

## KENT COUNTY COUNCIL

---

### ENVIRONMENT, HIGHWAYS AND WASTE CABINET COMMITTEE

MINUTES of a meeting of the Environment, Highways and Waste Cabinet Committee held in the Darent Room, Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone on Thursday, 3 October 2013.

PRESENT: Mrs P A V Stockell (Chairman), Mr M Baldock, Mr M A C Balfour, Mr R H Bird (Substitute for Mr I S Chittenden), Mr L Burgess, Mr C W Caller, Miss S J Carey (Substitute for Mrs S V Hohler), Dr M R Eddy, Mr S C Manion (Substitute for Mr M J Harrison), Mr J M Ozog, Mr C Simkins, Mr M E Whybrow and Mr M A Wickham

ALSO PRESENT: Mr D L Brazier

IN ATTENDANCE: Mr M Austerberry (Interim Corporate Director, Growth, Environment & Transport), Mr J Burr (Director Highways, Transportation & Waste and Principal Director of Transformation), Ms A Carruthers (Transport Strategy - Delivery Manager), Mr A Corcoran (Traffic Schemes & Member Highway Fund Manager), Ms R Childs (Landscape Officer), Mr P Crick (Director Environment, Planning & Enforcement), Mr R Fitzgerald (Performance Manager), Mr W Forrester (Head of Gypsy & Traveller Unit), Ms M Gillett (Major Projects Manager), Mr D Joyner (Transport & Safety Policy Manager), Mr A Kamps (Finance Business Partner), Mr J Prosser (Principal Planning Policy Officer - Waste), Mr T Read (Head of Highway Transport), Mr D Shipton (Head of Financial Strategy), Mrs S Thompson (Head of Planning Applications Group), Mrs C Valentine (Highway Manager), Mr R Wilkin (Waste Manager) and Mrs K Mannering (Democratic Services Officer)

#### UNRESTRICTED ITEMS

##### **16. Membership**

*(Item A2)*

The Cabinet Committee noted the appointment of Mr M E Whybrow.

##### **17. Declarations of Interests by Members in items on the Agenda**

*(Item A4)*

Mr Balfour declared an interest in Item D3 as a member of the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Joint Advisory Committee and Management Committee.

##### **18. Minutes of the meeting held on 19 June 2013**

*(Item A5)*

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting held on 19 June 2013 are correctly recorded and that they be signed by the Chairman.

## **19. Cabinet Member's and Corporate Director's Update (Oral report)**

*(Item A6)*

(1) Mr Brazier and Mr Austerberry gave verbal reports on the following issues:-

Mr Brazier

*Highways and Transportation* – St Dunstan's, Canterbury; Electric Vehicles; National Speed Awareness Course; Annual Resurfacing Programme (Repair & Renewal) 2013/14; and Safe and Sensible Street Lighting Initiative.

*Planning & Environment* – Solar Panels; Green Business Conference (19 November); and Update on the planning applications for the three exploratory boreholes in East Kent.

Mr Austerberry

Recent audit of the maintenance contract with Enterprise and Customer Fault reporting; grants to voluntary and community transport organisations; funding for two capital road schemes; response to the Airports Commission; Climate Change; and household waste recycling centres and transfer stations.

## **20. 13/00063 - 20mph Speed Limit Policy - Review**

*(Item B1)*

(1) Further to Minute 27 of 4 July 2012, the report presented national and local evidence on the benefits of 20mph schemes and recommended a new policy that the County would seek to implement 20mph schemes when there were clear road safety or public health benefits. Any locally supported schemes that could not be justified in those terms could still be implemented via the Member Highway Fund provided they were implemented as set out in Department for Transport Circular 01/2013.

(2) The policy would feed into the new Road Casualty Reduction Strategy which was being developed by Highways & Transportation to assist with meeting targets set out in Bold Steps for Kent and delivering the priorities set out in Growth Without Gridlock (GWG).

(3) In recent years the demand for the implementation of 20mph schemes had been increasing in response to both local and national campaigns. KCC had been implementing 20mph schemes in Kent and had 50 schemes covering over 800 roads. In addition, all new residential developments were designed to keep traffic at 20mph although they were not always signed as such to avoid unnecessary sign clutter. The County's current policy allowed the introduction of 20mph schemes at any location where such measures could be justified in crash savings terms or via the Member Highway Fund (MHF) providing they met implementation criteria as set out in DfT Circular 01/2013.

