

Minutes of the meeting of the **DOVER JOINT TRANSPORTATION BOARD** held at the Council Offices, Whitfield on Thursday, 9 June 2016 at 6.00 pm.

Present:

Chairman: Councillor N J Collor

Councillors: T A Bond  
S S Chandler  
G Cowan  
M R Eddy  
G Lymer  
S C Manion  
M J Ovenden  
D A Sargent  
P Walker

Also Present: Mr R S Walkden (Dover Town Council)  
Mr K Gowland (KALC)  
Mr A Minns (KALC)

Officers: East Kent Highway Manager (KCC Highways, Transportation and Waste)  
Street Lighting Planned Works Team Leader (KCC Highways, Transportation and Waste)  
Street Light Asset Manager (KCC Highways, Transportation and Waste)  
Head of Assets and Building Control  
Head of Community Safety, CCTV and Parking  
Highways and Parking Team Leader  
Corporate Estate and Coastal Engineer  
Democratic Support Officer

57 APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from District Councillor M J Holloway, County Councillors P M Brivio, L B Ridings and E D Rowbotham, and Mr B W Bano.

58 APPOINTMENT OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

It was noted that, in accordance with Rule 4 of the Council Procedure Rules, Councillor S S Chandler had been appointed as substitute Member for Councillor M J Holloway.

59 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

It was noted that there were no declarations of interest.

60 MINUTES

The Democratic Support Officer advised that Mrs L Burke, Mr R Frost, Mr K Gowland and Mr M Moorhouse had been omitted from the list of attendees in error, and the minutes would need to be amended accordingly.

Subject to the above amendments, the minutes of the meeting of the Joint Transportation Board held on 14 April 2016 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

61 APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN AND VICE-CHAIRMAN

It was noted that Councillors N J Collor and S C Manion had been appointed as Chairman and Vice-Chairman respectively of the Dover Joint Transportation Board by their authorities.

62 'SAFE AND SENSIBLE' STREET LIGHTING UPDATE

The Chairman advised that a representation from the Dover Society had been circulated to Members by e-mail.

The Street Light Asset Manager (SLAM) introduced the report which updated Members on the Safe and Sensible Street Lighting project. The Board had previously considered a report at its meeting held on 10 December 2015. At that meeting Members had raised concerns regarding the consultation on LED lighting which had concluded in November 2015. Those concerns had been raised with the KCC Cabinet Member, and it was confirmed that the autumn consultation had not related to the trial switch-off sites. The purpose of this report was to seek Members' views and any further information that might influence the recommendation that would go to the Environment and Transport Cabinet Committee in July 2016. In response to Councillor S C Manion, it was clarified that the costings given in the report were for LED lights.

Councillor T A Bond stated that around 10,000 houses were due to be built in Whitfield and surrounding areas which meant that Whitfield Hill would be heavily used in the coming months and years. KCC had spent more than £2,000 on the consultation which was what would be saved each year by switching off these lights. He was of the view that the lights should remain. Councillor G Lymer urged KCC to retain the lights. There had been fatal and serious injury accidents on Whitfield Hill during the last 5 to 10 years. The route was frequently used by night-shift workers at the industrial zone. He expressed concerns that the lorry escape route was on the bend next to the footpath. With no lighting on this bend, it was an accident waiting to happen. When viewed against the cost of each road fatality at £1 million, the minimal savings that would be achieved by switching off the lights were simply not worth it.

In response to Councillor G Cowan, the SLAM confirmed that reflective markers would be installed. Councillor Cowan stated that he could not support the proposal which would put people's lives at risk and save only £2,000 per annum over 15 years.

In respect of the A257 Ash By-Pass, Councillor S S Chandler commented that lighting made no difference to what was a bad junction. However, Councillor Cowan disagreed, arguing that it was not worth removing columns to save such small amounts of money, particularly when LED replacements would offer further savings in the long term. Councillor M R Eddy agreed, stating that lights were most definitely needed at the junction if it were used by agricultural workers who were unfamiliar with the roads and/or conditions.

Councillor Bond and Councillor P Walker commented that it made no sense to keep the lights off at Betteshanger Road when the district was trying to attract investment

for growth and regeneration. Councillor S C Manion disagreed, stating that there was no sense in keeping the lights on while the road was not in use. Councillor Lymer supported the proposal, arguing that it was an unused road and taxpayers' money should be saved where possible. Councillor Cowan believed the columns should be fitted with LED lights and switched on immediately. Councillor Eddy concurred, pointing out that it would cost only around £1,200 to switch all of the lights back on.

