacts by flexible traffic management and key activities were rescheduled to evening or weekends in order to limit the inconvenience. Ringway carried out the work and on 1 July the whole Ring Road was converted successfully to 2-way operation.

Public reaction has been mixed and this is not surprising when put into the context of the wider regeneration objectives and not as a narrowly based traffic improvement scheme. With the opening of the County Square shopping centre, the Stour Leisure centre, the new Learning Campus, the development of the sites south of Elwick Road and the launch of High Speed Domestic train services there will be an even greater need to improve pedestrian access in and around the town centre.

The focus is now on Bank Street and Stage 2 of the Ring Road involving the southern and western elements. A contract for the high quality public realm improvement of Bank Street has been awarded to Jackson Civil Engineering and work will commence in September. Every effort will be made to minimise inconvenience to shoppers and traders and the intention is to suspend work over the critical December trading period and resume again in January and seek to be substantially complete in time for the County Square opening in mid March.

The tenders for the Ring Road works involving the high quality public realm and shared space improvements to Elwick Road, West Street and Forge Lane; and the improvement of the Beaver Road/Victoria Road /Romney Marsh Road junction are being assessed. It is already known that the complete scheme is estimated to cost some £3m more than the funding currently available and consideration is currently being given to the options. This will involve either reducing the extent of the shared space public realm works to match the confirmed funding and bidding for funds to do the full scheme later; or doing the full scheme now on the premise of the additional funding coming from the next tranche of Growth Area Funding.

Newtown Road Bridge, Ashford

The scheme is to replace the bridge deck carrying the railway and build a new abutment to gain width and increased headroom for the future high quality Smartlink bus service and to provide a better and less oppressive route for pedestrians and cyclists. The scheme has £3.08m GAF funding and Network Rail is contributing about £600,000 that they would have incurred in a conventional deck replacement.

Considerable progress is being made with Network Rail who are leading on the bridge design and whose consultant's are expert on the innovative thin deck construction that is required to achieve the increased headroom.

There has been some increase in the estimated cost and slippage in the programme but this is a complex scheme and Government has recognised the progress that has been made and agreed to cover the additional cost and allow expenditure to roll forward into the first quarter of 2008/09.

Land has been secured and Agreements completed with Network Rail and with the funding arrangement above, Network Rail has been able to place the advance contract for the steel and fabrication of the deck.

Rushenden Relief Road

The County Council is progressing this scheme on behalf of and at the request of SEEDA.

SEEDA has had difficulty in securing all the compensatory land required to satisfy the environmental impacts of the road and its associated development. These issues have now been resolved to the satisfaction of the statutory and local environmental organisations and the planning application for the road will be considered by the County Council Planning Applications Committee meeting in September.

SEEDA are discussing the funding and spend profile with Government but they still need to secure some land and with the approaching autumn/winter it is probable that a start of construction will be deferred until early 2008.

Tenders for the road have been returned and these are currently being assessed. There is no immediate urgency to award a contract and negotiations will be required to reflect the changed programme for construction.

The County Council and SEEDA continue to work in partnership to deliver this important regeneration infrastructure scheme for Sheppey.

Eurokent Phases 4 & 5, Thanet

The County Council is working in partnership with Thanet District Council (TDC), SEEDA and Rosefarm to construct Phase 4 & 5 of the access road at Eurokent business park to facilitate early job creation.

Phase 5 was granted planning consent by TDC in July 2007. The detailed design has been completed. Although it is a conventional highway scheme a considerable amount of effort has been required to agree with Southern Water an acceptable and affordable solution to provide foul drainage to serve the new development.

The County Council has entered into a Collaborative Agreement with TDC. A four-way Agreement is being finalised with SEEDA, TDC and Rosefarm to cover detailed issues such as land transfers and funding contributions. SEEDA are making a £500,000 contribution as a developer of part of the site and Rosefarm are contributing the cost of Phase 4 which is a planning obligation on their development.

Construction tender for Phase 4 & 5 have been invited and subject to the Agreement and funding being satisfactorily concluded a contract award is likely in September with construction commencing in October. Advance archaeological works commenced in September.

Sittingbourne Northern Relief Road

This scheme was the subject of a detailed Report to the July meeting of the Board. The compromise layout at Ridham Avenue that aims to be a balance between the interests of the local community and the private sector objections to the statutory Orders was approved by the Cabinet Member following a period of consultation. A planning application for the revised layout was submitted on 20 August. Subject to satisfactory progress and receipt of planning consent the next stage would be publication of the statutory Orders in December and a probable public inquiry in summer 2008.

There were also many objections to the concept of a fixed bridge over Milton Creek. A Report by our consultants, Jacobs, explaining in detail why an opening ridge is not appropriate because of the higher capital and annual operation and maintenance revenue costs will soon be circulated to the objectors for their information although it is unlikely to change their position.

East Kent Access Phase 1

The scheme was completed in September 2007.

The overall scheme has had several phases that first commenced in autumn 2003 after the Open Golf Championships. The latter phase between Pfizer and the old Richborough power station has been particularly difficult where the scheme has required a replacement sluice,

major southern water utility diversions and a new bridge to carry the new south bound carriageway over Stonar Cut.

This scheme has been deceptive in its complexity. The successful completion is a credit to the partnership working between Jacobs and May Gurney and the tenacity that has been shown in resolving problems.

An opening ceremony was not appropriate as this was an on-line improvement. However, an event was held in July with the Sandwich Town Council and the local schools. The vice Chairman of the County Council was in attendance with Raven, the childrens television celebrity, when children from the schools were invited to bury time capsules at Stonar Cut. The party then went on to the primary school where a mosaic created by the children was unveiled celebrating the history of the school and then on to the Town Hall at the invitation of the Mayor.

This was a very successful day and reflects the very close working relationship that the site team established with the Town Council and local schools.

East Kent Access Phase 2

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

The statutory Orders were published in October 2006 and a Public Inquiry was held in April 2007. Statutory objections were successfully negotiated away and the Inquiry only lasted 2 days. The Inspector's Report is with the Secretary of State and we remain hopeful that the Orders will be confirmed before the end of 2007.

The next stage is a formal application to the Department for Transport (DfT) for Conditional Acceptance of funding. This is an onerous task and requires a detailed submission that updates the Programme entry bid and seeks to confirm the business case and scheme cost estimates. An important part of the submission will be the outcome of an independent Gateway Review carried out by 4ps which was the key recommendation from the very successful Inception Meeting held with DfT in November 2006. The Gateway Review is planned to be held over three days commencing on 9 October and part of the process will involve the reviewers interviewing key stakeholders. I am confident that we can respond successfully to this external challenge and it will give weight to the Conditional Acceptance submission.

Subject to the confirmation of Orders and Government giving Conditional Acceptance to the funding the next stage would be the invitation of construction tenders. Provided tender returns are consistent with the estimates and Conditional Acceptance then a final submission is made to DfT for Full Acceptance of funding. If successful this will allow full commitment to be given to the scheme and the construction contract awarded. The first year of activity will be archaeological investigation, environmental mitigation measures and developing the design and build elements. Main construction is expected to commence in spring 2009 and the road to be open in summer 2011.

A228 Leybourne & West Malling Bypass

The Bypass was opened on 19 October 2006.

The traffic calming works to Park Road, Birling Road and Castle Way will be completed in September. This will then allow the optimisation of the traffic signals between M20J4 and Kings Hill and the first opportunity since the Bypass opened to commence monitoring the local network operating in its final state.

After a year of frustration and lobbying, the Deed of Easement with Network Rail giving permanent access rights between the Bypass and West Malling Station is still not completed. However, I remain optimistic that this will be completed soon and this will then

allow the construction and implementation of the 300 space private car park to proceed although this will be a matter for the developer.

Other Schemes

Greenhithe Station

The upgrade of the Station was to be funded from the borrowing approvals given by Government in connection with the retention of tolls on the Dartford crossing.

Considerable progress was being made but Network Rail was informed that the County Council was unable to proceed because of the Government's abolition of the capital adjustment in the general grant floor and lack of additional revenue grant towards meeting the capital financing charges arising from Government supported borrowing approvals.

Greenhithe Station is a key transport node within Kent Thameside and much in need of improvement. Network Rail recognise this and have recently decided to proceed with the installation of a station building using their modular station upgrade concept with the objective of this being in place by the time Ebbsfleet Station opens in November. Network Rail hope to follow this with the platform and access improvements but this will be subject to them securing funding.

Fort Hill De-dualling, Margate

In connection with Turner Contemporary, the proposal is to remove the adjacent isolated section of dual carriageway to optimise land use, reduce the perception of severance and improve the connectivity between the town and the new development.

Detailed design is progressing in line with the commitment given to commence these works in April 2008 so that they are completed by the autumn 2008 when construction of Turner Contemporary is likely to start.