(4) The DfT published new advice on the implementation of 20mph schemes in its circular 01/2013 in January 2013 which contained guidance on the setting of local speed limits. There were two distinctly different types of 20mph speed restrictions which were limits, which relied solely on signing, and zones which required traffic

calming to reduce speeds. Highway Authorities had powers to introduce 20 mph speed limits that applied only at certain times of day. The variable limits might be particularly relevant where a school was located on a major through road that was not suitable for a full-time 20 mph zone or limit.

(5) The report included details and results of Primary School Speed Reduction Scheme Trials. Evidence showed that schemes which combined 20mph limits with traffic calming measures to reduce speeds had proved very successful in reducing casualties by around 40% to 60%. When only signing had been used the overall benefits were significantly less.

(6) The current safety record of the existing 20mph schemes in Kent which were a mix of both limits and zones showed that casualties recorded on 20mph roads in Kent as a proportion of all roads were 2% less than the national average.

(7) From 1 April 2013 Kent County Council became responsible for a number of Public Health functions. One of those was the Health Improvement for the population of Kent – especially for the most disadvantaged. There was evidence that 20mph schemes did encourage healthier transport modes such as walking and cycling as in Bristol, where preliminary results indicated increases in levels of walking and cycling of over 20%. An increase in the implementation of 20mph schemes could assist in the outcome of reducing obesity in adults and children in Kent and improving the overall health of the population.

(8) Kent Police would not support 20mph speed limits unless the average speed of vehicles was 24mph or less, as research had shown that signed only 20mph limits where natural traffic calming was absent had little or no effect on traffic speeds and did not significantly reduce accidents. They would also not support the introduction of 20mph zones without sufficient traffic calming measures being in place and of appropriate design, that reduced the speed of most traffic to 20mph or less thereby making them self-enforcing.

(9) Currently 20mph schemes were funded either from the County's Casualty Reduction Programme or via the Members Highway Fund. The total Casualty Reduction Programme budget for 2013/14 for new schemes was £800k which goes to fund many different types of safety engineering measures across the county. The cost of any 20mph scheme would vary due to the location and objectives of the scheme. It was estimated that the typical capital cost of a 1km length of 20mph speed limit (signing only) was £1,400 and a 1km length of 20mph zone (including traffic calming) was £60,000. Revenue costs associated with any scheme would need to be considered including Traffic Regulation Orders, design, consultation, engagement, marketing, monitoring, on-going maintenance of infrastructure and enforcement.

(10) As with many highway issues there was no national prevailing view as to the policy a local Highway Authority should adopt regarding 20mph schemes. The issues were complex and there were many pros and cons to the various options. The evidence presented did give some clear indicators that the benefits of 20mph zones were much more effective than signed only limits, providing greater speed and casualty reductions. Experience in Kent had shown that once traffic calming had been installed it could become very unpopular. Whilst calls for the introduction of blanket 20mph schemes were heard, the costs involved in installing blanket 20mph

across Kent were prohibitive and, given current financial restraints, the existing philosophy of introducing bespoke targeted road safety schemes was a more efficient way of achieving casualty reduction.

(11) The results of the trials conducted outside several primary schools in Maidstone showed that speeds outside the schools at picking up and dropping off times were already low and would meet with DfT criteria for a signed only 20mph limit.

(12) RESOLVED that a new policy on 20mph schemes be supported to:-

- a) implement 20mph schemes where there was clear justification in terms of achieving casualty reduction as part of the on-going programme of Casualty Reduction Schemes;
- b) identify locations for 20mph schemes which would assist with delivering targets set out in Kent's Joint Health Wellbeing Strategy; and
- c) enable any schemes that could not be justified in terms of road safety or public health benefits but were locally important to be funded via the local County Councillors Member Highway Fund. All schemes must meet implementation criteria as set out in DfT Circular 01/2013.

## **21. 13/00061 - Winter Service Policy 2013 - 14**

*(Item B2)*

(1) Each year Highways and Transportation reviewed the Council's Highways and Transportation Winter Service Policy and the operational plan that supported it in light of changes in national guidance and lessons learnt from the previous winter. The report set out proposed amendments following the review.

(2) The winter of 2012/13 was one of the most prolonged periods of cold weather experienced in Kent for many years, and as a result the winter service period had to be extended for two weeks and the last salting run of the season was 27 April. National guidance for winter service delivery by highway authorities was issued by the Department for Transport and detailed in the Code of Practice for highway authorities – Well Maintained Highways - section 13 Winter Service. Much of the guidance provided had long been incorporated in the Highways and Transportation (H&T) winter service policy and plan. However some of the technical recommendations (including issues such as vehicle calibration and salt storage) would be looked at and incorporated over the next few years into the planning for the Kent winter service. Guidance on decision making for salting runs had also been provided and a matrix had been developed for use this winter season by Winter Duty Officers.

