

Public Document Pack



Democratic Services
White Cliffs Business Park
Dover
Kent CT16 3PJ

Telephone: (01304) 821199
Fax: (01304) 872452
DX: 6312
Minicom: (01304) 820115
Website: www.dover.gov.uk
e-mail: democraticservices@dover.gov.uk

01 June 2015

Dear Councillor

I am now able to enclose, for consideration at the meeting of the **DOVER JOINT TRANSPORTATION BOARD** on Thursday 4 June 2015 at 6.00 pm, the following report that was unavailable when the agenda was printed.

4 **MINUTES** (Pages 2-5)

To confirm the Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 16 April 2015.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "Nicky", written over the printed name "Chief Executive".

Chief Executive

Minutes of the meeting of the **DOVER JOINT TRANSPORTATION BOARD** held at the Council Offices, Whitfield on Thursday, 16 April 2015 at 6.00 pm.

Present:

Chairman: Councillor N J Collor

Councillors: T A Bond
P M Brivio
G Cowan
M R Eddy
G Lymer
L B Ridings
F J W Scales
R S Walkden
P Walker

Also Present: Mrs M Burnham (Deal Town Council)
Mr K Gowland (KALC)
Mrs S Hooper (KALC)

Officers: Dover District Manager (KCC Highways, Transportation and Waste)
Traffic Engineer (KCC Highways, Transportation and Waste)
Highways and Parking Team Leader
Corporate Estate and Coastal Engineer
Democratic Support Officer

703 APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors B W Bano, J A Cronk, S C Manion, E D Rowbotham, and Mr J M Smith.

704 APPOINTMENT OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

There were no substitute Members appointed.

705 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

706 MINUTES

The minutes of the Joint Transportation Board meeting held on 26 February 2015 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

707 PROPOSED PROHIBITION OF TURNING MOVEMENTS - FELDERLAND LANE, WORTH

The Traffic Engineer introduced the report which set out proposals to introduce restrictions on turning movements into and out of Felderland Lane, Worth, a road in a largely rural area with a 30mph speed limit. Due to its location, it was frequently used as a shortcut between the A256 Eastry by-pass and the A258 Deal Road, and residents had raised concerns for a number of years over large vehicles and speeding traffic. The proposals were supported by Councillor Leyland Ridings, the KCC Member for the Division, who was intending to use his Member Highway Fund

(MHF) to fund the proposal. Of 58 responses received during consultation, 31 had supported the proposal, 25 had objected and 2 had partly supported the proposal. Members were also referred to comments circulated before the meeting from the Clerk to Easry Parish Council and a District Councillor, both of whom objected to the proposals.

Councillor L B Ridings spoke in favour of the proposals, arguing that the extra distance involved for drivers having to use the roundabouts would be just under half a mile. However, he accepted the arguments put forward regarding farm vehicles and proposed that these and emergency vehicles should be exempted from the restriction. There were serious concerns about the road and its use as a rat-run, and the proposals had been developed in order to prevent death or serious injury.

Councillor P Walker voiced concerns about the report which he felt lacked conclusive evidence to support the proposals, and the danger of vehicles doing u-turns at the Links Farm lay-by. Other locations had similar problems yet there were no proposals to address these. Furthermore, it appeared that Kent County Council's (KCC) intervention criteria had not been met. Whilst he had some sympathy for the residents of Felderland Lane, he was not convinced that the case for such restrictions had been substantiated. Councillor G Cowan agreed, commenting that it was around 18 months since speed restrictions had been introduced in Felderland Lane and these should remain without alterations. It was important to heed the concerns of the local community. However, the number of respondents for and against the proposals was close, and the report gave no indication as to whether respondents were local residents.

Councillor F J W Scales stated that he could not support what he considered to be a draconian proposal when there was no overwhelming support for it. There were clearly problems at Felderland Lane, but further evidence was needed on whether vehicle speeds had reduced since the introduction of the 30mph speed limit. Councillor T A Bond stated that he was normally in favour of the local community making local decisions, but the report failed to clarify the level of support amongst residents of Felderland Lane. He also raised concerns about drivers doing u-turns on the A258, and the likelihood that the restrictions would not be adequately enforced by Kent Police.

The Traffic Engineer advised that surveys had been conducted by local residents but he was not aware of any having been done by KCC. To his knowledge, there had been no personal injury crashes since the 30mph restriction was introduced. Councillor Ridings commented that he would use his MHF to fund a survey on traffic speeds in Felderland Lane.

RESOLVED: That it be recommended that the proposed prohibition of turning movements in Felderland Lane, Worth not be implemented.

708 HIGHWAY WORKS PROGRAMME 2014/15

The Dover District Manager (DDM) introduced the report which updated Members on works that had been approved for construction in 2014/15.

The Board was advised that the works set out in Appendix A were dependent on the weather and delivery of materials. Machine resurfacing works had been allocated commencement dates, although works to the Alkham Valley Road would not now start until 4 June. In respect of Appendix E, works to EB10 (Mount Road, Maxton to St David's Avenue, Aycliffe) had been partially completed.

Councillor M R Eddy thanked KCC for the work carried out on Dover Road, Walmer between Grams and Granville Roads. In response to a query from Councillor Bond regarding works to the A258 London Road at Sholden, the DDM advised that these were Section 38 works which were to be completed by a private developer. KCC had no control over the speed of these works since it was the developer's site. However, KCC held a bond which would enable it to step in and finish works if necessary. Furthermore, if works were not completed to KCC's satisfaction, the road would not be adopted. In respect of Hyton Drive, the DDM advised Councillor Bond that aspects of these drainage works were being carried out under Section 278 and KCC consequently had more control over them, e.g. by placing conditions on timing and the way in which the works were conducted. He undertook to ask the engineer to update Councillor Bond on progress.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

709 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 disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraphs 1 and 2 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

710 APPLICATIONS FOR DISABLED PERSONS' PARKING BAYS

The Corporate Estate and Coastal Engineer introduced the report which outlined details of six disabled persons' parking bay applications and proposed the removal of four parking bays which were no longer required.

One letter of objection had been received in respect of Application A, but no objections had been received in respect of Applications B to F following informal consultation. Since the 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. The disabled persons' parking bays detailed in Item G of the report were no longer required as the original applicants had moved, and it was therefore recommended that they be removed.

In respect of Application A, Councillor Cowan expressed concerns that the proposed bay was on the edge of zig-zags by a school patrol crossing. The school in question was due to expand in the next few years and there was currently already traffic congestion in the area. Whilst the applicant met all the criteria, the parking bay might not be appropriately positioned when expansion occurred. He advised Members that he was hoping to use his MHF to carry out improvement works in this location.

RESOLVED: (a) That it be recommended that Applications A to F 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).

(b) That it be recommended that the four disabled persons'

parking bays detailed in Item G of the report be formally advertised with the intention of removing them 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 6.40 pm.