Land Matters

Property and Land Held for Highway Purposes

Property and land is held for future highway schemes. There are also areas of land that we happen to own or have been acquired in the past or required to be taken as part of other acquisitions. Not all this land is required for operational purposes and the need to retain this land is being robustly reassessed in support of the corporate initiative to realise capital receipts from tied up assets so that they can be used in support of Towards2010 objectives.

The opportunity to dispose of the Red Lion Public house that is held for the future dualling of the A228 Snodland Bypass is the subject of a separate Report to this meeting of the Board.

Following the decision earlier in the year to abandon major improvements to Upper Stone Street, Maidstone work continues with Corporate Property, Regeneration & Economy and Maidstone Borough Council to achieve some limited highway improvements as part of the wider consideration of the regeneration of the general Wrens Cross area.

Land Compensation Act Part 1 Claims (LCAPart1)

Current activity is mainly in respect of claims received for the Fastrack Phase 1 Major Scheme and the earlier Fastrack related scheme for Everards Link Phase 1. In October, claims can be expected for the A228 Leybourne & West Malling Bypass.

Claims continue to be handled in respect of S278 schemes where developers indemnify the County Council for any liability. There are situations where developers build a section of a wider highway proposal and they challenge the basis of assessment that is partly judged on future higher traffic flows. Counsel's advice is being taken so that a definitive view can be taken about the correct basis of assessment.

Land Acquisition

In previous Reports to this Board I have referred to the major claim by London & Continental Railways/Union Railways against the County Council in connection with South Thames-side

Development Route Stage 4. The claimant elected to make reference to the Lands Tribunal whereas previously they had pursued it as an insurance claim and the effect is that it reverts to the County Council to defend the claim rather than our insurers and this has significant resource implications.

A Directions Hearing was held in January 2007 for the Lands Tribunal to give Directions for the conduct of the Hearing itself. A further procedural hearing in August has led to a further Pre- Hearing Review on 19 September at which it is expected that the Tribunal will give further Directions and set a new date for the Hearing.

The Hearing will consider Preliminary Issues and this relates to whether the claimants had an interest in the land and if so the nature of that interest and if that interest was a compensatable interest and the extent of that compensatable interest. The County Council is robustly defending this claim.

Other

Previous Reports have also referred to a claim made by a Developer that an obligation on the County Council to commence a junction improvement by 31 December 1994 was not fulfilled and that a contribution of £150,000 that with interest would now amount to approaching £500,000 should be returned. The claim is being robustly defended and is being heard in the High Court at a hearing on 1 & 2 October.

This page is intentionally left blank

A228 Snodland Bypass Dualling

Red Lion Public House

A report by the Capital Programme Manager to the Highways Advisory Board meeting on 18 September 2007.

Introduction

1. An outline design for the future dualling of A228 Snodland Bypass was approved in 1992. The scheme is generally contained within the highway boundary except that it would require the demolition of the Red Lion Public House that was acquired by the County Council under blight many years ago. The scheme is not programmed and the property is a deteriorating asset and not capable of beneficial use. See Fig.1. This Report proposes an amended outline design for the bypass dualling that will allow the property to be declared surplus.

Discussion

Dualling Proposals

2. The A228 is a key strategic route within the County and has been incrementally improved over the years. A single carriageway bypass of Snodland was constructed in 1983. The A228 is of such significance that it was considered prudent in 1992 to approve a dualling scheme for Snodland so that a proposal existed in the event of development coming forward that would require its funding and construction to be a S106 planning obligation. In 1992, traffic flows were quoted as 23,000 vehicles per day (vpd) and a future dualling need was predicated on the basis that future flows would grow to between 31,000 and 37,000 by 2006. In the event, flows in 2006 are about 20,000 and this is no doubt in part due to the nature of the A228 generally between the M20 and M2 and the physical and operational constraints. Counts undertaken from Peters village proposals have confirmed this figure and forecasts for 2022 are 28,600 without Peters village and 31,800 with Peters village. Operational capacity assessments concluded that dualling was not necessary under these conditions and that the existing single carriageway road is sufficient to safely and efficiently accommodate the predicted future year flows. The County Council does not have proposals to secure Government funding through the Local Transport Plan to dual the bypass and the scheme would not achieve a high priority on the criteria used for regional prioritisation. The intent has always been that the scheme would only proceed in the event of full developer funding being secured.
3. Dualling the bypass would be an expensive scheme and could only be justified or imposed on a very substantial development. Over the years, the requirement or opportunity to secure such funding to dual the bypass has not arisen and on present knowledge it is unlikely this will happen in the foreseeable future. However, the A228 remains a key route and it is considered appropriate to retain proposals for the dualling of the bypass.

Red Lion Public House

4. The public house is located at the end of the High Street. Maintaining a reliable tenancy has always been difficult and maintenance liability has been an increasing concern. In early 2004 increasing concern about criminal and anti-social activity led to the tenants being evicted and the property boarded up. This has inevitably led to a visual blight on the lower end of the high street with the increasing derelict appearance of the property and deterioration in the structure and fabric of the building.

A228 Snodland Bypass Dualling Red Lion Public House

5. In commercial terms, the County Council is holding a significant capital asset that is deteriorating, with an annual security and maintenance liability and no rental income. At the same time, the County Council is seeking to maximise its use of its estate to support the Property Enterprise Fund so that capital receipts can be released to support more immediate and deliverable projects to the benefit of Kent residents and its business community.

Amended Scheme

6. Our consultant, Jacobs, has been commissioned to see whether an amended scheme for a future dualling of the bypass that does not affect the public house can be achieved. By locally amending the alignment, constraining the overall cross section and with a retaining wall along the flank of the public house such a scheme is possible. In the event of the bypass dualling proceeding, the amended alignment would require a 50mph speed limit. While the Police often have reservations about such limits it is probable that such a limit would be considered in any event. The corridor through Snodland is semi-urban in nature, only about 2.5km between roundabouts and with intermediate junctions at Rocfort Road and Brook Street.
7. As there is no immediate likelihood of the scheme being progressed the general principles of the 1992 approved scheme have been retained and the focus of investigation has been limited to avoiding the public house. In the event of the scheme being progressed, it could be envisaged that the junction layout at Rocfort Road and Brook Street would be reconsidered to possibly provide some positive control to deal with the issue of HGV turning movements and the desire for pedestrians to cross at grade.

Financial Implications

8. The financial implications for the County Council are the ability to realise a significant capital receipt and to be released from an ongoing maintenance and security liability. The construction cost component of dualling the bypass has not been estimated but a broad view has been taken about the cost difference between the existing scheme and the proposed scheme. The view is that it is probably cost neutral or that any increased cost is marginal when considered in the context of the overall cost. While costs will ultimately fall to a developer it would clearly have been inappropriate to replace an existing scheme with one that had a high cost premium just to achieve the release of a capital receipt.

Consultation

9. Formal public consultation has not been carried out or considered appropriate because the alignment amendments are fairly subtle and the overall scheme remains generally within the highway boundary. No private property is affected and extensive consultation would unnecessarily raise expectations or concerns for a scheme that is not programmed and may never happen.
10. Snodland Town Council has been consulted at a meeting of their Planning & Environment Committee on 13 August. The principle of the disposal of the Red Lion was accepted on the basis that a dualling scheme could still be achieved.

A228 Snodland Bypass Dualling Red Lion Public House

11. A report is being taken to the Tonbridge & Malling Joint Transportation Board meeting on 10 September and their views will be reported at the Board meeting.
12. The local County Member has been consulted on the report and any views will be reported at the Board meeting.

Recommendation

13. Subject to the view of this Board it is proposed to recommend to the Cabinet Member for Environment, Highways & Waste that:
 - i. The scheme for the dualling of A228 Snodland Bypass shown on Drawing No. 102408/3A is abandoned.
 - ii. The revised scheme for A228 Snodland Bypass shown on Drawing No. B0659000/3 is approved for development control and land charge purposes.
 - iii. The Red Lion public house is declared surplus to highway requirements.
-

Accountable Officer: John Farmer (01622) 696881

Background Documents:

None

On Display:

Drawing No. 102408/3A (existing 1992 proposal)
Drawing No. B0659000/3 (revised proposal)

This page is intentionally left blank

KHS Winter Service Review

A report by the Director of Kent Highway Services, to the Highways Advisory Board, on 18 September 2007.

Introduction

1. On 19 September 2006 the Highways Advisory Board supported the Winter Service Policy Statement and Plan for 2006/07 and these were used as the basis for all winter service operations. This report gives information relating to the winter of 2006/07 and seeks approval of the Winter Service Policy and Plan for 2007/08.