(3) The allocated budget for winter service for 2013/14 was £3,299,900, £20,000 of which was allocated for the purchase of additional salt bins. The revisions to the winter service policy met the objectives of the Council's medium term plan for 2014/15, Bold Steps for Kent. Working in partnership with other authorities contributed towards achieving a better service and value for money for Kent residents. Putting the citizen in control would be achieved by continuing to provide salt bags to parishes who requested them. Salt bins would continue to be provided across the county. Advice on how people in the Kent community could self help

during winter conditions would also be included on the website, including road safety tips.

(4) Well Maintained Highways recommended that local authorities identified a minimum network that would be treated continuously for a period of six days in the event of a severe winter event. Last year H&T identified the minimum network for Kent as being the main strategic network, i.e. all A and B roads and some other locally important roads as identified in the highway network hierarchy and amended the policy accordingly. Essentially, these equated to the current primary routes minus the local roads and roads that go through estates etc. H&T would always endeavour to treat the entire primary network as identified in the policy but recognised that there might be times as experienced in previous years where it would be prudent to reduce the network as stated above to maintain salt levels and keep the main roads in Kent moving as much as possible.

(5) Additionally, H&T had identified an Operational Winter Period which was October to April and a Core Winter Period which was December to February and the stocks of salt needed during those periods to effectively treat the network in line with recommended resilience levels. H&T had 23,000 tonnes in stock so were well within the recommended resilience levels.

(6) In previous years good relationships had been established with the Highways Agency MAC Area 4 who managed the trunk roads and motorways in Kent. KCC shared two depots with the HA and there had been a reciprocal salt sharing arrangement for some time which had worked very well. Additionally there was an arrangement with Medway Council in respect of the weather forecast and treating areas on the borders of Kent and Medway.

(7) The farmers currently contracted to clear rural areas provided an extremely valuable service. All farmers had agreed routes to clear, usually in rural areas, village centres etc.

(8) Last year a successful winter service campaign 'We're prepared are/have you?' was run across the county. The campaign was designed to increase awareness of the service and also to encourage people to be prepared and use self-help when possible. The winter page on the website was well used with 64,516 hits in January. Visits to the dedicated winter pages increased by 58%. A similar campaign had been designed for the coming year.

(9) Additionally a new feature would be on the website – Find my nearest salt bin – which would enable people to identify the salt bin closest to their home or place of work. All KCC salt bins had been labelled as property of KCC and with a short message about how the contents should be used.

(10) Last year a three year contract was awarded to Meteogroup for the supply of the winter weather forecast. At the time of writing the report the ice prediction service currently provided by Vaisala was out to tender.

(11) The Winter Service Policy was set out in Appendix B to the report, and was supported by an operational Plan which had been updated in line with the Policy and discussions with the contractor Enterprise plc to ensure that plans were aligned. In addition district plans had been developed in conjunction with district councils across

the county and these will be used together with the Policy and Plan to deliver the winter service. Local district plans will be reported to the next round of Joint Transportation Boards.

(12) The following revisions had been made to the Winter Service Policy:

- (a) Salt bins would be identified on a map on Kent.gov – Find my Nearest
- (b) A new one year contract to provide an ice prediction service would be in place for the start of the winter service season
- (c) A trial with some farmers salting key routes through villages in addition to ploughing

(13) RESOLVED that the proposed changes to the Highways and Transportation Winter Service Policy for 2013/14, be noted.

## **22. 12/01924 - A20 Corridor Statutory Quality Bus Partnership Scheme**

*(Item B3)*

(1) The report detailed the proposed Statutory Quality Partnership Scheme (SQPS) to be established along the A20 London Road, near Maidstone, and gave an overview of what the Scheme involved and the respective commitments that KCC, Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council and local bus operators would sign up to. It sought approval to establish the SQPS, which would become a legally binding document. The Scheme would then be sent to the Traffic Commissioner for the local area and bus operators serving the route. An official Notice would also be published in the local press, at which point the Scheme would run for a period of 10 years.

(2) There are no financial implications. S106 funds are being used to provide infrastructure improvements (£373,000 available from Holborough Lakes) and more funding would become available in the future from developments at Kings Hill and Leybourne Chase. KCC maintenance requirements were in line with existing procedures so would not necessitate any extra spending.

