

18 September 2007

**KENT COUNTY COUNCIL**

---

**HIGHWAYS ADVISORY BOARD**

MINUTES of a meeting of the Highways Advisory Board held on Tuesday, 18 September 2007 at Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone.

PRESENT: Mr R F Manning (Chairman), Mr J R Bullock, MBE, Miss S J Carey, Mr I S Chittenden, Mr C G Findlay, Mr W A Hayton, Mr C J Law, Mr J I Muckle, Mr R J E Parker (substitute for Mr T J Birkett), Mr R A Pascoe, Mr A R Poole, Mrs P A V Stockell, Mr R Tolputt and Mr R Truelove.

IN ATTENDANCE: Mr D Hall, County Transportation Manager; Mr D Cook, Technical Director; Mr J Farmer, Regeneration and Projects Manager; Mr K Hills, Business Transformation Director; Mr I Procter, Road Safety Manager; Mr A Riley, Technical Director; and the Head of Democratic Services (represented by Mrs K Mannering).

Prior to the commencement of the meeting the Chairman welcomed visitors from Maidstone Borough Council and Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, representing the External Overview and Scrutiny Committee, set up to review the relationship with Kent Highways.

A list of questions had previously been submitted to the Chairman who had, in consultation with officers, responded prior to the meeting. Copies of both questions and answers were circulated to Members.

**UNRESTRICTED ITEMS**

**1. Membership**  
*(Item 1)*

The Board noted that Mr I S Chittenden had replaced Mr D S Daley.

**2. Minutes**  
*(Item 4)*

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting held on 10 July 2007 are correctly recorded and that they be signed by the Chairman.

**3. Transformation Update**  
*(Item 5 – Oral report by Business Transformation Director)*

(1) The Business Transformation Director updated the Board on the current position/progress of the Highway Service in Kent. Mr Hills referred to:-

Areas for Improvement

- Improved response
- Improved control and risk

18 September 2007

- Improved efficiency and performance
- Improved customer satisfaction

### Processes

Look at the process, should we even be doing some of them? Completed full assessment in the first half of this year.

### Structure (People)

Consultation started on 1 June (staff briefings, roadshows, Personnel 1 to 1's)

- Heads of Service – 30 days – End of June
- Internal applicants interviewed/appointed in July
- Main structure – 90 days – End August

Final draft structure now being considered by new Managing Director, Adam Wilkinson and Cabinet Member for Environment, Highways and Waste, Keith Ferrin.

Target was to commence the new structure from January 2008, as originally planned.

### Accommodation

Ashford – Started in July 2007 would be complete in July 2008

Haysden – Started in July 2007 would be completed in December 2007

Wrotham – subject of a Judicial Review consideration

### IT

Proof of concept completed, final details being agreed on the software packages and the delivery programme.

Hardware requirements being sourced

Mobile technology – supporting mobile working

(2) Following a question and answer session, Mr Hills undertook to provide a written progress report in future, to enable Members to evaluate performance. Mr Truelove referred to the standing item that was submitted to the meetings of the Environment and Regeneration Policy Overview Committee, and the possibility of the same item being submitted to the Board.

(3) The Board noted the report.

## **4. Transportation and Safety Package Programme 2008/09** *(Item 6 – Report by Head of Transport and Development Planning)*

(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). The funding had been provided to support local transport schemes that delivered the LTP, which itself set out the County Council's approach to achieving a number of key transport objectives, including:-

18 September 2007

- 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; and
- Improve local air quality, particularly in designated Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs).

(2) Kent's LTP funding for 2008/09 included a capital allocation of £12.883m, which consisted of borrowing approvals and grant and was specifically for the implementation of Integrated Transport (IT) schemes. As a Floor Authority, KCC had determined that the allocation should be capped at a level to which the borrowing element could be fully supported. Therefore, the actual funding allocation for 2008/09 had been determined by the County Council's Medium Term Financial Plan and was subsequently set at £9.1m for 2008/09. Whilst the lower allocation represented a shortfall when compared to the Government's initial LTP settlement for 2008/09, it did represent a significant increase in scheme funding for Kent when compared to previous years; in 2007/08, funding was set at £7.3m.

(3) The report provided a summary of the 126 schemes that made up the proposed Transportation and Safety Package Programme for 2008/09 and provided details of how Kent's £9.1m investment programme would be allocated across the County. The schemes proposed for 2008/09 were presented in order of District and included the individual PIPKIN Score, Scheme Priority Rating and Scheme Rank (out of 126 schemes) and were shown in Appendix 1 of the report.

