

Minutes of the meeting of the **DOVER JOINT TRANSPORTATION BOARD** held at the Council Offices, Whitfield on Thursday, 10 September 2015 at 6.00 pm.

Present:

Chairman: Councillor S C Manion (Items 11-17 only)

Councillors: S F Bannister (Items 11-16 only)
T A Bond
P M Brivio
P I Carter
N J Collor
G Cowan (Items 11-17 only)
M R Eddy
T P Johnstone
G Lymer
M J Ovenden
E D Rowbotham
D A Sargent

Also Present: Mr B W Bano (Deal Town Council)
Mr P M Wallace (Dover Town Council) (Items 15-21 only)
Mr M W Moorhouse (Sandwich Town Council)
Mr K Gowland (KALC)

Officers: Dover District Manager (KCC Highways and Transportation)
East Kent Highway Manager (KCC Highways and Transportation)
Traffic and Safety Team Leader (KCC Highways and Transportation)
Project Engineer (KCC Highways and Transportation)
Highways and Parking Team Leader
Corporate Estate and Coastal Engineer
Democratic Support Officer

11 APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors L B Ridings, P Walker, Mr R J Frost and Mrs S E Hooper.

12 APPOINTMENT OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

It was noted that, in accordance with Rule 4 of the Council's Procedure Rules, Councillor S F Bannister had been appointed as a substitute Member for Councillor P Walker.

13 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

It was noted that there were no declarations of interest.

14 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting of the Joint Transportation Board held on 4 June 2015 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

15 PROPOSED RAISED TABLES - NEW STREET AND HIGH STREET, SANDWICH

The Traffic and Safety Team Leader (TSTL) presented the report which outlined proposals to install four raised tables in High Street and New Street, Sandwich in response to measures requested by residents through the local Kent County Council (KCC) Member, Councillor Leyland Ridings. The scheme, which would be funded by Section 106 monies, had strong support from Sandwich Town Council, Sandwich Town Team and Stagecoach. The proposals were designed to improve pedestrian safety and reduce the speed of traffic using the town's one-way system. Traffic surveys, carried out from 18 May, had shown that average speeds had been 19.2mph in the High Street and 22mph in New Street. There were limitations on where the tables could be placed, but it was intended to site them in the vicinity of the town's main pedestrian routes.

Councillor P I Carter proposed that recommendation 4.2 of the Officer's report should be taken forward. A good deal of work had been done by Sandwich Town Team and the scheme ticked all the boxes. Councillor N J Collor supported the scheme since it had Stagecoach's support, but expressed concerns about the number of responses received after the deadline and the poor response rate. Mr Moorhouse advised that Sandwich Town Team had contacted some High Street residents who had not responded to the consultation. They had indicated their support for the proposals, thus increasing the overall number of residents in favour of the scheme.

Councillor G Cowan questioned the need for the tables, given the average speed of traffic using the roads. The number of consultation responses had been very low and, in his opinion, the tables would look unsightly. Councillor M J Ovenden expressed concerns about option 4.2 since it was not clear what would happen in the event that the vibration and core surveys indicated that the tables would cause damage to buildings. Councillor M R Eddy agreed, adding that traffic speeds were generally compliant and the streets narrow, and the money could therefore be spent more productively elsewhere. Councillor S F Bannister commented that the tables were unlikely to be effective at slowing down the minority of drivers who were the real target of these measures. In response to Councillor Bannister, the TSTL confirmed that the Sandwich town area was not a KCC priority for casualty reduction measures. Councillor T A Bond stated that he was very much in favour of giving local people what they wanted. However, he too had concerns about the very poor consultation response and believed that the money could be better spent elsewhere.

Mr Moorhouse and Councillor Carter expressed concerns about some Members' responses. The proposals were part of a wider plan to address longstanding traffic problems in Sandwich, including traffic speeds and HGVs striking buildings. It appeared that some Members were unaware of these. A considerable amount of time, effort and money had been put into resolving these problems, and it was disappointing that Members were not more sympathetic.

It was moved by Councillor P I Carter and duly seconded that Option 4.2 of the report should be progressed. On being put to the vote, the motion was LOST.

Councillor Eddy opined that there was a reasonable case for taking measures in New Street. If it could be clearly demonstrated that the measures were effective there, then further measures could be implemented in the High Street. It was incumbent upon Members to consider the outcome and potential efficacy of measures taken, not the amount of money that had been spent to date.

RESOLVED: (a) That, taking into account the number of objections to the proposals in High Street, it be recommended that the proposed scheme there be abandoned and further investigations be made into other options.

(b) That it be recommended that the raised tables in New Street should proceed as proposed in the consultation.