Councillor Cowan commented that he could not accept lights being switched off in the built-up area at Farthingloe. He corrected comments attributed to him in the report, advising that it was houses that had been burgled and not the farm shop. In his view, there were sixteen columns in total that were crucial and should be switched back on, these being all the columns from the 40mph zone to columns GAP 83 and 82. He was not asking for all the lights to be switched back on and, indeed, was content for those columns heading towards Capel to be removed. Councillor Lymer agreed but argued that all the lights should be retained due to the large development at Farthingloe.

Councillor Eddy reminded Members that the Campaign to Protect Rural England was litigating against Dover District Council to try to prevent the Farthingloe development. However, should the development go ahead, the columns would need to be re-instated. Due to measures on the A20, Folkestone Road was currently being heavily used by traffic entering and exiting the town. In his view all the columns should be retained. Several Members agreed, arguing that it would be nonsensical to remove all the columns, knowing that they might have to be reinstated for the Farthingloe development which would see over 500 houses built.

The SLAM advised that it cost £1,500 to install a new column. She would report Members' views to the Cabinet Member. However, there was likely to be a cost in leaving the columns in place as they would still require maintenance. This matter would be investigated with UK Power Networks.

Councillor S C Manion, with the support of five other Members present, requested that voting on the Whitfield and Farthingloe proposals be recorded in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 18.4.

RESOLVED: That it be recommended to the KCC Cabinet Member:

- (a) That the street lights on Whitfield Hill be retained and lighting re-instigated for the safety of road users.
- (b) That the street lights on the A257 Ash By-Pass be retained.
- (c) That the lights on Betteshanger Road be switched on immediately and kept on permanently.
- (d) That 22 lights (the 6 referred to in the report recommendation plus a further 16 from the 40mph zone to GAPS 82 and 83) at Farthingloe be switched back on immediately and converted to LED in due course.
- (e) That all other columns at Farthingloe be retained and switched off until such time as the Farthingloe development is constructed. Reflective strips should be fitted to these columns.

(Councillors T A Bond, S S Chandler, N J Collor, G Cowan, D G Cronk, M R Eddy, G Lymer, S C Manion, M J Ovenden, D A Sargent and P Walker voted for the motions on proposals relating to Whitfield Hill and Farthingloe. There were no votes against the motions or abstentions.)

63 ALBERT ROAD AND SOUTHWALL ROAD, DEAL: PROPOSED LINK ROAD

The East Kent Highway Manager (EKHM) introduced the report which outlined proposals for a new highway linking Albert Road to Southwall Road, Deal.

Councillor Bond welcomed the proposal but referred to potential problems for HGVs. In some parts of Albert Road it was impossible for HGVs to pass each other. An HGV turning left at the fire station would not be able to go forward or reverse if it met an HGV coming in the other direction. There had been a suggestion that there would be a traffic signal which would operate in coordination with the level crossing. He questioned whether these issues had been addressed by the developer/KCC. He also queried what measures would be taken for drainage. Councillor Eddy agreed that HGVs would have difficulty negotiating the railway bridge, and could cause traffic mayhem near the level crossing. The linkage to Minter's Yard would be beneficial, but an opportunity had been lost to provide a better solution which took pressure off Matthews Close, Southwall Road and Middle Deal Road. This was inevitably governed by the fact that part of the funding was coming from the private sector. He also questioned whether a cycle route had been incorporated into the design. Councillors Bond and Eddy stressed that these points should be taken back to the KCC Cabinet Member, and would need to be addressed when the application came before Planning Committee.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

64 CHANNEL VIEW ROAD AND POULTON CLOSE, DOVER - LORRY PARKING PROHIBITION PROPOSALS

The Head of Community Safety, CCTV and Parking (HCSCP) introduced the report which outlined proposals to introduce parking restrictions for heavy goods vehicles (HGVs). Fly-parking was a serious issue for Dover as it was the entry and exit point for every HGV. Informal agreement had been reached some while ago between Dover, Ashford and Shepway Councils to introduce clamping. This approach had been trialled in Ashford and had proved successful. However, clamping was not financially viable and there were legislative issues. Shepway had since introduced an HGV ban across its district. The measures taken in Ashford and Shepway had transferred the problem to Dover. A survey had been undertaken by the Council's Civil Enforcement Officers (CEOs) and the information passed to Kent County Council (KCC).

