

St. Dunstan's Regeneration Steering Group
15th January 2014 1030 to 1300
Tower House, West gate
Canterbury

MINUTES

Attendance List	Apologies for Absence	Distribution
Chair: David Brazier (Cabinet Member for Transport & Environment) DB Deputy Chair: Peter Vickery Jones (Canterbury Councillor) PVJ Richard Moore (Transportation Manager, Canterbury City Council) RM Tim Read (Kent County Council, Head of Transportation) TR Andrew Westwood (Kent County Council , Traffic Manager) AW Katie Clarke (Kent County Council) KC Martin Vye (KCC Member) MV Graham Gibbens (KCC Member) GG John Gilbey (Canterbury City Council, Leader) JG Bob Jones (Canterbury City Centre Partnership) BJ Jonathan Watts (for Paul Barrett) (Canterbury for Business) JW Philip Norwell (Managing Director, Stagecoach) PN John Todd (Kent County Council, Communications) JT	Colin Carmichael (Canterbury City Council, Chief Executive)	All Steering Group members Public

Item	Details	Action
1	Apologies for absence and opening of group by Chair and acceptance of minutes from last meeting Before the meeting began MV noted that with the intense public interest in this group, he wanted to retain the freedom to factually report back on the meeting. PN wanted to note that Stagecoach have previously stepped back from commenting at this group.	
2	Feedback from consultation data KC presented headline numbers on the responses to the consultation Comment was made on the distribution of option selection by mode of response. (Post meeting note: Online response 79% Option E, 9% Option C, 5% Option B, 3% Option D, 3% Option A. Email Option E 63%, Option A 25%, Option C 13%. Paper Option E 91%, Option C 5%, Option B 2%, Option A 1% and Option D 1%)	KC to find out
3	Features discussion AW went through each of the features and summarised the comments for each	

	<p><u>20mph speed limit</u> MV asked what the average speed is through the area at the moment Concerns were raised that 20mph do not always work, they require features or design of the road to slow traffic down, 20mph zones can also get quite expensive. 71% of responders agreed with making St Dunstan's a 20mph zone Decision: Pursue 20mph zone in St Dunstan's area</p> <p><u>Pound Lane</u> RM asked what the people of Pound Lane had responded (Post meeting note: 7 residents responded who listed Pound Lane as address – 6 were in favour of closure, 1 was unsure) BJ commented that during the trial, businesses felt trapped – would timed access be an option? JG – timed access is complicated and open to abuse RM – If leaving Westgate Towers open to traffic, closure of Pound Lane would be one less barrier to pedestrians, it would keep the flow going in to town. JG – two way traffic passing on the road is hard, with lots of pedestrian use PVJ – Know that we have to deal with the majority, but received letters from Pound Lane residents highlighting improved air quality Discussion over whether one way would be an option, but this could speed up traffic and still causes conflict with pedestrians. It may also be required to put in speed control measures. JG commented that the Gaol Café and hotel will be opening in the summer, increasing footfall in the area PN – Pound Lane could be used as an alternative route for buses (see bus section) Decision: Options will be sought on possible closure of Pound Lane for a decision by the JTB</p> <p><u>Widened footways</u> 49% of responders disagreed with widening the footways in the area. However many of these commented that the existing situation should be maintained. This decision was made without the buses using the area – if buses were to return this may affect public opinion. BJ reported that local businesses had employed more staff to cover outside areas and many were waiting on a final decision before buying outdoor furniture Interesting to find out what people who live on the street think (Post meeting note: 39 people responded with a St Dunstan's Street address – 11 Agree, 15 Disagree, 8 Don't know/unsure, 5 left blank) Decision: No proposals for further widened footways but keep the existing and replace the temporary materials.</p> <p><u>New crossing on Station Road West</u> LSTF Project money could support funds for this Detailed design process would decide which type of crossing and where best placed. Concerns over a zebra crossing raised – constant flow of pedestrian traffic would lead to congestion</p>	<p>KC to find out</p> <p>AW to organise meeting</p> <p>KC to find out</p> <p>KC to find out</p>
--	---	---