(3) The desire for the SQPS grew out of the Medway Valley Sustainable Transport Strategy (MVSTS). It is recognised as an important tool to lock in the benefits of investments that had been made by KCC through developer contributions and by bus operators in the area. It is also seen as an opportunity to reduce air pollution in the local Air Quality Management Areas. Arriva and KCC successfully bid for the Government's Green Bus Fund for grant funding to support the purchase of 11 new hybrid diesel/electric buses for Route 71 (Maidstone to Holborough and Snodland via Leybourne Lakes), which KCC also contributed to.

(4) Whilst KCC is not responsible for bus services, the SQPS provides the opportunity to mandate high quality service levels and safeguard investments in bus facilities. It is a legally binding partnership between Kent County Council and Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council to improve bus travel along the A20 London Road corridor. The Scheme would provide all passengers with a high quality bus service. As well as benefiting current bus travellers, it is hoped the improvements will encourage more people to travel by bus and thus limit the increasing congestion on the corridor. The Scheme area is 3 miles in length running

along London Road (A20) from the Junction with Coldharbour Lane (Coldharbour Roundabout) in a Westerly Direction, to the junction with Ashton Way (A228) and Castle Way (See 13.3 map of Scheme Area)

(5) The report included information on the following:-

- Service Standards to be met by operators
- Facilities provided by KCC
- Infrastructure/Services provided by Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council
- Maintenance standards provided by KCC
- Options considered and dismissed – including maintaining the status quo
- Any legal implications of the suggested action
- Any equalities implications of the suggested action
- Any implications for the council's property portfolio of the suggested action
- Who was likely to inherit the main delegations via the Officer Scheme of Delegation – e.g. does a contract need signing who was likely to do it?
- Any other information required in order that the Board/Committee/Cabinet Member/Cabinet is well-informed and has all the information necessary to consider/take the decision

(6) Establishing the SQPS would guarantee local bus operators provided a high quality bus service: one fit for a heavily trafficked, densely populated corridor in which bus travel provided a viable alternative to the private car. It would limit congestion and help to reduce air pollution. The Scheme would ensure maximum return on investments made by KCC and Arriva in improving bus travel in the area.

(7) RESOLVED that:-

- (a) the Consultation Report and the EqIA for the Statutory Quality Partnership Scheme, as set out in Appendix B to the report be supported; and
- (b) the Cabinet Member for Transport & Environment be recommended to approve the Statutory Quality Partnership Scheme along A20 London Road, as set out in Appendix A to the report.

### **23. North Farm Link Road (Longfield Road) Improvement, Tunbridge Wells - Decision No.13/00031C**

*(Item B4)*

(1) Further to Minute 6 of 19 June 2013, the report updated Members on discussions with landowners and scheme development. The 2013/14 tranche of £600,000 of the Pinch Point funding offer of £3.5m had been received from the Department of Transport. KCC had committed to contribute up to £1.5m and Tunbridge Wells had indicated a willingness to underwrite £0.5m, and there were potential opportunities for s106 contributions.

(2) With the benefit of survey information, commencement of initial detailed design, initial responses from utility companies and considerations of buildability, a more informed view could be taken. Cost consultants had been retained and the current estimate was £6.3m. The detailed design and utility diversions needed to be developed but the estimate of £6.3m reflected the state of current knowledge with an appropriate allowance for risk and was affordable when taking account of anticipated

s106 contributions. Expenditure to date in developing the scheme and securing the land was approximately £250,000.

(3) Land negotiations had been protracted with the main issue being that, despite most owners being supportive of the scheme, concerns were raised that they might be liable to claims from their retail tenants for any economic loss that might be attributable to disruption caused during construction of the scheme. KCC could not provide an indemnity for economic loss and it was uninsurable. Businesses had been reassured that everything practical would be done to maintain access and minimise disruption. 8 plots of land were required for the scheme and a commitment to 7 had been secured. The remaining plot was held by Asda.

(4) Despite an extensive supply of traffic information and discussion that showed that the scheme would result in an improvement to journey times to and from their store, Asda had not agreed to release the land required for the scheme. Greg Clark MP was kindly making arrangements to meet Asda's CEO in a last attempt to secure their support for the scheme. As Asda were the only firm who had not indicated support, options had been investigated to amend the scheme without their land so that the scheme could still proceed. Since Asda were located at the start of the scheme and land take was only required for road widening and not a junction improvement, dualling through the section had been retained, through slightly reducing lane widths and a narrowing of the central reservation. However, it also meant that a section of shared footway/cycleway would be need to be deleted from the scheme.