The Winter of 2006/07

2. The winter service policy requires precautionary salting on 'A' and 'B' and other busy roads (as defined in the policy statement paragraph 2.1.2) where frost/ice is likely to form on road surfaces. An analysis of winter weather and the action taken by KHS for 2006/07 is contained in Annex A. A table of forecast accuracy and other performance indicators are given in Annex B. A statistical comparison of winter activities for the 2006/07 winter with the preceding four years is given in Annex C.
3. On all occasions, during the winter of 2006/07, when frost was forecast and frost occurred, precautionary salting had taken place in advance of freezing temperatures. There were instances during the winter service period where a frost was not predicted in the main forecasts issued at 14:00hrs, but subsequent updates warned that frost was likely. This activated precautionary salting instructions where necessary.
4. Overall the winter was exceptionally mild but also with some very brief snow interludes. See Appendix A for full details.

Finance

5. The KHS winter service budget for 2006/07 was £2,425,000 and the out turn was £2,263,000. Some funding provision was allocated for gully and drain clearance due to higher than average rain fall. The snow emergency cost an additional £29,000 and this has been funded from the corporate emergency fund. The budget for 2007/08 has been set at £2,225,000.

Contract Arrangements

6. The winter service contractor for the winter of 2006/07 was Ringway Infrastructure Services for the whole county. Ringway Infrastructure Services will be the service provider for the coming winter within the alliance partnership agreement formed by Kent Highway Services.

Forecast Service

7. The Meteorological Office supplied forecast services for the winter of 2006/07 under a five-year agreement, which lasts until 2008. The Highways Advisory Board agreed this arrangement in 2003.

Ice Prediction Service

8. The ice prediction service was provided by Vaisala Ltd and performed well over the season. It is proposed to continue the relationship with Vaisala Ltd. for the coming winter.

Winter Service Policy and Plan 2007/08

9. The Winter Service Policy 2007/08 is given in Appendix D (Any alterations are shown in *Italics*). There are no significant changes to the policy for the forthcoming winter. Copies of the Winter Service Plan for 2007/08 have been placed in the Members Room.

Pre-Wetted Salt

10. It was reported to Members last year that pre-wetted salt was to be introduced during the winter of 2007/08. This is on schedule to occur at our operational depot at Haysden but is now unlikely to happen at the other depots until the winter of 2008/09. This is due to delays with the refurbishment and new depot build programme.

Salting Route Optimisation

11. A review of the primary salting routes was carried out in the summer of 2006. It was felt that savings and efficiencies could be made by reviewing the number and size of salting vehicles used against the network to be salted. The review was carried out by KHS staff and is an interim measure pending winter service operations moving to the new depot locations next year. As a result of the exercise the number of routes was reduced from 63 to 55 without any reduction in the network salted. The average length of route has increased from 35k to 45k but all routes are still able to be completed within the times laid down in policy.

Conclusions:

12. Subject to the views of this Board it is proposed that the Cabinet Member for Environment, Highways and Waste be asked to:
 - (i) approve the Winter Service Policy and Plan for 2007/08
 - (ii) agree the continuation of the arrangement with Vaisala Ltd. for the provision of ice prediction computer services.

Accountable Officer - Peter Lott (01622 221088)

Previous Committee reference: Winter Maintenance Report to the Highways Advisory Board, 19 September 2006.

KHS Winter Service Review

The Winter of 2006/07

1. According to Met Office statistics the autumn of 2006 was the warmest on record for the UK, as a whole, and this was followed by the warmest winter on record for the southeast of England. The 2006/07 winter in Kent was extraordinary for the small number of frosts that occurred although there were some brief snow events. The number of precautionary salting runs required were about half of the long term average and the least number experienced for many years.
2. October (16th day onwards)
The weather was generally unsettled with rain fall above average. Some heavy rain fell towards the end of the month (18mm at Edenbridge on the 22nd and 19.5mm at Manston on the 26th). The month was very mild generally. Road surface temperatures remained above freezing during the period and precautionary salting was not required.
3. November
After a colder start, with some air frosts, November was another very mild month. Some heavy rain affected the county during the middle of the month but it became drier towards the end. Road surface temperatures remained above freezing during the period and precautionary salting was not required.
4. December
The first half of the month was dominated by low pressure systems, and the second half by high pressure which gave rise to frosts and persistent fog in the few days up to Christmas. The month ended with strong winds with a gust of 87 mph recorded at Langdon Bay on the 30th. It was a mild, wet and dull month with just 37.5 hours of sunshine recorded at East Malling. Precautionary salting took place on 7 nights during December; one of these was a partial run.
5. January
January was a very mild month and the warmest over England and Wales since 1916. There was a colder spell in the fourth week but even then temperatures were only just below average. It became windy with the 18th being the windiest day since 1990 causing fallen trees and some disruption to road and rail travel. There were some wintry showers on 24th and 25th with small temporary accumulations.
Precautionary salting took place on 6 nights during January. Salting was required twice in the same night on three occasions due to predicted and actual snow fall.
6. February
February was exceptionally wet and also dull. Overall it was mild but it was cold in the second week with some frost and snow and then milder thereafter. A minimum road temperature of -5.5 degrees C. was recorded at Stilebridge on the night of 6/7th February. On the morning of the 8th February snow fell across Kent with a typical depth of 2cm. The rest of the month was unsettled under the influence of Atlantic weather systems. Precautionary salting took place on 7

KHS Winter Service Review

nights during February. Salting was required twice in the same night on 1 occasion due to predicted and actual snow fall.

7. March

March was mild again but also very sunny with over 140% of normal sunshine. Rainfall was close to the average and there was a brief snow shower on 20th in Maidstone. There was a colder snap with temperatures below average in the third week with some sleet and snow showers. Towards the end of the month it became exceptionally mild with 16.8 degrees C. recorded at East Malling on 28th (over 6 degrees above normal). Precautionary salting was required on 5 nights with two of these being partial runs. Salting was required twice in the same night on two occasions due to predicted and actual snow fall.

8. April (until 22nd day)

It was an exceptionally dry month with no measurable rain until the 23rd and then only small amounts. April was also exceptionally warm and it turned out to be the warmest on record and the driest of 70 years. Prolonged sunshine boosted air and road temperature values. The maximum temperature peaked at 24.3 degrees on the 15th at East Malling. Road surface temperatures remained above freezing during the period and precautionary salting was not required.

9. Precautionary salting took place on a total of 25 nights during the operational winter maintenance period. On 6 of these nights, double precautionary salting runs were necessary. This gave rise to a total number of 31 occasions when the primary routes were treated. Of these there were 28 occasions when precautionary salting of primary routes took place countywide with selective treatment taking place on the remaining 3 occasions. Selective treatment was possible as a result of central decision making based on detailed weather information provided by the Meteorological Office and the County's road weather stations. The cumulative total of whole salting runs equates to 28.8 which is much less than the budgeted figure of 55.

10. Precautionary salting of secondary routes, required because particularly cold weather conditions or snow was forecast, took place on 9 occasions. This figure is higher than normal and reflects the incidence of predicted and actual snow falls.

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

12. The table shows that forecast accuracy for the 2006/07 winter service period equals the previous highest value.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

1. Table of Forecast Accuracy

	00/01	01/02	02/03	03/04	04/05	05/06	06/07
Correct Forecasts							
(i) No frost predicted No frost occurred	107.5	109.6	112.0	112.0	106.0	98.0	133.0
(ii) Frost predicted Frost occurred	27.8	27.6	31.6	31.0	28.0	37.0	11.0
Incorrect Forecasts							
(i) No frost predicted Frost occurred	6.2	3.9	2.5	1.0	5.0	3.0	2.0
(ii) Frost predicted No frost occurred	9.5	9.9	4.9	8.0	13.0	14.0	6.0
% Correct forecasts	90%	91%	95%	94%	88%	89%	95%

Note:

No account is taken in the above table of updated forecasts issued up until midnight. However, when these are taken into account the forecast accuracy remains at **95%**.