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

(5) A report outlining the principles and a proposal to implement PIPKIN was presented to the Board in July 2006, and was approved by the Cabinet Member for Environment, Highways and Waste on the strength of the recommendations of the Board. The introduction of PIPKIN had 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 provided 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 the schemes equated to more than £20m. The proposed Transportation and Safety Package Programme for 2008/09 included 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 was that it was closely aligned to the Transforming KHS programme delivery timetable. The emerging delivery timetable required the annual Transportation and Safety Package Programme to be presented to

18 September 2007

the Board earlier in the scheme concept, design and build process. Therefore the proposed programme for 2008/09 was presented to the Board in September 2007, rather than in March 2008.

(8) Kent's scheme priorities for 2008/09 provided 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 included 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 included:-

- Continuation of Kent's pilot **UTMC** project, which had already delivered the County's Traffic Control Centre in Maidstone. (Funding in 2008/09 - £500K).
- Phase 1 of improvements to the Maidstone **Bridge Gyratory 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).
- 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).

(10) The proposed Transportation and Safety Package Programme for 2008/09 represented a balanced programme of investment for Kent. The schemes presented above demonstrated the strategic nature of the proposed programme. A key strength of the PIPKIN process and therefore the programmes of investment derived from it, was that whilst PIPKIN recognised the need to tackle strategically important issues it also recognised the genuine need to tackle local priorities. This feature had 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. The approach also enabled Kent to prioritise local safety schemes using local data relating to personal injury crashes.

(11) During debate Mr Hall stated that the rejection list would be circulated to Members.

(12) The Board:-

- (a) supported the proposals for recommendation to the Cabinet Member for Environment, Highways and Waste that:-

18 September 2007

- (i) the proposed Transportation and Safety Package Programme for 2008/09, as set out in Appendix 1 of the report, be approved; and
  - (ii) the Joint Transportation Boards receive a report on the approved schemes for their area; and
- (b) agreed to provide ongoing support for the development and application of Kent's Scheme Prioritisation Model, PIPKIN.

*(The list referred to in paragraph (11) above was subsequently circulated to Members on 12 October)*

## **5. A New Tree Policy for Kent Highway Services**

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

(1) Kent Highway Services was responsible for maintaining and developing the highway network in Kent and ensuring the safety of its users. As part of Kent County Council it had a wider role in managing and enhancing the environment and, as part of its commitment to safety and to the environment, it aimed to sustain a balanced and healthy highway tree population. The roles could 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) The policy set out the strategic objectives on which KHS would base the management and enhancement of the highway tree stock. It would be reviewed annually and when there were significant changes in legislation or best practice recommendations.

(3) Arising from the objectives was a set of operational processes which defined how they were to be met on a day to day basis. The highest priority for funding was to ensure the safety of the highway. Other objectives would be met or worked towards as budgets permitted.

(4) The policy recognised the need to develop an inventory of all highway trees and information arising from data collected and managed in the inventory would inform future management decisions and help plan future funding to meet those objectives. The new policy for trees was set out in Appendices 1 and 2 of the report.

(5) The Board supported the proposal for recommendation to the Cabinet Member for Environment, Highways and Waste that the tree policy as set out in Appendices 1 and 2 of the report, be adopted.

## **6. Progress Report on Major Capital Projects**

*(Item 8 – Report by Capital Programme Manager)*

(1) Further to Minute 3 of 6 March 2007, the report provided an update on progress of the major transport and highway schemes. The Board welcomed the reports and the intention was to continue to provide them half yearly and when there were important issues to bring to Members' notice. 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. The first 6 months of 2007/08 had been dominated by the considerable efforts of the Team in trying to progress the Growth Area schemes in Kent Thameside and Ashford that were constrained by the funding deadline of 31 March 2008.

(2) Several schemes had been recognised in various industry awards:-

18 September 2007

#### Fastrack

- National Transport Awards 2007 – Winner of the bus category. This was a major achievement as the National Transport Awards were probably the most prestigious of the many transport awards.
- Certificate of Excellence –2007 from HST Integration Project. HST was the Interreg funded initiative for accessibility improvements related to the high-speed train network in Northwest Europe.
- Jacobs Performance Excellence Award 2007 – This was 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

(3) 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 was set out in the Appendix to the report. For brevity, only some of the background provided in previous reports was provided with the focus given to activity in the last half year.

(4) In the last half year, there had been substantial progress and the key milestone achievements had 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.

18 September 2007

- 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 had identified 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.

(5) The key problems in the period had 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 had demanded a rethink on the junction layout at Ridham Avenue.

(6) The Board noted the report.