(5) Of the 7 plots with landowner/retailer commitment, Officers were continuing to formally agree the Deeds of Dedication. To date 3 had been executed, 2 were to be finally agreed and 2 with a verbal commitment and discussions to commence on the terms of the draft Deed.

(6) Further surveys continued in preparation for the detailed design stage. Geotechnical site investigation, coring of the carriageway to determine the robustness of the existing pavement construction, drainage surveys to understand the existing system and a tree survey had all been completed. There had been slight refinement of the outline design particularly in the context of verges and minor earthworks and the Report sought approval to the latest outline design scheme plan, 4300034/000/01 Rev 2, and including a possible alternative amendment should the Asda land not be secured, 4300034/000/065 Rev 0.

(7) The continued focus on securing the land meant that the programme had unavoidably slipped and it was expected that it would not be possible to invite construction tenders until January 2014 with a construction start in May 2014 and completion in May 2015. Any continued significant delay in formally securing the land would cause the programme to slip further and might well prejudice the availability of the Pinch Point funding.

(8) A Masterplan for North Farm was developed by KCC in September 2012, and was based on the phased implementation of independent improvement schemes. The Masterplan would be incorporated into the emerging Transport Strategy which would support development aspirations set out in the Tunbridge Wells Local Plan. The lifespan of the Local Plan was to 2026 and the implementation of all phases of



the Masterplan was required within that time period. The suggested phases of the Masterplan were:

Phase 1 and Phase 2 – dualling of Longfield Road between A21 and Dowding Way.

Phase 3 – one way system incorporating the southern end of Longfield Road, Lambert Road and Dowding Way.

Phase 4 – alternative route through North Farm Lane.

Phase 5 – widening of High Brooms Railway Bridge on North Farm Road to allow vehicles to pass side by side and allow access to buses, pedestrians and cyclists.

(9) RESOLVED that the Cabinet Member for Transport & Environment be recommended to:-

- (a) approve the revised scheme for the improvement of Longfield Road, shown as an outline design on Drg 4300034/000/01/Rev 2 and Drg 4300034/000/065 Rev O, if land could not be secured from Asda, for land charge disclosures and development control;
- (b) give approval to progress the detailed design, tender preparation and any ancillary works and approvals for the scheme for the improvement of Longfield Road;
- (c) give approval for Legal Services to take a dedication, transfer or by some other appropriate legal mechanism to secure the land required to deliver the Longfield Road scheme, shown in outline on Drg 4300034/000/01/Rev 2 including but not limited to any ancillary works such as drainage and environmental mitigation; and
- (d) approve the Masterplan for North Farm shown in concept on the plan in Appendix C to the report, and taking forward to the next stage of feasibility assessment.

#### **24. Environment, Highways & Waste Cabinet Committee Draft Programme of Work**

*(Item B5)*

RESOLVED that the draft programme of work for Environment, Highways and Waste be noted.

#### **25. Enterprise & Environment Directorate Financial Monitoring 2013/14**

*(Item C1)*

(1) Members were asked to note the first quarter's full budget monitoring report for 2013/14 reported to Cabinet on 16 September 2013. The relevant annex from the Cabinet report was attached to the paper and was presented in the pre-election portfolio format. The Cabinet Member for Finance and Procurement was currently assessing the resource implications of mapping the information to the post-election portfolio structure, in light of the current change programme.

(2) RESOLVED that the revenue and capital forecast variances from budget for 2013/14 for the Enterprise & Environment Directorate based on the first quarter's full monitoring to Cabinet be noted.

## **26. Medium Term Financial Outlook**

*(Item C2)*

(1) The Government had recently launched 3 consultations which provided more information about the final settlement for 2014/15 and indicative settlement for 2015/16. The report provided members with a summary of the potential implications for KCC in advance of consideration of the forthcoming Budget and Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP). The estimated funding settlement figures included in the report were speculative at this stage. The figures would become more definitive following the outcome of Government's consultations and the publication of funding settlements. The proposals in the government consultation would have a significantly detrimental impact on future funding settlements.

(2) The council's proposed response would emerge when the draft Budget and MTFP were published for consultation later in the year. The final Budget and MTFP would be presented to County Council on 13 February 2014. The report included detailed information on 2014/15 Indicative Funding Allocations; 2015/16 Settlement; Technical Consultations; 2016/17 and Beyond; and Timetable for 2014/15 Budget.