In 2014/15, 614 Penalty Charge Notices (PCNs) for Poulton Close, Coombe Valley Road and Channel View Road had been issued. Whilst it was not possible to differentiate between types of vehicles, it was known that of the 614 PCNs issued, 70 had been issued to lorries parked wholly or partly on footways (Code 61). In 2015/16, 738 PCNs had been issued, of which 136 were Code 61. From 1 April 2016 to date, 236 PCNs had been issued, of which 63 were Code 61. Officers wished to address the increase by prohibiting lorry parking in Poulton Close and Channel View Road.

Mr Walkden welcomed the proposal but regretted that it had not come sooner. He would have liked to see the prohibition extended as soon as possible. The

Chairman advised that the Council had not taken action before now as it had been waiting for the results of the Ashford pilot. Shepway had gone its own way, and DDC was now breaking away from the informal agreement as it did not want to see HGVs moving into residential areas. Councillor Cowan commented that Coombe Valley Road was particularly bad, with an illegal lorry park there creating noise and pollution for local residents. He welcomed the proposal and queried whether drivers paid an on-the-spot fine when clamped.

The HCSCP advised that drivers were expected to pay immediately when issued with a Fixed Penalty Notice by the police. If clamped, HGV drivers would also need to pay a fee to be released. The recommendation was to introduce a ban rather than clamping at this stage. Bans had proved effective in other areas, but there were presently no plans to introduce a district-wide ban as that could potentially lead to other problems. The East Kent Highway Manager (EKHM) advised that a lot of work was being done with Kent Police and local authorities to look at the bigger picture as they did not want to push problems into other districts. 150 local police officers across county had been trained to issue PCNs. If drivers were unable to pay, the vehicle would be impounded. A count of illegally and inappropriately parked lorries would take place this week. The HCSCP advised that a PCN was a non-criminal punishment issued by CEOs. A Fixed Penalty Notice was a criminal punishment issued by the police. A debt agency was used to recover fines which were pursued where possible.

RESOLVED: That Parking Services be permitted to draw up plans to prohibit lorry parking along appropriate sections of Channel View Road and Poulton Close, Dover, and to formally advertise the proposals. (The results of the consultation will be presented to a future meeting of the Board to make its recommendation.)

## 65 PARKING RESTRICTION PROPOSALS - SANDWICH AND EASTRY

The Parking Operations Manager (POM) introduced the report which detailed three proposals for consideration. The first was a loading prohibition to protect access to Watts Yard which was behind the Guildhall in Sandwich. It was confirmed that Sandwich Town Council and Age Concern had been consulted and supported the scheme. The second proposal concerned the extension of a loading bay outside premises in Strand Street, Sandwich which was currently too short for a commercial vehicle. In response to a proposal from Councillor M J Ovenden that the restriction apply from Monday to Saturday only, the POM agreed that this could be done but advised that such a change would require re-advertisement. However, this would afford the opportunity to re-consult Sandwich Town Council whose views on the proposal were not presently known. The third proposal, supported by Eastry Parish Council, was to introduce a limited waiting restriction outside a parade of shops on Eastry High Street.

In response to the Chairman, the POM confirmed that authorising the Chairman and Vice-Chairman to consider and determine any objections received would speed up the process. This would be of particular benefit for Sandwich Town Council which was keen for the Watts Yard scheme to be implemented as soon as possible. No objections had been received to date.

RESOLVED: (a) That it be recommended that, subject to the Strand Street proposal being amended to operate from Monday to Saturday only and re-advertised accordingly, and there being no written objections received before 12.00 noon on 20 June 2016, Kent

County Council seals the three proposed parking schemes detailed in the report.

(b) That it be recommended that, should any objections for any scheme be received before 12.00 noon on 20 June 2016, the Chairman and Vice-Chairman be authorised to consider the objections and decide whether to recommend, on behalf of the Board, that Kent County Council seals all or any of the three proposed schemes or to refer all or any of the schemes back to the Board for further consideration.

## 66 REVIEW OF DISABLED PERSONS' PARKING BAY PROCEDURES

The Head of Assets and Building Control (HABC) introduced the report which outlined proposals to streamline the process for disabled parking bay applications to ensure that those in need of a bay got it as quickly as possible.

The Board was informed that a review had been undertaken of the services provided by the department to establish that they were delivered efficiently and by the most appropriate member of staff. The review had identified that there were long delays for those applying for disabled parking bays. These were caused by the current practice of placing two advertisements in the press and referring applications to the Board for a decision.