16

PROPOSED HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENTS TO SOUTH STREET, DEAL

The Project Engineer (PE) introduced the report which outlined proposed highway improvements to South Street. These would be funded by a specific allocation made by Government which could not be used elsewhere. KCC Highways had worked with Deal Town Council on the improvements. Public consultation, including an exhibition, had taken place between 16 July and 14 August 2015, in response to which 118 objections had been received, including from Deal Town Council. Section 2 of the report summarised the various points raised during consultation. As a result of the concerns raised, Officers were proposing to make amendments to the original scheme and to take the amended scheme out for further public consultation.

The principal point arising from the consultation had been the change in traffic flow which would be reviewed as part of the amended scheme. The key objective for KCC was to ensure that the scheme caused no detriment to local businesses. The public's concerns about Middle Street being used as a 'rat run' could be addressed by reversing the one-way directional flow of traffic. Other concerns related to the location of taxi bays, bus-stops, increased pedestrian movements and the safety of pedestrians and other road users. In particular, Officers were keen to address issues surrounding buses double parking and pedestrians crossing through moving traffic and between parked cars.

Councillor E D Rowbotham emphasised that the needs of the elderly and schoolchildren should be taken into account. This was an opportunity to improve safety and make improvements to the appearance of South Street, the latter potentially with funding from Deal Town Council. Councillor Eddy supported the amended scheme set out at Appendix B of the report. Consultation should be undertaken with businesses, Stagecoach, local residents, taxi and bus users/drivers. He suggested that Deal Town Council be approached to establish what funding it could provide for environmental improvements to the area.

Mr B W Bano stressed that the needs of bus users should be prioritised, as was improving the bus shelter. A scheme was needed which would allow bus users, particularly the disabled and those with prams, to get on and off buses safely. Councillor Bond praised KCC for the work it had done and the level of consultation. South Street was a confined space which needed tidying up. To achieve this it might be necessary to consider relocating some facilities, such as taxis and coaches. Councillor Collor added that public safety should be a priority, and pointed out that some dropped kerbs did not appear in the revised plan.

In response to Councillor Carter, who questioned why the scheme was going ahead given traffic problems elsewhere in Deal, the PE undertook to check on South Street's accident/fatality record and where the scheme ranked in priority. In respect of Soudes Road, it was clarified that it was intended to install 'no stopping' and 'no loading' 'blips' on its junction with Victoria Road in order to ensure that there was clear access for buses which were regularly obstructed by cars parked illegally. In

response to a point raised by Councillor Bond, the PE advised that he would be addressing the issue of lorries reversing into the High Street which was an illegal manoeuvre.

- RESOLVED:
- (a) That it be recommended that, following the substantial objections received in response to the consultation on the initial designs, the initial designs should not be proceeded with.
 - (b) That it be recommended that further consultation be undertaken on the alternative plans set out at Appendix B of the report.
 - (c) That it be noted that Kent County Council will work closely with local businesses (including taxi companies) to firm up proposals prior to consultation, as a result of which the design of the scheme may alter further.

17 OPERATION STACK UPDATE

KCC's East Kent Highway Manager (EKHM) presented the report which updated Members on the plan to use Manston as a holding area for HGVs unable to cross the Channel due to industrial action.

Councillor Collor referred to the KCC Environment and Transport Cabinet Committee report that had been circulated to Members in advance of the meeting. This report differed to the report presented to the JTB as it stated that traffic would be diverted to Manston once it became apparent that Phase 2 of Operation Stack was needed. The JTB report indicated that traffic would only be diverted to Manston if Phase 3 was required. Given that Phase 3 had never been implemented, the level of manpower and machinery based at Manston until June 2016 was wasteful and unnecessary.

The plan to restrict departures from Manston to conveyors of 20 vehicles at a time would unnecessarily prolong the period of disruption to east Kent's roads. It was estimated that 28 police officers would be needed to police the route where it fell within Dover district alone. In any case, the proposed scheme would only deal with traffic for Dover; Channel Tunnel traffic would still be stacked on the M20. He was aware that Highways England were working on a long-term solution.

Councillor Cowan agreed that the use of Manston was idiotic and would simply lead to the clogging up of east Kent's roads. Kent had effectively been closed for business during the summer, with a loss to the economy of £250 million per day, and a long-term solution had to be found. The levy of £10 imposed on HGVs by the Government should be used to build lorry parks, but these would have to be free, or the cost of them included in Eurotunnel or ferry tickets, or drivers would not use them. Councillor Eddy commented that the potential disruption to local roads would be horrendous. The idea of a lorry park at Westenhanger, broached some time ago, had not been pursued and should be reinvestigated.

Councillor Ovenden was concerned that the villages she represented would be used as diversion routes from the A2. Councillor Bond shared the concerns raised by other Members, adding that the expansion of the Port of Dover was only likely to make matters worse. He was incredulous that the trial carried out at Manston had not gone on to test the transfer of lorries from Manston to Dover.