(3) It was clear that announcements on grants for further Council Tax freezes were likely to be around 1%. Referendum levels for excessive increases were also likely to be around 2%, which left very little room for manoeuvre on Council Tax.

(4) RESOLVED that the potential implications on future funding settlements and the Council's Budget/Medium Term Financial Plan and the likely timetable for setting the 2014/15 budget be noted.

## **27. Enterprise & Environment Performance Dashboard**

*(Item C3)*

(1) The Enterprise and Environment Performance Dashboard, set out in the Appendix to the report, included results up to the end of June 2013 for the Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) included in the year's Divisional business plans. Key Performance Indicators were presented with RAG (Red/Amber/Green) alerts to show progress against business plan targets. All Key Performance Indicators were either ahead of target or were at acceptable levels above the floor standard for the year to date position. There were no indicators rated as Red.

(2) Within the activity indicators the work in progress was higher than expected for Highways and Transportation due to additional demand in the previous quarter, although was now on a reducing trend. The tonnage of waste collected at Household Waste recycling centres had also been lower in the last 12 months than expected, primarily related to policy changes implemented in October 2012.

(3) Mr Whybrow asked whether Ambers for Waste Management represented a plateau being reached for performance and whether we would see further improvement. Mr Wilkin responded that step changes were being delivered with partners from quarter 2 and we would see recycling rates improve as a consequence. New schemes had been introduced from July in Ashford, Maidstone and Swale. The new services in Ashford in particular would result in substantial increases in recycling rates in that district. There were also improvements made in some of the Household

Waste recycling centres. Mr Wilkin was therefore confident that results would show good improvement for the rest of the year

(4) A question was also raised in relation to Carbon emissions and whether outsourcing and other changes in service delivery were fully accounted for in the figures. Mr Crick responded that reduced staffing levels would assist with KCC's own carbon footprint but we need to work to ensure this doesn't increase emissions elsewhere. Support was being provided by the council for businesses to help introduce a range of energy efficiency measures, so activity was focussed not just on KCC's own emissions but across the whole Kent economy.

(5) Mr Baldock asked whether the Committee could be engaged with the setting and review of targets for the indicators. Mr Fitzgerald responded that feedback at any time from Committee was always welcome, however the setting of targets was an annual process through the business plan process, and the Committee would be consulted on the development on next year's plans.

(6) Mr Caller commented that some targets were set lower than last year's performance and this did not seem challenging. Mr Burr responded in relation to Highways and Transportation that maintaining previous performance levels was not an easy task and that targets were reviewed annually. Mr Brazier added that performance was at high levels currently, and this was not the case in the past and he was satisfied with this, although he was committed to tightening up on targets where appropriate.

(7) RESOLVED that the June Performance Dashboard be noted.

## **28. Public Transport Ticketing - A Kent Travel Smartcard**

*(Item D1)*

(1) It was proposed to develop a new Travel Smartcard for use on bus and rail services across Kent and Medway. The Vision is to provide a convenient and cost-effective way to access transport services, making it easy to travel on different routes, with multiple operators, across both bus and rail. The Kent Travel Smartcard is an important part of the work to improve access to services, and deliver a viable alternative to the car journey, tackling congestion and supporting the regeneration of the Kent economy.

(2) KCC had invested in Smart Ticketing since 2008 through facilitating new ticket machines as well as smart Older Persons', Disabled Persons' and Freedom Pass Travel cards. KCC is now in a position to extend the benefits of the investment, and is currently working in partnership with Arriva to launch a pilot project on Arriva bus services in Maidstone during the beginning of 2014. The Maidstone Arriva pilot Smartcard would comprise Pay-As-You-Go (credit stored on card) and Period Pass tickets (unlimited day, weekly and 4 weekly travel). It is intended that the pilot project would then lead to an extension to other operators in Maidstone (target date spring 2014), and then extension across Kent and Medway (target date autumn 2014).

(3) All bus and train companies had been approached to discuss possibilities for extending the scheme countywide and across transport modes. Bus operator Arriva was committed to the Maidstone pilot and the development of multi-operator tickets. Stagecoach is interested in principle in the scheme and the opportunity to develop

multi-operator tickets. All smaller bus operators were extremely keen to join the scheme. Southeastern Rail were keen to work with KCC to ensure bus and rail ticketing were integrated.

(4) H&T officers continue to liaise closely with the project manager of the 'Kent Card' (the Corporate Smartcard), who was fully aware of the Travel Smartcard proposals.