	<p>Pedestrian Guard Railing was discussed at this location and also at the North Lane crossing. (Post meeting note: North Lane and Station Road West were covered in a Pedestrian Guard Railing audit report carried out by Jacobs in 2012 however the sites were removed from the report because they formed part of the Westgate Towers Trial. The initial report suggested removing the guard rail from Station Road West but that North Lane should be retained, although the decisions in the report were never ratified as the sites were removed from the final JTB report) Railings at Station Road West would depend on the scheme – until it is decided where and what to put in. GG requested that the railings in North Lane go back in as the area was currently dangerous. RM advocated the converse argument that not having railings in would encourage walking and cycling on the route and that now pedestrians don't have to take a detour or risk jumping the barrier to take a direct route into the city. If the street scene was to change by making the area appear more like a shared space there would be less conflict between cars and other road users. Decision: A crossing for Station Road West should be installed and a full review of pedestrian guard railing for the scheme</p> <p><u>Weight limit</u> Majority (70%) of responders agreed with a weight limit in the area. It was confirmed that this would extend along Whitstable Road, including St Thomas' Hill and Blean. MV raised the issue of needing to discuss this with Haulage industry so that there are no breaches of the restriction etc. AW confirmed that FTA are currently working with KCC and they will help with targeting local businesses with the up to date information. Decision: Implement a weight restriction in the area</p> <p><u>Level Crossing</u> Decision: No action</p> <p><u>Width Restriction</u> The consultation included a commitment to protect the towers with a width restriction. Decision: Advertise a regulated width and height restriction.</p> <p><u>Buses</u> PN gave an overview of current bus usage in the area which generally showed that the out of city route (uni bus, midi bus and no.5) had shown a decrease in the number of people boarding at Westgate while the the city centre bus stops had shown an increase, but not to the same level as the decrease. Stagecoach, as the operator needs to review the city services now that the decision has been made to keep the traffic movements the same.</p>	<p>AW to organise meeting</p> <p>KCC Officers</p> <p>KCC Officers</p>
--	---	---

	<p>Stagecoach wants to have buses in the area. Their buses will not be able to go through the Towers with the width and height restriction in place. With the width restriction in place it will be a criminal offence to breach it and to damage the monument. Stagecoach wants to support regeneration of the area and want to play a part in this. Investment has been made in biofuel buses to ease pollution on these routes which now are not being used for their intended purpose.</p> <p>PN supported widened footways and stated that if traffic movements were to remain, buses would not go down towards the Towers on St Dunstan's Street but would potentially use Station Road West and service the station.</p> <p>Possible route options were discussed including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Looping round Station Road West and up to London Road This would add to pollution in the area and add to the journey time. - Going down to Kingsmead area JG raised problems of the roundabouts and congestion - Uni service using North Lane to turn around back up to uni - Access to St Peters Place through Pound Lane BJ raised concerns about the impact on traders on St Peters Place affected by the lack of bus service. Traders on St Dunstan's Street are not so affected as footfall from the train station. Stagecoach has a bus which would be small enough to use this route to provide access to this end of the city. It would mean approximately 6 buses an hour using Pound Lane. Work would have to be carried out on the road to make it suitable for buses. <p>Hopper Buses After investigation, the cheapest cost to run a Hopper service in the area was £900,000 a year which was considered unviable. Kent County Council would not want to get involved in running buses and it is unlikely that a commercial operator would choose to do so. Stagecoach has looked at the option of a narrower minibus type vehicle (approx. 20 seats) for the city service, but it would still struggle to get through and would not be commercially viable.</p> <p>Bus Gate PVJ suggested a bus gate which would allow buses round the side of the Tower. This would allow buses to use the area, and importantly remove buses from London Road. AW confirmed it was decided not to progress this idea as it would likely cause similar levels of congestion as the trial. MV reported that CAMP have requested Stagecoach attend a JTB Action: Meeting with Stagecoach, KCC and CCC to discuss possible options for routes including Pound Lane</p>	<p>PN</p> <p>PN, RM, AW</p>
--	--	---------------------------------

	Press release to include decision on Hopper Buses	JT
4	<p>Scheme decisions</p> <p>AW presented an idea submitted by the Canterbury Society which, whilst leaving the traffic movements as they are now, provided a good idea on how to improve the street scene. KCC may not have the funds for all of this, but possible addition to the LEP list (Local Enterprise Partnerships)</p> <p>Roper Road access to station mention, especially as a solution to congestion and pollution – however Canterbury City Council do not own the property on the land</p> <p>Action to investigate this in Transport Strategy</p>	RM
5	<p>Publicity</p> <p>DB suggested getting the general points out from the meeting as quickly as possible. JT confirmed a press release would be put together that afternoon so make sure it made this week's press</p>	JT to draft
6/7	<p>Next steps/Draft Program</p> <p>Draft program for meetings and TRO timeline to be produced Minutes to be released and made public</p>	KCC Officer
8	<p>Next Steering Group Meeting</p> <p>None planned at present – if required DB will request</p>	