2. Coverage Factor

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

3. Precautionary Salting Route Length

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

KHS Winter Service Review

WINTER SERVICE STATISTICS

	2001/02	2002/03	2003/04	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07
<u>Precautionary Salting Routes</u>						
Number of primary precautionary salting routes	61	61	62#	63^	63^	55**
<u>Precautionary Salting</u>						
Number of nights primary precautionary salting routes treated	40	39	45	56	65	25
Number of occasions primary precautionary salting routes treated	46	51	59	74	74	31
First full precautionary salting run	09.11.00	08.12.02	27.11.03	13.11.04	17.11.05	08.12.06
Last full precautionary salting run	01.03.01	16.03.03	11.03.04	12.03.05	15.03.06	21.03.07
Expenditure, excluding money spent on snow clearance or persistent ice.	£1,760K	£1,881K	£2,245K*	£2,145K	£2,497K	£2,263K
<u>Snow Clearance</u>						
Number of days of lying snow	0	7	7	14	5	2
Number of days of snow emergency	0	3	0	11	4	1?
Expenditure due to snow emergency	0	£401K	0	£1,200K	£192K	£29K
Expenditure due to persistent ice	0	0	0	0	0	0
<u>Snow Fencing Lengths</u>						
County Roads	0m	0m	0m	0m	0m	0m
<u>Salt Bins Numbers</u>						
County roads	1,102	1,102	1,102	1,102	1,102	1,102
<u>Snow Clearing Equipment</u>						
Number of farmers' snow ploughs	250	250	250	250	250	250
Number of snow blowers	7	7	7	7	12	12
Number of snow throwers	4	4	4	4	4	4

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

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

^ Additional route in Shepway to cover de-trunked A259

** Number of routes reduced due to route optimisation

KENT HIGHWAY SERVICES

WINTER SERVICE

POLICY STATEMENT

FOR 2007/08



Contents

<u>No</u>		<u>Page</u>
1.	<u>Introduction</u>	3
1.1	Winter Service - Statutory Duties	3
1.2	Winter Service Standards	3
1.3	County Highways	4
1.4	Motorways and Trunk Roads	4
2.	<u>Winter Service Objectives</u>	4
2.1	Salting	4
2.2	Snow Clearance	4
2.3	Snow Fencing	5
2.4	Roadside Salt Bins	5
3.	<u>Winter Service General</u>	5
3.1	Winter Service Contracts	5
3.2	Winter Service Season	5
3.3	Alternatives to Salt	5
4.	<u>Weather Information</u>	5
4.1	Weather Information Systems	5
4.2	Weather Reports	6
4.3	Principal Winter Service Duty Officers	6
5.	<u>Salting</u>	6
5.1	Planning of Precautionary Salting Routes	6
5.2	Precautionary Salting	6
5.3	Post Salting	6
5.4	Spot Salting	7
5.5	Instructions for Salting of Primary Routes	7
5.6	Instructions for Salting of Secondary Routes	7
6.	<u>Snow Clearance</u>	7
6.1	Instructions for Snow Clearance	7
6.2	Snow Clearance Priorities on Carriageways	7
6.3	Snow Clearance Priorities on Footways	8
6.4	Agricultural Snow Ploughs for Snow Clearance	8
6.5	Snow Throwers/Blowers for Snow Clearance	8

Contents (continued)

<u>No</u>		<u>Page</u>
7.	<u>Severe Weather Conditions</u>	8
7.1	Persistent Ice on Minor Roads	8
7.2	Ice Emergencies	8
7.3	Snow Emergencies	9
8.	<u>Roadside Salt Bins</u>	9
8.1	Provision of Roadside Salt Bins	9
9.	<u>Snow Fencing</u>	9
9.1	Erection of Snow Fencing	9
10.	<u>Budgets</u>	9
10.1	Winter Service Budget	9
10.2	Ice and Snow Emergencies	9
11.	<u>Public and Media Communications</u>	9
11.1	Neighbouring Authorities and Other Agencies	9
11.2	The Media	9
11.3	Pre-Season Publicity	10
11.4	Publicity during Ice and Snow Emergencies	10

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Winter Service - Statutory Duty

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

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

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

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

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

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

1.2 Winter Service Standards

1.2.1. In order to respond as quickly and efficiently as possible to its responsibilities KHS has adopted policies and standards for each of the winter service activities and these are detailed within this document. In July 2005 the Roads Liaison Group, published 'Well Maintained Highways'. Section 13 deals with 'Winter Service' which updates the same section in the 'Code of Practice for Maintenance Management' published in 2001. Our current approach has been reviewed and found to be consistent with the guidance as recommended in the new document. The operational details for the winter service activities in Kent are detailed in the Winter Service Plan 2007/08 that complements this Policy Statement.

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

- Minimise the loss of life and injury to highway users, including pedestrians, and preventing damage to vehicles and other property
- Keep the highway free from obstruction and thereby avoiding unnecessary hindrance to passage

1.3 **County Council Maintained Highways**

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

1.4 **Motorways and Trunk Roads**

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

2. **WINTER SERVICE OBJECTIVES**

2.1 **Salting**

2.1.1 Objectives:

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

2.1.2 Roads to be Included within Primary Precautionary Salting Routes

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

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

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

2.2 **Snow Clearance**

2.2.1 Objectives:

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

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

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

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

2.3 **Snow Fencing**

2.3.1 Objective:

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

2.4 **Roadside Salt Bins**

2.4.1 Objective:

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

3. WINTER SERVICE GENERAL

3.1 Winter Service Contracts

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

3.2 Winter Service Season

3.2.1 In Kent the weather can be unpredictable and the occurrence and severity of winter conditions varies considerably through the season, and from year to year. Severe winter weather is most likely to be experienced in December, January and February but ice and snow can occur earlier or later. To take account of all possible winter weather the County Council's Operational Winter Service Period runs from mid October to mid April. Exact dates for the coming winter are given in the Winter Service Plan.

3.3 Alternatives to Salt

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

4. WEATHER INFORMATION

4.1 Weather Information Systems

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

4.2 Weather Reports

4.2.1 During the operational winter service period Kent Highway Services will procure detailed daily weather reports specifically dedicated to providing forecast information for roads in Kent.

4.3 Principal Winter Service Duty Officers

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

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

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

5. SALTING

5.1 Planning of Precautionary Salting Routes

5.1.1 Primary precautionary salting routes will be developed from those lengths of highway that qualify for treatment, whenever ice, frost or snowfalls are expected. Each primary precautionary salting route will have a vehicle assigned which is capable of having a snowplough fixed to it, when required. Secondary precautionary salting routes will also be developed from other important highways for treatment during severe winter weather conditions.

5.2 Precautionary Salting

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

5.3 Post Salting

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

5.4 Spot Salting

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

5.5 Instructions for Salting of Primary Routes

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

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

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

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

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

5.6 Instructions for Salting of Secondary Routes

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

6. SNOW CLEARANCE

6.1 Instructions for Snow Clearance

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

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

6.2 Snow Clearance Priorities on Carriageways

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

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

6.3 Snow Clearance Priorities on Footways

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

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

6.4 Agricultural Snowploughs for Snow Clearance

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

6.5 Snow Throwers/Blowers for Snow Clearance

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

7. SEVERE WEATHER CONDITIONS

7.1 Persistent Ice on Minor Roads

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

7.2 Ice Emergencies

7.2.1 During prolonged periods of severe and persistent icing delegated officers may declare an ice emergency covering all or part of the County.

7.3 Snow Emergencies

7.3.1 In the event of significant snowfalls delegated officers may declare a snow emergency covering all or part of the public highway network. In this event Divisional Managers will implement a course of action to manage the situation.

8. ROADSIDE SALT BINS

8.1 Provision of Roadside Salt Bins

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

9. SNOW FENCING

9.1 Erection of Snow Fencing

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

10. BUDGETS

10.1 Winter Service Budget

10.1.1 The budget for the annual operational winter service period is based on salting the primary precautionary salting routes on 55 occasions. The main budget is managed by Network Operations centrally but Divisional Managers will hold funds for local salting action and other winter service activities instructed by them.

10.2 Ice and Snow Emergencies

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

11. PUBLIC AND MEDIA COMMUNICATIONS

11.1 Neighbouring Authorities and other Agencies

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

11.2 The Media

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

11.3 Pre-Season Publicity

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

11.4. Publicity during Ice or Snow Emergencies

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

The Traffic Management Act – Awnings and Light Canopies Overhanging the Highway

A report by the Director, Kent Highway Services, to the Highways Advisory Board on 18th September 2007

Introduction

1. The Traffic Management Act, which received Royal Assent in July 2004, requires Highway Authorities to enable the expeditious movement of all traffic on the road network. In November 2004, the Government issued the Network Management Duty Guidance, which describes how an Authority should meet the requirements of the Traffic Management Act 2004. As part of the Network Management Duty the local Highway Authority is tasked with ensuring that any street furniture or structure either on or overhanging the highway does not create congestion or a disturbance to the public highway and that the needs of all traffic including pedestrians, paying particular attention to the visually and mobility impaired, is taken into account.

Background

2. In the County of Kent, this obligation rests with the Kent County Council (KCC), as Highway Authority, and the owners of any features or structures on or overhanging the highway. Under the Highways Act 1980, KCC have powers to grant licences to others to legitimise the placing of structures that overhang the highway. These powers can make provision for any term or condition which the Highway Authority declare to be necessary for the purpose of securing the safety of persons using the highway or of preventing interference with traffic thereon.
3. Following the introduction of the Government Health Bill to ban smoking in public places which came into force in July 2007, there has been a marked increase in the number of applications from businesses in Kent to erect awnings or light canopies on their premises.

Suggested Measures

4. In order to meet the requirements of the Traffic Management Act 2004 and the associated Network Management Duties it is necessary to put a Policy (Appendix 1) into place to ensure both the effective management of awnings and light canopies which overhang the public highway and ensure a consistent approach across the County. This Policy will regulate features such as permissible height, structural design, erection and maintenance of the structures.