The EKHM sympathised with Members' concerns, particularly those relating to rural roads. He clarified that the plan to release a limited number of trucks was designed to minimise the impact on Sandwich and the A256. Signs were already in place to discourage lorries from entering Sandwich and minor roads as it was evident that the police would be physically unable to resource the scheme. Members were reassured that lorry parking was high on KCC's agenda and a meeting, involving all agencies and authorities, was scheduled for the following month to consider options. Many man-hours had been spent by numerous bodies (including Highways England, Balfour Beatty and Mott McDonald) trying to find a solution.

RESOLVED: That a letter be written by the Chairman on behalf of the Board to the Secretary of State for Transport and Highways England (copied to KCC) expressing the Board's concerns about the use of Manston and the need to find a long-term solution.

18 STREET LIGHTING - LED PROJECT UPDATE

The Dover District Manager (DDM) advised that the consultation period would run from 21 September to 29 November 2015 and not as stated in the report. The proposals would be publicised extensively, including on the radio, on KCC's website and in libraries.

Councillor Eddy stressed that if some sites were being considered for permanent removal, Members should be consulted. Mr P M Wallace criticised the scheme and questioned how much money it would actually save given that £4 million had already been spent on installing timers. He was also critical of the standard of original consultation, and referred to the unpopularity of the scheme with members of the public, as evidenced by a 10,000-signature petition. Both Councillors Bond and Collor stated that they were sceptical of the scheme and in particular the time allowed in providing a meaningful report to the JTB on the outcome of consultation.

RESOLVED: (a) That the report be noted.

(b) That the Chairman writes on behalf of the Board to express its concerns about the very short period allowed between the consultation deadline and reporting the outcome of the consultation to the Dover Joint Transportation Board at its meeting to be held on 10 December 2015.

(Following the departure of the Chairman, Councillor N J Collor assumed the chairmanship of the meeting).

19 HIGHWAY WORKS PROGRAMME 2015/16

The DDM introduced the report which updated Members on works that had been approved for construction in 2015/16. In respect of Appendix A, Members were advised that microsurfacing works to Telegraph Road, Deal had been rescheduled and would now go on next year's programme. Works to Albert Road, Dover had been postponed due to the weather and were now scheduled to start on 28 September. The DDM undertook to pass on concerns raised by Councillor Carter about lorries and other commercial vehicles using the Sandwich toll bridge in order to avoid the A256 Sandwich by-pass during machine resurfacing works. In respect of Appendix B, the DDM acknowledged recent flooding problems experienced in Mill Hill Road raised by Councillor Rowbotham, but explained that this was common

throughout the district and was caused by a lack of capacity in the sewerage system.

In respect of Appendix D, the DDM advised that remedial access works at Buckland Hospital had been completed, but another access was due to be constructed. With regards to Appendix F, the DDM advised that works to path no EB10 (Maxton to Aycliffe) were due to commence in 2 to 3 weeks' time. Works to the North Downs Way at Guston had started and were due to take 6 weeks. Councillor Eddy passed on compliments from a Walmer Parish Councillor regarding the speedy filling of potholes, and reported that a Belisha beacon by a crossing at Marke Wood was not working.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

20 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.

21 APPLICATIONS FOR DISABLED PERSONS' PARKING BAYS

The Corporate Estate and Coastal Engineer introduced the report which outlined details of thirteen disabled parking bay applications and proposed the removal of three bays which were no longer required. Following informal consultation with neighbours, letters of objection had been received in respect of Applications A to E and I to K, with one letter of support received for Application C. Applications A, B, C, D, F, G, H, I, J, L and M met all the criteria and it was therefore 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 Board was advised that Application E met all the criteria. However, KCC guidelines suggested a minimum road width of 3.2 metres to accommodate a parking bay. The road was narrower than this and it was therefore recommended that the application should be refused. The applicant of Application K was not the driver of the vehicle and had access to off-street parking which was provided at cost. The applicant chose not to make use of this, but had been offered use of the access driveway for loading and unloading by the freeholder. The road in question was very narrow and did not meet KCC's minimum width guidelines. The recommendation was therefore that the application should be refused. Whilst Councillor Eddy expressed sympathy for the applicant, the road was very narrow and, given that the individual had driveway access for loading and unloading, he agreed that the application should be refused.

Item N of the report dealt with three bays which were no longer needed.

RESOLVED: (a) That it be recommended that Applications A, B, C, D, F, G, H, I, J, L and M 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 Applications E and K be refused.
- (c) That it be recommended that the three disabled persons' parking bays detailed in Item N of the report be formally advertised with the intention of removing them and, in the event that no objections are received, that 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 8.15 pm.