## **7. A228 Snodland Bypass Dualling – Red Lion Public House**

*(Item 9 – Report by Capital Programme Manager)*

(1) An outline design for the future dualling of A228 Snodland Bypass was approved in 1992. The scheme was 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 was not programmed and the property was a deteriorating asset and not capable of beneficial use. The report proposed an amended outline design for the bypass dualling that would allow the property to be declared surplus.

(2) The A228 was a key strategic route within the County and had been incrementally improved over the years. A single carriageway bypass of Snodland was constructed in 1983. The A228 was 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 were about 20,000 and this was 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 had confirmed the figure and forecasts for 2022 were 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 was sufficient to safely and efficiently accommodate the predicted future year flows. The County Council did 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 had 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 had not arisen and on present

18 September 2007

knowledge it was unlikely this would happen in the foreseeable future. However, the A228 remained a key route and it was considered appropriate to retain proposals for the dualling of the bypass.

(4) The public house was located at the end of the High Street. Maintaining a reliable tenancy had always been difficult and maintenance liability had 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 had 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.

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

(6) The consultant, Jacobs, had been commissioned to see whether an amended scheme for a future dualling of the bypass that did not affect the public house could 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 was possible. In the event of the bypass dualling proceeding, the amended alignment would require a 50mph speed limit. While the Police often had reservations about such limits it was probable that such a limit would be considered in any event. The corridor through Snodland was semi-urban in nature, only about 2.5km between roundabouts and with intermediate junctions at Rocfort Road and Brook Street.

(7) As there was no immediate likelihood of the scheme being progressed the general principles of the 1992 approved scheme had been retained and the focus of investigation had 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.

(8) The financial implications for the County Council were 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 had not been estimated but a broad view had been taken about the cost difference between the existing scheme and the proposed scheme. The view was that it was probably cost neutral or that any increased cost was marginal when considered in the context of the overall cost. While costs would 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.

(9) Formal public consultation had not been carried out or considered appropriate because the alignment amendments were fairly subtle and the overall scheme remained generally within the highway boundary. No private property was affected and extensive consultation would unnecessarily raise expectations or concerns for a scheme that was not programmed and might never happen.

(10) Snodland Town Council had 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. Similarly, Tonbridge & Malling Joint Transportation Board meeting, on 10 September, supported the proposal.

18 September 2007

(11) The Board supported the proposals for recommendation to the Cabinet Member for Environment, Highways & Waste that:-

- (a) the scheme for the dualling of A228 Snodland Bypass shown on Drawing No. 102408/3A be abandoned;
- (b) the revised scheme for A228 Snodland Bypass shown on Drawing No. B0659000/3 be approved for development control and land charge purposes; and
- (c) the Red Lion public house be declared surplus to highway requirements.

## **8. KHS Winter Service Review**

*(Item 10 – Report by Director of Kent Highway Services)*

(1) Further to Minute 12 of 19 September 2006, the report gave information relating to the winter of 2006/07 and sought approval of the Winter Service Policy and Plan for 2007/08. The winter service policy required precautionary salting on 'A' and 'B' and other busy roads (as defined in the policy statement paragraph 2.1.2) where frost/ice was likely to form on road surfaces. An analysis of winter weather and the action taken by KHS for 2006/07 was contained in Annex A; a table of forecast accuracy and other performance indicators were given in Annex B; and a statistical comparison of winter activities for the 2006/07 winter with the preceding four years was given in Annex C of the report.

(2) 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. Overall the winter was exceptionally mild but also with some very brief snow interludes.

(3) The KHS winter service budget for 2006/07 was £2,425,000 and the outturn 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 had been funded from the corporate emergency fund. The budget for 2007/08 had been set at £2,225,000.

(4) The winter service contractor for the winter of 2006/07 was Ringway Infrastructure Services for the whole county. Ringway Infrastructure Services would be the service provider for the coming winter within the alliance partnership agreement formed by Kent Highway Services. The Meteorological Office supplied forecast services for the winter of 2006/07 under a five-year agreement, which lasted until 2008. The Board agreed the arrangement in 2003. The ice prediction service was provided by Vaisala Ltd and performed well over the season. It was proposed to continue the relationship with Vaisala Ltd. for the coming winter.

(5) The Winter Service Policy 2007/08 was given in Appendix D of the report. There were no significant changes to the policy for the forthcoming winter. Copies of the Winter Service Plan for 2007/08 had been placed in the Members' Room.

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

18 September 2007

(7) 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 was 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 had increased from 35km to 45km but all routes were still able to be completed within the times laid down in policy.

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

- (a) the Winter Service Policy and Plan for 2007/08 be approved; and
- (b) the continuation of the arrangement with Vaisala Ltd. for the provision of ice prediction computer services be agreed.