Policy Summary

5. The Policy will set out the processes to be considered when applying for a licence to place an awning or light canopy over the public highway. It will also outline the criteria that must be considered by an applicant, the good practice that should be followed and the conditions to be adhered to by the applicant. The Policy will illustrate all pre-application considerations and lay down the necessary procedures to be followed when applying for a licence for an awning or light canopy.

The Traffic Management Act – Awnings and Light Canopies Overhanging the Highway

Conclusion

6. Subject to the views of this Board it is proposed to recommend to the Cabinet Member for Environment, Highways and Waste that approval is given to the publication of the Policy for the Location and Licensing of Awnings and Light Canopies over the Public Highway.

Contact Officers: Lorna Day 01622 696873

Background Documents:

Appendix 1 – A Policy for the Location and Licensing of Awnings and Light Canopies over the Public Highway

The Traffic Management Act 2004

The Network Management Duty Guidance

The Highways Act 1980



A POLICY FOR

THE LOCATION AND LICENSING OF
AWNINGS AND LIGHT CANOPIES
OVER THE PUBLIC HIGHWAY

LD/JUNE/07

INTRODUCTION

- 1.01 **The Policy** - This policy sets out the processes to be considered when applying for consents to place any awning or light canopy that may protrude or project (overhang) the public highway from an adjoining building. It is intended to act as a guide to applicants to explain why there is a need to control and manage these structures placed over the highway, the issues to be considered and the conditions that will be applied upon successful application.

Other more significant structures that protrude, project or overhang the public highway are generally administered and licensed by KHS Structures Management using the Technical Approval Procedure for Highway Structures.

BACKGROUND

- 1.02 **Common law** – Common law has established that a highway is a route which all persons can use to pass and repass along as often and whenever they wish without hindrance and without charge. This definition therefore includes the road or carriageway and the footway or pavement. In order to preserve these rights of way it is necessary to ensure that they are not obstructed either wilfully or without due consideration. Consequently there is an obligation to regulate features placed over the highway to minimise risk and to make sure that there are no severe hazards particularly for the visually impaired, for those with mobility problems, the elderly and those with young children.
- 1.03 **Responsibilities** - In the County of Kent, this obligation rests with the Kent County Council (KCC), as Highway Authority, and the owners of any features or structures placed over the highway. The KCC is responsible for the fabric of the highway and therefore must ensure that, for example, access is maintained, that furniture does not obstruct sight lines or road traffic signs and that the area is maintained for the safe passage of pedestrians and vehicular traffic. These features are assessed and safeguarded using Highways Act powers.
- 1.04 **Powers** – Kent County Council (KCC), as Highway Authority, have powers under the Highways Act 1980 to grant consents, (licences) to place structures, both temporary and permanent overhanging the public highway. The powers also exist to remove any unauthorised structure under the same Act.
- 1.05 **Permissions** - An applicant seeking approval to erect a structure over the public highway will need to be aware that there are other administrative elements to consider :-
- 1) Local authority (district/borough authority) planning permission will usually be required for the structure and possibly for the use of land prior to application of this licence. Applicants are advised to contact the Planning Department within their local District/Borough Council.

- 2) Local authority (district/borough authority) advertisement consent may be required if an element of advertising is proposed in any decoration or design.
 - 3) Local authority (district/borough authority) listed building consent may be required for structures proposed to adjoin listed buildings.
 - 4) A KCC Highways Act licence is needed because the highway is maintained by the Highway Authority and the safe passage of pedestrians and vehicular traffic must be regulated.
- 1.06 **When a structure can be erected** - An applicant is **not** in a position to erect any structure over the highway until all the required approvals, associated with 1) – 4) above, have been granted as necessary. In addition, not until evidence of public liability insurance has been provided and checked and the licences are on public display within the body of the business as specified.
- 1.07 **Enforcement** - Under the Highways Act 1980, KCC has permissive powers to enforce any structure that overhangs the public highway. This role is to be carried out by a nominated Kent Highway Services (KHS) representative who has cause to visit the premises as part of their routine duties or following a report from a member of the public via the contact centre, by post or in person.

If justified complaints are received and following investigation it is found that full compliance of all conditions is not achieved or if conditions alter, a licence may be withdrawn at no cost to the authority at any time during the period of consent.

Unless there is an immediate and urgent problem the site will be visited by a KHS representative and followed by a written warning notice for which there will be an administration charge. This action will be replicated on one further occasion before despatch of communication to indicate that further action will be taken. It is possible that the licence will then be withdrawn or further enforcement action taken. It may be necessary to remove projections from over the public highway. These structures may be demolished and all materials resulting from the demolition may be disposed of for which all reasonable costs will be recharged to the licence holder.

GOOD PRACTICE GUIDANCE

CRITERIA TO BE CONSIDERED BY THE APPLICANT

- 2.01 **Issues to consider** - Prior to presenting any application consideration must be given to the following which will be taken into account as part of any formal assessment.
- 2.02 **Space** – Is there enough room for the use as proposed? A minimum vertical clearance of 2.6m is required from the surface of the footway to the lowest point of the underside of any projection and there must be a minimum clearance of 0.6m from the edge of the furthest point of the projection to the edge of the carriageway (the kerb).
- 2.03 **Neighbours** – Will the proposal affect neighbouring businesses and residents? It would be very useful to consult with neighbours, tenants and adjacent residents and to submit evidence to show that they have been consulted and present any letters of support. By giving those adjacent to the site or those who may materially be affected the opportunity to comment, it may be possible to address any concerns prior to a formal submission. This will also assist the planning process. As part of the administration of the Highway Licence, the Kent County Council (KCC) may consult with any neighbours who may be materially affected.
- 2.04 **Public liability insurance** – Insurance cover is required The persons to whom permissions are granted must always have valid public liability insurance for at least £10,000,000 which also indemnifies the KCC its agents, servants and workmen against any costs, claims, expenses, actions or damages arising. Evidence of such public liability insurance shall be provided to the satisfaction of the KCC respectively before permissions can be exercised.
- 2.05 **Fees and charges** – Are fees and charges due? Fees will be payable within the provisions of the fees scale determined by the KCC relevant to the period for which the application/consents relate/s.
- 2.06 **Design** – While not a highway issue, consultation with the Planning Authority on design is advisable prior to submission of an application, to avoid potentially abortive discussion on highway matters.

Conditions

- 4.01 The applicant shall display a complete copy of all the conditional consent/s in a conspicuous position at or near to the place to which the consent/s is/are applicable throughout the period of consent/s.
- 4.02 Nothing in this consent shall absolve the applicant from prosecution should the application area be used in any other way than consented to or if any use expands beyond the application area.
- 4.03 Access for Emergency Services will be not be obstructed at any time.
- 4.04 With the exception of planning permissions, advertisement consents and listed building consents, the consent/s may be withdrawn, at no cost to the authority involved at any time during the period of consent if complaints are received, conditions alter or if full compliance of all conditions is not achieved. Unless there is an immediate urgent problem, the applicant will be served with up to two written notices/warnings to comply. A failure to still comply will result in a third communication indicating that action will be taken. Applicants should note that consents last for one year and therefore require renewal.

PROCEDURES for APPLICATION FOR A LICENCE

- 5.01 For a licence on the highway, first contact Kent Highway Services, at the address given to establish if the principle would be acceptable
- 5.02 If an indication is given that the submission is satisfactory the applicant should then make contact with the relevant Planning Officers within the local district/borough authority to make arrangements to submit a planning or other related applications as necessary to cover all the relevant aspects of the proposal as outlined in this policy.
- 5.03 The applicant should contact the KCC Kent Highway Services appropriate Divisional Office for an application form (Appendix 1) which should be completed and returned along with all the relevant necessary documentation. To ensure that your application is processed quickly, you should have considered all the points listed in the 'application checklist' and supply all the relevant supporting data.
- 5.04 It may take up to three months to process all aspects of the application which takes into consideration all representations made by interested frontagers who would be materially affected by the proposal. Consultation may include the local Superintendent of Police and Local Authority Planning Departments .
- 5.05 It must be emphasised that any proposed structure **cannot** be erected until the applicant has all the required licences and paid the associated fees and charges.

6.01 PRE-APPLICATION CONSIDERATION

Prior to making an application for a licence to place an awning or light canopy over the public highway it will be necessary for the applicant to give consideration to the following criteria.

- Is it likely that the KCC will agree to a request in principle
- Are there any doubts about land ownership
- Are there any doubts about rights of way
- Are there any existing related planning consents
- Is the local environment suitable
- Are other frontagers likely to object
- Is the site a 'communal area'
- Will accessibility be preserved on the footway and within the site
- Is there sufficient space to accommodate a projection over the public highway
- Will the furniture be fit for its intended purpose
- Will direct or third party advertising be part of the proposal
- Can cleanliness standards be achieved and maintained

6.02 The application should be accompanied by the following;

- A location plan 1:1250 which clearly defines the premises
- A plan 1:50 or larger to show:

The premises, the adjacent properties and the highway boundary. The kerb line should be shown by a red line.
- A Detailed plan showing sections or elevations of the proposed projecting features.
- Copies of any necessary local authority (district/borough) permissions such as planning, licensing etc. or written confirmation that these permissions will not be required.