(5) The initial costs of the trial and development would be funded primarily by KCC and Medway Council from existing budgets. Such costs were estimated to be £60,000. It was expected that the scheme became self-funding in the longer term through a commission out of the revenue apportioned to operators. The DfT had made £15m available for bus ticketing development and it was intended to approach the DfT for funding to deliver the rollout of new technologies such as paying with contactless bank card (EMV) and mobile phone (NFC).

(6) RESOLVED that the contents of the report be endorsed.

**29. Report on KCC's representations on recent District Local Plan consultations including Canterbury City Council Local Plan Preferred Options Consultation; Thanet District Council Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation; and Swale Borough Council Local Plan Preferred Options Consultation**

*(Item D2)*

(1) The District and Borough Councils consulted KCC as a statutory consultee at the formal consultation stages in pursuance of Regulation 18 (Issue and Options and Preferred Options) and Regulation 19 (Pre submission) of The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. The Planning Policy Team co-ordinated the KCC response by consulting internally with officers, members of the EHW Committee and KCC Local Members, who represented wards in the relevant Borough or District to ensure their views were provided to the Cabinet Member for consideration when making KCC's response to each Local Authority. An overview of KCC's response for all three of the Local Plans consultations was set out in the report.

(2) The report summarised KCC representations on the following Local Plan consultation documents:-

*Canterbury City Council Local Plan Preferred Options (June – Aug 2013)*

The City Council proposed that a minimum of 15,600 dwellings would be built over the plan period 2011-2031. The Local Plan also included 118,000 sq m of business space on eight strategic sites and proposed that the Wincheap Retail Area would be developed as a satellite centre of Canterbury City, focused on retail and leisure provision.

*Thanet District Council Local Plan Issues and Options consultation (July – Aug 2013)*

TDC were at an earlier stage of the Local Plan process and considered three job growth options ranging from a Lower Growth option of 1,200 jobs, an economic baseline based on historic trends of 3,100 jobs and a Higher Growth scenario of

5,100 jobs. TDC had taken a similar approach to housing and matching that to job growth to produce a series of scenarios including zero migration of 3,714 homes and trend migration up to 11,648 homes. Manston Airport was considered separately, and could provide an additional 2,420 jobs. The Plan aimed to strengthen and diversify the local economy and focus investment at the coastal towns and at Westwood.

*Swale Borough Councils Local Plan Preferred Options consultation (Aug – Sept 2013)*

SBC planned to keep its housing target at 540 dwellings per annum leading to a housing target of 10,800 dwellings for the years 2010/11 – 2031. Sittingbourne continued to be the main focus for development and concentration of public services and facilities. The Plan provided employment land targets of 545,614m<sup>2</sup> floorspace and 7053 jobs (353 per annum) between 2011 and 2031. Kent Science Park, Sheerness Port and the Sittingbourne Southern Relief Road were identified as “Areas of Future Change” which could trigger a partial review of the Local Plan.

(3) The decisions to be taken by Canterbury City Council might have long term financial implications for KCC as the provider of infrastructure and services to support development. Thanet District and Swale Borough were both at an earlier stage in their processes and as such there would be no direct financial implications for the County Council from decisions taken at that part of their process.

(4) RESOLVED that the representations submitted from KCC by the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport as set out and summarised in the report be noted.

### **30. Adoption of the Kent Downs & High Weald Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) Management Plans** *(Item D3)*

(1) The report provided an overview of the statutory review of the Kent Downs and High Weald Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) Management Plans. Its purpose was to inform Members of the background and process, and highlighted any significant changes, in order to inform a decision on the Plans’ adoption.

(2) Kent County Council had a statutory duty, along with other local authorities within the boundaries of the two AONBs, to act jointly to prepare and review the Management Plans. It was the second review of the AONB Management Plans, originally adopted by KCC in 2004 – the iteration strongly reflected the original adopted plan. The statutory deadline for adoption was 31 March 2014.

(3) Both AONB Management Plans included targets and/or policies that supported sustainable rural businesses, which contributed directly to Kent’s rural economy. Through the Management Plans, targets and policies were included which delivered support for volunteering, training and education.

(4) The report included details of the Relevant History & Background to Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty Management Plans. Neither Plan had brought forward any major changes, although a few amendments and occasionally new policies had been included to tackle policy changes. From June 2013 to September 2013 the

Plans underwent a formal consultation and work was now underway to finalise the documents ready for the adoption deadline.