The installation of a disabled parking bay required a Traffic Regulation Order, notice of which the authority was required by legislation to place in the press. However, notices were usually consolidated to save money and this often led to delays. A further notice was issued once the parking bay had been installed, leading to yet more delays. To try and avoid delays caused by objections being raised during the formal notice period, the current practice was also to undertake an informal consultation with neighbours before the statutory advertisement period. This generated more comments than the formal consultation period which generated relatively few objections. By advertising twice in the press, the authority was doing more than it was statutorily required to do. It was therefore proposed to place a public notice at the site and on the Council's website during informal consultation, and another in the press during formal consultation.

Further delay was caused by referring applications to the Board for a decision. In the vast majority of cases, the Board was merely rubber-stamping Officers' recommendations. It was therefore proposed that, in the future, Officers would determine straightforward applications, subject to consultation with the Chairman and/or Vice-Chairman. The Board would then receive a report on the applications that had been determined at its next meeting.

Members welcomed the proposals, stating that most applications were uncontentious and delays of three months or more were unacceptable. There was agreement that the only applications that should be referred to the Board for a decision were those that had received significant objections or where there were complications, such as general problems with parking in the street.

**RESOLVED:** (a) That future disabled parking bay applications should be determined as per the Procedural Guidance set out at Appendix A to the report, subject to (b) below.

(b) That the Dover Joint Transportation Board should be consulted on disabled parking bay applications where there are complications, e.g. a significant number of objections received or general parking problems.

67 HIGHWAY WORKS PROGRAMME 2016/17

The East Kent Highway Manager (EKHM) presented the report which updated Members on works that had been approved for construction in 2016/17.

In respect of Appendix A, the Board was advised that considerable consultation had been undertaken with businesses over proposed works to Menzies Road, Whitfield. A meeting with KCC's resurfacing manager and the contractor was due to be held at the end of July to discuss how the works would be carried out. On Appendix B, the EKHM advised that the installation of a new drainage system at Nash Road, Ash had started on 6 June and was due to be completed by the end of July. In respect of Appendix C, Members were advised that street lighting works in Dover which the report described as being already completed were not, in fact, due to be completed until the end of June.

Schemes in Sandwich, Dover and Wingham Well, outlined in Appendix D1, were currently on hold awaiting funding. Improvement works to South Street, Deal were largely finished pending some minor issues such as obstruction by parked cars. In response to Councillor Cowan, the EKHM undertook to raise the lack of a sign warning of a speed limit change from 30mph to 20mph at Capel-le-Ferne. In respect of Appendix E, the Board was advised that works to the A20 York Street and Prince of Wales roundabouts had already started. The EKHM undertook to find out for Councillor Chandler the timetable for Section 278 works at The Street, Preston. The Chairman commented that traffic calming works to Castle Street had not proved very effective.

In response to a point raised by Councillor Eddy, the HABC advised that the Council owned 76 bus shelters. In addition to these, 46 shelters had been provided by J C Decaux under a contract which had expired the preceding year. These would be removed by J C Decaux and replaced by Adspace, the new contractor, shortly. In response to Councillor Eddy, the HABC undertook to find out whether the bus shelter in front of the fire station in Deal would be replaced. He recognised that the location of the bus shelter in front of the Bengal Spice restaurant was not ideal and presented problems, but undertook to revisit this matter. Councillor Eddy updated Members that, thanks partly to the generosity of Walmer Parish Council, gateway works at Kingsdown Road, Walmer were due to start on 4/5 July.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

68 EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

That, under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the remainder of the business on the grounds that the item to be considered involves the likely discussion of exempt information as defined in paragraphs 1 and 2 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

69 APPLICATIONS FOR DISABLED PERSONS' PARKING BAYS

The Corporate Estate and Coastal Engineer (CECE) introduced the report which outlined details of seven disabled persons' parking bay applications. Following

informal consultation, no letters of objection had been received in respect of Applications B, C, D, F and G. Since these applications met all the criteria, it was recommended that they proceed to the second stage of formal advertisement and, thereafter, be sealed by KCC should no objections be received during the advertisement period.

One letter of objection had been received in respect of Applications A and E but, since they met all the criteria, it was recommended that these applications also be progressed to the second stage. In response to the Chairman, the CECE undertook to refer a suggestion for double yellow lines from a respondent on Application E to KCC Highways for further investigation.

**RESOLVED:** That it be recommended that Applications A, B, C, D, E, F and G be formally advertised and, in the event that no objections are received, they be recommended for sealing by Kent County Council (with any objections being referred back to a future meeting of the Dover Joint Transportation Board for further consideration).

The meeting ended at 7.58 pm.