- A copy of the applicants £10 million Public Liability Insurance which must be valid until the expiration of the licence period. This insurance must also indemnify Kent County Council against any action or liability arising as a consequence of the existence or use of the awning or light canopy.
- A photograph or brochure detailing the specification of the proposed projection eg. Design, fabric, and manufacture.
- Details of method of attachment and a method statement for erecting and maintaining the structure.
- For all renewal applications it will be necessary to provide independent structural check certificates detailing both mountings and wind resistance.

REFERENCES

Highways Act 1980, Section 177

The Disability Discrimination Act 1995

Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)

Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) Regulations 1992
(as amended)

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1982



KENT COUNTY COUNCIL

KENT HIGHWAY SERVICES

HIGHWAYS ACT 1980 SECTION 177

PROJECTIONS LOCATED OVER THE PUBLIC HIGHWAY

PERMIT NUMBER:.....

PERMISSION HAS BEEN GRANTED UNDER THE ABOVE LEGISLATION FOR THE PLACING OF A PROJECTION OVER THE PUBLIC HIGHWAY ABUTTING THE PREMISES TRADING AS:

.....

ADDRESS.....

.....

.....

THIS PERMISSION IS GRANTED FOR A PERIOD OF TWELVE MONTHS

COMMENCING:

.....

AND EXPIRING:

.....

ANY CONCERNS OR QUERIES RELATING TO THESE ACTIVITIES AUTHORISED BY THIS PERMIT SHOULD BE MADE IN WRITING TO:

INSERT ADDRESS OF APPROPRIATE DIVISIONAL OFFICE

APPENDIX 1

East Kent Division
Beer Cart Lane
Canterbury CT1 2NN
Fax 01227 785144

Mid Kent Division
Doubleday House
St. Michaels Close
Aylesford ME20 7BU
Fax 01622 798333

West Kent Division
Joynes House
New Road
Gravesend DA11 0AT
Fax 01474 544029

Direct Dial: 08458 247 800

Dear Sir/Madam

Licence to Place a Projection over the Public Highway

I refer to your request for information on the above. A licence has to be obtained from Kent Highway Services to permit the placing of any projection eg. Awnings, canopies or blinds over the public highway.

Please find enclosed for your information:

- A licence application form, to be completed and returned to the Divisional Office appropriate to the site at which the projection is proposed be placed.
- A copy of the Conditions of Licence TC2

Charges for the licence are £115 for a one year licence and full payment must be received with your application. This is an administration charge for processing the licence and is non-refundable. Cheques should be made payable to Kent County Council.

Depending on the location of the premises, Kent Highway Services may be required to advertise your intent to place a structure over the highway. This is normally done by displaying notices in the immediate area of the intended site, however sometimes more extensive advertising may be required. If this is the case additional costs may be incurred. You will be advised of any charges upon application and these costs must be paid in full before the licence can be granted.

Please note that it is necessary for Kent Highway Services to receive an application for a licence to place a projection over the highway at least 6 weeks prior to the intended placing of the projection.

You must provide a detailed plan clearly showing the extent of the area you wish to use including dimensions.

Planning permission may be required for certain sites. You should contact your local Borough / District Council planning authority for further information. If planning permission is required, you need to attach a copy of the permission to your application

If you have any further queries, please contact Kent Highway Services on 08458 247 800.

Yours faithfully

For and on behalf of the Divisional Manager

Licence to Place a Projection over the Public Highway

Section 1 – To be completed by the Applicant

Proposal for :			
A projection over the public highway eg. Awnings, canopies or blinds			
Location		New Application : <input type="checkbox"/>	
		Renewal : <input type="checkbox"/>	
Full Name and Address of Applicant		Operative Period	
		From	To
Emergency Telephone Number.....			

I have read, understood and will comply with the Conditions of Licence TC2 and agree to pay for the issue of this licence for 1 year or alternatively agree to pay for the issue of a renewal licence for 1 year.

Signed: Contact Telephone Number:

Contact Fax Number:.....

Name: Date:

- The Council, pursuant to the powers conferred by Section 177 of the Highways Act 1980 hereby grants permission to the above Owner in accordance with the above dated application for the operative period as stated above (or as shown in the special conditions)

THIS LICENCE IS NOT VALID UNTIL SECTION 2 IS COMPLETED

Section 2 – To be completed by Kent Highway Services

Special Conditions:

.....

Signed: Date:

For and on behalf of the Divisional Manager

Paid in full:	Yes / No	Agreed By:		Insurance & indemnity checked	Yes / No
Agreed:	Yes / No	Licence No:		Renewal:	Yes / No

Assessed by: Division

Telephone: Fax:

Conditions of Licence – TC2

1. Detailed plans must be provided to Kent Highway Services clearly indicating the premises, the adjacent properties, the highway boundary and the kerb line along with a detailed plan showing sections and elevations of the proposed projecting feature. (see 6.02)
2. The proposed structure shall be positioned as agreed with Kent Highway Services. No items shall be sited as to obstruct access to any premises unless the consent of the occupier of these premises has been obtained.
3. All initial applications must be accompanied by a method of attachment and a method statement for erecting and maintaining the structure certified by a suitably qualified person.
4. Certification by a qualified person that the installation of the awning or light canopy is in accordance with all necessary legislation and is safe for the public to pass under must be received by Kent Highway Services within 28 days of erection of the awning.
5. The licence owner will be charged fees of £24 if, following a routine inspection, any infringements of the licence, or problems arising out of the use of the site are found. Any additional visits to the site, which may have to be carried out by Kent Highway Services, will be charged at £24 per visit.
6. Any infringements of the licence or problems arising out of the use of the site must be immediately rectified to the satisfaction of Kent Highway Services. Kent Highway Services reserve the right to terminate a licence without notice.
7. No structure shall remain overhanging the public highway pursuant to this permission after the period of this permit has expired.
8. The owner will indemnify KCC from all actions as a consequence of the existence/use of the awning/oversailing and will additionally hold Public Liability Insurance to indemnify the Kent County Council up to the value of £10 million against any liability, loss or damage, claim or proceeding whatsoever arising under Statute or Common Law in respect of the placing and maintaining of a projection over the public highway or their removal there from and any action as a consequence of the existence or use of the awning or light canopy. The applicant is required to submit proof of this insurance prior to the licence being issued.
9. No structure is to be placed within 0.6m of the edge of an adjacent carriageway and must maintain a minimum vertical clearance of 2.6m from the surface of the footway to the lowest point of the underside of any projection.

10. If the area within or under the projection is to be used as a specified smoking area or if it is deemed likely that the area will be used for this purpose, the applicant shall provide convenient receptacles for the disposal of associated waste. These receptacles must be contained within or on the applicants property and emptied daily or more frequently if necessary. They should not be an obstruction to any member of the public.
11. Planning permission may be required for certain sites. If you require any form of advertising you must contact your local planning authority prior to applying to Kent Highway Services. You should contact your local Borough / District Council planning authority for further information. If planning permission is required, you need to attach a copy of the permission to your application.
12. Depending on the site location, there may be additional local agreements or conditions to adhere to. If so, these will be sent out with your licence.
13. The licence is valid for up to one year and must be renewed annually if the applicant wishes to continue using it. All annual renewal application must include an independent structural check covering both the mountings and wind resistance.

Local Public Service Agreement 2 (Road Safety)

A report by the Director of Kent Highway Services to the Highways Advisory Board on
18 September 2007

Introduction

1. Kent County Council launched the LPSA2 project in October 2004. The aim of the LPSA2 project is to achieve the major element of the 2010 national road casualty reduction targets i.e. a 40% reduction in the number of people killed and seriously injured, by 31st December 2007. This challenging target is being addressed by a partnership of key players drawing on the contribution of their particular skills and resources for our collective benefit.
2. This report provides an update on progress to date, an overview of activities undertaken so far and plans for the remainder of the project.

Progress to date

3. During the final year of the LPSA2 we are closely monitoring our progress towards the end of year target. Crash and casualty data to June 2007 indicates that there were 331 killed and seriously injured (KSI) during the first half of the year. Data from previous years indicates that we should expect an average increase of 15% in KSIs in the last six months of the year, If this trend is followed during 2007 we are likely to have an end of year figure of 712 KSIs. To achieve the target of 40% reduction in KSIs we will need to reach 716.