## **9. The Traffic Management Act – Awnings and Light Canopies Overhanging the Highway**

*(Item 11 – Report by Director, Kent Highway Services)*

(1) The Traffic Management Act, which received Royal Assent in July 2004, required 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 described how an Authority should meet the requirements of the Traffic Management Act 2004. As part of the Network Management Duty the local Highway Authority was tasked with ensuring that any street furniture or structure either on or overhanging the highway did 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, was taken into account.

(2) In the County of Kent, the obligation rested 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 had powers to grant licences to others to legitimise the placing of structures that overhang the highway. The powers could make provision for any term or condition which the Highway Authority declared 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 had been a marked increase in the number of applications from businesses in Kent to erect awnings or light canopies on their premises.

(4) In order to meet the requirements of the Traffic Management Act 2004 and the associated Network Management Duties it was necessary to put a Policy 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. The Policy would regulate features such as permissible height, structural design, erection and maintenance of the structures.

(5) The Policy would set out the processes to be considered when applying for a licence to place an awning or light canopy over the public highway. It would also outline the criteria that must be considered by an applicant, the good practice that should be

18 September 2007

followed and the conditions to be adhered to by the applicant. The Policy would 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.

(6) The Board supported the proposal for recommendation to the Cabinet Member for Environment, Highways and Waste that approval be given to the publication of the Policy for the Location and Licensing of Awnings and Light Canopies over the Public Highway.

**11. Local Public Service Agreement 2 (Road Safety)**  
*(Item 12 – Report by Director of Kent Highway Services)*

(1) Kent County Council launched the LPSA2 project in October 2004. The aim of the LPSA2 project was 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 31 December 2007. The challenging target was being addressed by a partnership of key players drawing on the contribution of their particular skills and resources for our collective benefit. The report provided an update on progress to date, an overview of activities undertaken so far and plans for the remainder of the project.

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

(3) The approach to the project had been to integrate the known benefits of education, enforcement, engineering and evaluation. The main thrust of the Road Safety team's work had 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.

(4) The activities were in addition to planned public education work. A co-ordinated approach between public education and planned programmes of engineering work ensured that added value was gained during localised projects. We also liaised with Kent Police and Kent Fire and Rescue to identify shared priorities and plans wherever possible, and worked together in joint initiatives whenever it was appropriate to do so.

(5) The research led approach had identified the main areas of concern as dangerous and illegal speed, road user impairment and lack of awareness. The research also helped to identify that we needed to continue delivering a strategy of public education, alongside existing programmes of work and that we needed to particularly engage with drivers and motorcyclists.

(6) Appendix A of the report showed the planned publicity campaigns and public engagement projects to March 2008, all were supported by robust media and public relations engagement. All activities to date were either completed or on-going.

*(Appendix A of the report had been omitted at the time of printing. Copies would be circulated to the Board following the meeting).*

(7) The Road Safety Manager was confident that the PSA2 project target would be met, but it was not a foregone conclusion. However, achievement of the PSA2 target on 31 December 2007 did 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

18 September 2007

for 2010, Dept. of the Environment, Transport and the Regions, 2000). The targets were, 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 was a risk that we would be unable to sustain the casualty reduction success achieved between 2000 and 2007. It was important that the Road Safety team were able to maintain an adequately funded programme of public education beyond the PSA2 project, thereby reinforcing previous work and increasing potential to meet the 2010 national casualty reduction targets.

(9) The Road Safety team were 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 were 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

(10) Following discussion Mr Procter undertook to report back on completion of the LPSA2.

(11) The Board noted the report.

## **12. KHS Road Safety Position Statement on Minibus Driving within Kent County Council**

*(Item 13 – Report by Director of Kent Highway Services)*

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

(2) Since the publication of the Code of Practice there had 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 might not be aware of recent developments, or might choose to ignore them. There was a concern that units within KCC might be unaware of best practice developments on driving related issues and that this could be exposing KCC, its staff and customers to avoidable risk.

18 September 2007

(3) To overcome the concern the Road Safety team had developed a Position Statement that covered a range of key issues related to minibus driving safety. The purpose of the Position Statement was 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.

(4) The Board supported the proposal for recommendation to the Cabinet Member for Environment, Highways and Waste that the Highways Advisory Board approve the Position Statement as set out in the Appendix to the report.

Following the meeting, the Chairman invited comments/questions from the Borough Councils' representatives. Issues raised related to the Kent Association of Parish Councils' membership on Joint Transportation Boards and the inability of representatives to vote or propose a motion or amendment; the KHS Contact Centre; and circulation of the KHS Newsheet.

Arrangements would be made for JTBs to:-

- (a) visit the Contact Centre; and
- (b) attend a PIPKIN seminar.