(5) The revision of the two Management Plans had successfully reacted to shifting policy, and the rapidly changing social and economic climate of recent times in addition to environmental pressures. Whilst some minor changes had been made, both Plans were fundamentally the same as the original adopted Plan.

(6) RESOLVED that the Management Plans proceeding for approval be endorsed.

### **31. Possible Traveller Site Management Opportunities**

*(Item D4)*

(1) The report outlined possible future opportunities for the Gypsy and Traveller Unit, and considered how it might reflect the transformation agenda, help improve quality and economy, and generate income. The Gypsy and Traveller Unit was created in 1989, primarily to ensure that sufficient sites were established for “gipsies”, as was KCC’s duty then under the Caravan Sites Act 1968. Once the law changed in 1994, site management generally followed freehold ownership of sites.

(2) At present, the Gypsy and Traveller Unit managed seven KCC freehold sites, plus one Tonbridge & Malling BC site, and managed two further sites, under contract, with Maidstone BC. Ten sites in all were managed. The Unit also managed unauthorised encampments on KCC land (mainly highway land) across Kent, on behalf of KCC as Corporate Landlord.

(3) Although the service was not one of those listed under the first Market Engagement and Service Reviews, the principles of identifying the most appropriate provider, to deliver the best possible service for customers, applied to all services. It seemed appropriate to explore possibilities which could tackle duplication, repetition and remove low value or no value activity, and which encouraged creativity and innovation.

(4) Within the past eighteen months, a number of councils outside Kent had approached the Unit with a variety of requests and proposals over site management. Most recently, there had been an invitation to discuss joint opportunities, along with a number of county councils in the East and South East of England.

(5) It was understandable, in the current climate, that all authorities were looking for arrangements which were as economic and effective as they could obtain. The risks of taking on any new arrangement depended on the nature of what was being offered. A contract to manage sites, like the one with Maidstone BC, had few financial risks to KCC, but was for a fixed fee and there were no extra financial benefits when site income exceeded costs. However, transfer of a site long lease or freehold, with the long-term responsibility to manage the site or sites, involved careful consideration of a whole range of risks connected with land ownership, and consideration of whether the benefits that could reasonably be expected would be worth the potential risks.

(6) RESOLVED that:-

(a) the opportunities outlined in the report be further explored; and

- (b) an updated report be submitted to the Cabinet Committee.

### **32. Kent Minerals and Waste Development Framework (MWDF) Core Strategy at Pre-Submission (Draft Plan) Stage - 12/01879**

*(Item E1)*

(1) The purpose of the report was to ensure that the County Council submitted its Minerals and Waste Local Plan (MWLP) to the Secretary of State. After an Examination in Public into the soundness of the plan had been held and reported upon by an appointed planning inspector, the County Council would be able to adopt the MWLP as its planning policy for minerals and waste. The production of a Minerals and Waste Local Plan (MWLP) was a statutory requirement for the County Council. When adopted, along with Local Plans produced by District Councils and Government Planning Policy, it would form the policy basis for decision making by the County Council when determining planning applications for proposed minerals and waste developments. Its preparation was separate from KCC's role as Waste Disposal Authority (WDA) for household (municipal) waste. It was also a distinct function from KCC's role as Planning Authority in determining minerals and waste planning applications. A list of all the planning policies in the MWLP was set out in Appendix B to the report.

(2) Hosting the Examination in Public and paying for the appointed planning inspector was the County Councils responsibility. It was estimated that it would cost up to £250,000 and a budgetary provision had been made.

(3) The future programme for the MWLP was set out in the report. When the Minerals and Waste Plan 2013-2030 was adopted, the County Council could then proceed with the formal stages of production of the Minerals and Waste Sites Plans. It was estimated that the documents could be finished, consulted upon and submitted to the Secretary of State such that they could be adopted by the County Council during April 2016. The report included details on public consultation; submission; options; legal implications; equalities implications; and delegated powers.

(4) RESOLVED that the Pre-Submission Draft Kent Minerals and Waste Local Plan (MWLP), prior to its submission to Cabinet for endorsement and onward transmission to the County Council for approval to submit the Plan to the Secretary of State be noted, subject to:

- (a) a six week period of public consultation on the plan;
- (b) no material objections being received during the public consultation; and
- (c) the Director of Planning & Environment being given delegated powers to approve any non-material changes to the MWLP in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment following on from the public consultation and to agree any amendments to the MWLP during the Examination in Public for submission to the appointed planning inspector, if the amendments were likely to resolve objections.