Activities to date

4. Our approach to this project has been to integrate the known benefits of education, enforcement, engineering and evaluation. The main thrust of the Road Safety team's work has been in public education through a programme of countywide publicity campaigns, proactive press and public relations and public engagement projects involving Road Safety Officers in the field.
5. These activities are in addition to planned public education work. A co-ordinated approach between public education and planned programmes of engineering work ensures that added value is gained during localised projects. We also liaise with Kent Police and Kent Fire and Rescue to identify shared priorities and plans wherever possible, and work together in joint initiatives whenever it is appropriate to do so.

Planned activities

6. Our research led approach has enabled us to identify our main areas of concern as dangerous and illegal speed, road user impairment and lack of awareness. This research also helps to identify that we need to continue delivering a strategy of public education, along side existing programmes of work and that we need to particularly engage with drivers and motorcyclists.

Appendix A shows the planned publicity campaigns and public engagement projects to March 2008 all are supported by robust media and public relations engagement. All activities to date are either completed or on-going.

Local Public Service Agreement 2 (Road Safety)

Challenges beyond the PSA2 project

7. I am confident that we will meet the PSA2 project target but this is not a foregone conclusion. However, achievement of the PSA2 target on December 31 2007 does not remove the requirement for us to meet the national casualty reduction targets for 2010 set out by HM Government in 2000 (Tomorrow's Roads - Safer Roads for Everyone, the Government's road safety strategy and casualty reduction targets for 2010, Dept. of the Environment, Transport and the Regions, 2000). The targets are.

By 2010, and based on the average figures for 1994 to 1998, to at least achieve:

- A 40 % reduction in the number of people killed or seriously injured in road crashes.
- A 50% reduction in the number of children killed or seriously injured.
- A 10% reduction in the slight casualty rate, expressed as the number of people slightly injured per 100 million vehicle kilometres driven.

8. There is a risk that we will be unable to sustain the casualty reduction success achieved between 2000 and 2007. It is important that the Road Safety team are able to maintain an adequately funded programme of public education beyond the PSA2 project, thereby reinforcing previous work and increasing our potential to meet the 2010 national casualty reduction targets.

9. The Road Safety team are working to further strengthen existing links with key partners such as Kent Police, Kent Fire and Rescue Service, the Highways Agency and Medway Council. We are also exploring the potential for extending the casualty reduction benefits provided by existing successful initiatives such as;

- The Kent and Medway Safety Camera Partnership
- The Kent Driver Diversion Partnership including National Driver Improvement and Speed Awareness courses
- Support for the Pass Plus scheme

Recommendations

10. That Members note the information contained within this report.

Accountable Officer: Ian Procter, KHS, Road Safety Manager.
01622 221285 ian.procter@kent.gov.uk

Background documents: None

	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	Comments
Speed		➡➡YD				➡➡		Jul – YD Nov - Generic
Mobile Phones		➡➡		➡➡				Joint Initiative with Kent Police Publicity campaign, RSO projects and enforcement
Drink Drive		➡➡				➡➡	➡➡	Joint Initiative with Kent Police Publicity campaign, RSO projects and enforcement
Seatbelts	➡➡YD			➡➡	➡➡YD			Joint Initiative with Kent Police Publicity campaign, RSO projects and enforcement (Sept. – All ages)
At Work Drivers		➡➡	➡➡			➡➡		Jul – Minibus safety Aug – Driving Business Safety Nov – Minibus safety
Adult Drivers			➡➡		➡➡		➡➡	Aug – General Oct – Winter driving Dec – Visibility
Young Drivers		➡➡				➡➡		Jul – Speed Nov – Driving in the dark
Motorcycling			➡➡		➡➡			Joint Initiative with Kent Police Publicity campaign, RSO projects and enforcement
Pedestrians		➡➡			➡➡	➡➡		Jul – Children out in the evening Sep – Be Safe Be Seen (tie in with DfT) Nov – Nights drawing in
Cycling		➡➡		➡➡				Jul - Tie in with Tour de France Sept - New school year
'Crashes not accidents'			➡➡		➡➡		➡➡	Media engagement and RSO projects

Notes;

YD = Young Driver (and vehicle occupants)

This page is intentionally left blank

KHS Road Safety position statement on minibus driving within Kent County Council

A report by the Director of Kent Highway Services to the Highways Advisory Board on 18 September 2007

Background

1. Kent County Council's Corporate Health & Safety Board produced a Minibus Code of Practice in 1996. This Code was developed with the inclusion of all the relevant parties and the Road Safety team were involved in this process.
2. The Code dictates much of the content in the Minibus Drivers Familiarisation Training Course run by the Road Safety team. The largest user groups of the Course are schools and Social Care Centres, although individuals from other teams and outside agencies affiliated with KCC often participate. A key element of the Code is to regulate and standardise the requirements, both legal and from a safety perspective, supporting safe minibus operation on KCC business.

Current Situation

3. Since the publication of the Code of Practice there have been some significant changes in legislation governing minibus operation and in - vehicle safety generally (e.g. mobile phone, child seats, etc.). Consequently some managers or organisations may not be aware of recent developments, or might choose to ignore them. There is a concern that units within KCC may be unaware of best practice developments on driving related issues and that this could be exposing KCC, its staff and customers to avoidable risk.

Proposed Position Statement

4. To overcome this concern the Road Safety team has developed a Position Statement (Appendix A.) that covers a range of key issues related to minibus driving safety. The purpose of this Position Statement is to clarify and reinforce road safety good practice and remind managers and drivers of the need to place safety above all else whilst operating a large vehicle. The Statement, which would be circulated throughout KCC, should be viewed as a blueprint for the safe operation of any large passenger carrying vehicle and should be promoted as such to organisations outside of KCC.

Recommendations

5. Subject to the views of this Board, it is proposed to recommend to the Cabinet Member for Environment, Highways and Waste that the Highways Advisory Board approve the Position Statement set out in appendix A of this report.

Accountable Officer: Ian Procter, KHS, Road Safety Manager.
01622 221285 ian.procter@kent.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix A.

Driving on behalf of Kent County Council (KCC) – a road safety perspective

Passenger Carrying Vehicles; with emphasis on minibuses

Preamble:

This position statement sets out the advice and good practice provided by Kent Highway Services' Road Safety team in relation to driving minibuses and other passenger carrying vehicles. This statement is meant to provide guidance in the following situations:

Anyone using a minibus, or passenger carrying vehicle:

- INSURED through Kent County Council
- PROVIDED by Kent County Council
- ON BEHALF of a Kent County Council establishment (including schools and social services centres)
- to TRANSPORT clients of Kent County Council (including children on a school activity, i.e. representing the school)
- that is EMPLOYED by Kent County Council and on KCC business

Although this guidance is provided for the purpose of supporting KCC colleagues, as it represents advice provided by road safety professionals it could also be considered as good practice for those external to KCC.

Two basic principles that should be adopted throughout are (1) that drivers and managers are 'a caring parent' in terms of their relationship with their clients and staff and (2) 'no purpose for a journey is ever more important than safely making the journey itself.'

The following is a list of the main issues that can affect the safety of any trip and primarily relates to the driver. In the eyes of the law the driver is the person responsible for the safety and roadworthiness of the vehicle being used and the safety of the passenger being transported. However, the driver's manager and organisation has a duty of care to the driver to ensure no policy conflicts with the individuals own responsibilities. In essence, the major issues that follow are aimed at the manager and organisation almost as much as they are aimed at the driver.

The way this document is presented is to identify a key issue, provide some basic developmental questions followed by a narrative. Each issue has an **ACTION** section that can be viewed as a consolidation of the key points.

This list is not exhaustive and appears in no particular order of importance. Guidance may be added on other major issues as they arise.

Appendix A.

Key Issues:

Manager's responsibilities

Can a manager affect the safety of one of their drivers, whilst they are driving? YES
Do managers and employers have a duty of care towards their staff? YES

Managers should ensure that drivers are fully equipped to carry out their duties safely and efficiently, both in terms of tangible resources (e.g. a suitable vehicle) and properly preparing their staff (e.g. driver training and development).

Managers should ensure policies do not place undue pressures on drivers, e.g. the speed at which they are expected to drive, workload scheduling, whether they have to be fully contactable during driving, the facility for suitable rest periods and vehicle maintenance regimes.

ACTION: Managers to review policies that affect drivers, to ensure there is no conflict with the driver's individual responsibilities under the Road Traffic Act.

Appendix A.

Driver training

Can a manager be better informed as to a driver's competence?	YES
Should a manager satisfy themselves of the abilities of drivers that work for them?	YES

In order for managers to be satisfied the drivers they use are occupationally competent, each driver must complete an appropriate driver training course. For managers to ensure drivers sustain their competence they should ensure all drivers are regularly re-assessed for their suitability to drive the specific vehicle.

Concerns for a driver's ability to drive safely must be rectified through a period of additional training to improve on areas of weakness, which is followed by a further re-assessment to check for resolution of the original concerns. Drivers identified in this process must not be allowed to drive minibuses, or passenger carrying vehicles, until satisfactory completion of the assessment process.

ACTION: All drivers must complete a driver training course, approved by KCC in line with the current KCC Minibus Code of Practice, followed up with a regular, satisfactory re-assessment at a maximum interval of every 3 years.

Appendix A.

Use of seat belts

Do seat belts save lives? YES
If seat belts are fitted, doesn't it make sense to use them? YES

In a crash at 30mph the body weight of each occupant is multiplied 25 times (making a 10 stone person the equivalent to a 250 stone object). Very little can stop this unrestrained weight from hitting other occupants or the window screen

Despite any legal position related to seat belt usage on large vehicles, there is no doubt that seat belts save lives – where belts are fitted, they must be worn. It is particularly important to consider the fitting of belts for children and small adults. A preparatory booster seat may be required to ensure the correct fitting for anyone under 135cm in height and under 12 years of age. The booster seat, if fitted correctly, ensures that the adult belt is positioned correctly – the lap part fits across the top of the thighs and the diagonal part comes across the collar bone. Indeed for young children it is important to use the correctly fitted, appropriate child restraint for their age and weight.

The law may currently exempt small buses, those over 2.5 tonnes unladen weight, from the requirement to use seat belts but in terms of Duty of Care a driver is expected to ensure all passengers under 14 years of age do wear the restraints available and that older passengers are encouraged to do so.

Vehicles under this weight are basically classified as 'cars' and the normal law regarding all occupants being restrained apply.

ACTION: All drivers must understand their legal obligation to wear seat belts and that they are used by children under 14, as well as their moral responsibility to ensure all occupants are wearing seat belts where fitted. Information on seat belt legislation is available from www.childcarseats.org.uk and www.thinkroadsafety.gov.uk/advice/childcarseats.htm

Managers and employers should consider providing training for drivers in the correct fitting of booster seats and child restraints, if they transport children. Drivers must satisfy themselves as to whether child restraints are required on any journey made.

Appendix A.

Use of mobile phones

Are mobile phones, and other communication devices, an unnecessary distraction to drivers? YES
When using dangerous machinery or attending an important meeting, would you expect the user to switch off their mobile phone? YES

Mobile phone use whilst driving causes an unnecessary distraction to the driver. The level of distraction caused, even by using a hands-free mobile phone, slows driver response times to an equivalent level experienced by a drink driver.

Using any form of mobile phone whilst driving makes the driver 4 times more likely to crash.

There is a clear law against the use of any hand-held mobile phone whilst in control of a motor vehicle (this includes a stationary vehicle with the engine running, except in exceptional circumstances as defined within the law).

If it becomes clear that a driver crashed whilst using a hands-free mobile phone, drivers can still be prosecuted for driving without due care and attention.

ACTION: All drivers must be aware of their legal obligation not to use a hand-held mobile phone whilst driving, including when stopped with the engine running. There is also a moral obligation to not use a hands-free mobile phone whilst driving. Using a hands-free mobile phone can contribute to 'driving without due care and attention'.

Drivers must not be expected by their employer to use any communication device whilst driving.

Appendix A.

Alcohol and drugs

Does alcohol impair a driver's ability to drive safely?	YES
Will small amounts of alcohol affect driving i.e. one drink?	YES
Can prescription or illegal drugs impair driving ability?	YES

Alcohol is a 'depressant' drug and therefore slows the speed at which the brain processes information. This leads to reduced reaction times and affects on judgement and perception. The affect on 'normal' judgement can also lead to a sense of greater security and enhanced belief in driving ability, which ultimately leads to greater risk taking.

Currently there is a legal maximum permitted level of alcohol that a driver may have in their system. Although the level is the same for everyone, it takes a different amount of alcohol for different people to reach that level – dependant factors include size, weight, sex and strength of drink. However, even small amounts of alcohol will affect driving ability and the only 'safe' limit is a zero limit.

It takes time for the body to process alcohol. It is highly likely that someone drinking moderate amounts of alcohol one evening could still have alcohol in their system the next morning. The more alcohol consumed, the longer alcohol will be in their body. Drivers should be discouraged from drinking any alcohol the night before morning driving. Some companies impose a 12 or 24 hour alcohol ban on drivers, meaning no alcohol can be consumed for 12 or 24 hours before driving.

Lunch-time drinking for drivers is perhaps a more obvious concern for managers and employers and drivers should be discouraged from consuming any alcohol during the working day.

The only way to 'sober up' is to wait for the alcohol to be processed by the body. Fresh air, cold showers, a night's sleep or black coffee will not work.

The Police will breathalyse all drivers involved in a crash that they attend, regardless of the time of day.

Alcohol is a drug and other drugs also present a risk to drivers' ability to drive safely. Illegal and prescription drugs are likely to have some impairment on driving ability.

Prescription drugs will carry a warning of the possible impairment, including drowsiness, and the prescribing Doctor should be specifically asked by the driver as to possible affects on driving. Illegal drugs carry no such warning and mean the driver is potentially unaware of the affects on driving. This coupled with the fact that many illegal drugs can remain in the system for many days, means impairment can go on for much longer than the driver may think.

Likely impairments from illegal drugs will include reduced reaction times, affects on judgement and perception, paranoia, distorted vision, frustration, aggression, apathy, misplaced sense of invulnerability.

ACTION: All drivers must not consume alcohol, even small amounts, prior to driving. Drivers must be made aware of the risks of consuming alcohol the evening before a morning drive. Managers should consider appropriate alcohol bans imposed on drivers.

Appendix A.

Drivers must be made aware of the risks of taking drugs, including medication, prior to driving and should inform their manager or employer of the need to take any prescribed drug. Drivers must consult their Doctor about possible affects of medication on driving.

Appendix A.

Driver's hours and fatigue

Should there be a limit on a driver's working day?	YES
Should driving be seen as time at work rather than 'down time'?	YES

Fatigue is a major cause of crashes on high speed roads (limits of 50mph and over). The likelihood of a driver suffering fatigue increases with the length of journey and the length of their working day. Fatigue is especially likely on long monotonous stretches of road, like motorways.

Our body clocks experience natural dips in alertness between 2pm and 4pm, and 2am and 6am.

Similarly to alcohol, fatigue impairs reaction times and judgement.

Drivers must be allowed to take sufficient rest breaks to allow them to maintain good levels of alertness. Car drivers are advised to build in breaks of at least 20 minutes, where they get out of the vehicle and move around every two hours of driving.

Winding down the window or turning up the radio will not cure fatigue, only rest will.

On longer journeys managers and employers must consider providing two drivers for the journey.

No one should be expected to work a full day and then drive long distances on business. Overnight stays should be built into journey planning.

ACTION: Managers and employers should not expect drivers to drive for prolonged periods without being allowed to rest. Drivers must not be expected to work a full day then drive long distances on business.

Appendix A.

Driver licensing categories

Should managers and employers satisfy themselves that drivers have the correct licence?

YES

Drivers have a responsibility to be correctly licensed for the vehicle they wish to drive. Managers and employers should satisfy themselves as to the correct licence categories required to drive their vehicles, and that their drivers have these.

Some licence categories are time bound and have to be renewed by the driver (e.g. PCV and some vocational).

Some categories can be revoked for medical reasons and managers and employers need a robust system to regularly check drivers' licences for their current status (ideally every six months).

ACTION: Managers and employers should check all drivers' licences regularly to satisfy themselves as to their current status. Drivers should be expected to notify their manager or employer of endorsements (including for speeding) as they occur and employers may choose to set a level for endorsements, above which drivers will have their role reduced or removed.

More information on driving licences can be found at www.dvla.gov.uk and specifically in the DVLA information note INF 68.

Appendix A.

Driving speeds

The bigger a vehicle is and the faster it is moving, the greater the damage it will cause and the more severe any resultant injuries will be.

If you crash it's because you couldn't stop in time. If you cannot stop in time, you were going too fast for the conditions – this can apply when driving below the speed limit!

Due to the rise in vehicular traffic, congestion is a common occurrence on the roads. Consequently journey times and job scheduling can be difficult to manage. No driver should be placed under pressure to break any traffic law, including speeding.

The driver is the person liable for prosecution should any traffic law be broken and must be allowed to make their own judgement of the appropriate way of driving in any situation. In the case of a fatal crash the manager and employer can also be prosecuted if it is clear that employer's policies and/or working practices contributed to the driver's behaviour. Prosecution under Corporate Manslaughter legislation is a distinct possibility in such situations.

ACTION: Drivers must be reminded of the need to drive within the traffic laws, including driving within speed limits. Speed limits for large vehicles can be different from those imposed on cars and drivers must be aware of such differences.

Other issues that managers and organisations must be aware of, but not dealt with here as primarily they are not 'road safety' based:

- Bus permits
- Driving abroad
- Escorts for journeys
- Equipment on a minibus
- Insurance cover