

# Public Document Pack

Minutes of the meeting of the **DOVER JOINT TRANSPORTATION BOARD** held at the Council Offices, Whitfield on Thursday, 26 February 2015 at 6.02 pm.

Present:

Chairman: Councillor N J Collor

Councillors: T A Bond  
P M Brivio  
G Cowan  
G Lymer  
M J Ovenden  
E D Rowbotham  
F J W Scales  
J M Smith  
P Walker

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

Officers: Dover District Manager (KCC Highways and Transportation)  
Strategic Transport and Development Planner (Kent County Council)  
Head of Community Safety, CCTV and Parking  
Highways and Parking Team Leader  
Corporate Estate and Coastal Engineer  
Democratic Support Officer

## 691 APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors B W Bano, J A Cronk, M R Eddy, S C Manion and R S Walkden, and Mr B Scott.

## 692 APPOINTMENT OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

It was noted that, in accordance with Rule 4 of the Council Procedure Rules, Councillors J M Smith and M J Ovenden had been appointed as substitute Members for Councillors B W Bano and R S Walkden respectively.

## 693 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor N J Collor advised that he would not participate in consideration of Agenda Item 8 (Proposed Residents' Parking Scheme – Athol Terrace, Dover) on the grounds of predetermination, and left the Chamber during consideration of this item.

## 694 MINUTES

In respect of Minute No 688, the Dover District Manager advised that he would take follow up action with Mr Luigi Scott to ensure that Mrs Burnham was advised when lamp columns along Deal seafront would be replaced.

The minutes of the Joint Transportation Board meeting held on 11 December 2014 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

Mr Corcoran invited questions on the report that had gone to the JTB meeting of 11 December 2014 on 20mph zones and limits.

Referring to paragraphs 5.1 and 5.2 of the report, Councillor T A Bond queried the results of the surveys, arguing that they were different to results found elsewhere. In his opinion there was no doubt that speed restrictions should be imposed outside schools.

Mr Corcoran emphasised that the results set out in the report related only to certain schools involved in the Maidstone trial which had arisen as the result of a petition. It was likely that traffic speeds had shown an overall increase due to seasonal variations, but vehicles had generally abided by the 20mph limit. The Government had commissioned a study into 20mph zones and limits and results were expected by 2017. Indications were that 20mph zones had an impact on speed but not necessarily on safety.

Councillor G Cowan agreed with Councillor Bond and felt that Members had been fobbed off over this issue, having been told differing things over the years as to why 20mph speed limits could not be imposed. There had been several incidents outside St Edmunds School in Dover, and it was time speeds were restricted along Barton Road. Councillor P Walker was critical of the report which lacked detail on enforcement and consultation with schools.

Mr Corcoran responded that the report outlined Kent County Council's (KCC) policy on when it would fund 20mph zones. KCC supported the use of 20mph zones – evidence being that these were more effective than speed limits – and was happy to implement them, provided they met Government criteria and funding was available. On the latter point, there simply was not the funding to install zones outside every school. Members were reminded that the KCC Member Highway Fund (MHF) could be used to fund such schemes.

Many zones had been implemented in locations with road safety problems, and KCC was looking to expand these in order to tackle public health issues. It was confirmed that the schools involved in the Maidstone trial had been consulted before the survey was carried out to gauge their views and perceptions. Parking rather than speeding had emerged from the trial as a key concern.

Mr P Carter expressed the view that the Maidstone study had been flawed. Seasonal variations should have been taken into account, and it was well known that cars slowed down outside schools but then speeded up once past the school. This was why speed limits rather than zones were needed. Referring to paragraph 11.3 of the report, he argued that £50,000 was an inadequate amount of money and, given the cuts to Member funding, KCC Members did not have sufficient money to contribute.

Mr Corcoran contested that the Maidstone study had been robust, taking into account national and European research on this issue. The surveys undertaken outside the schools had been only a minor element contributing to the conclusions reached. It was recognised that traffic calming zones were effective at reducing casualties but there was limited evidence regarding the use of speed limits. A targeted approach was the most appropriate, given the limited budget available.

In response to Mr Carter, Mr Corcoran clarified that the Maidstone trial had been undertaken with schools that were of interest to Members, who had decided to use their MHF monies for this purpose, notwithstanding that there had been no casualties or crashes at these locations. Councillor F J W Scales reported that the calming of the road outside a school in Capel-le-Ferne had been a factor in encouraging more children to walk to school. Mr Corcoran advised that Capel-le-Ferne was fifth on the list of areas being investigated by KCC for the use of the £50,000 set aside for 20mph schemes.

Councillor E D Rowbotham argued that road safety schemes should be included as a core part of KCC's highways work. The £25,000 allocated to each Member in the MHF should not be expected to cover this work as well as community projects.

In response to Councillor Cowan regarding works at Barton Road, Mr Corcoran clarified that KCC would fund essential road safety works from a budget of £2 million if evidence were presented. Mr Corcoran suggested that a study similar to the one at Maidstone could be funded from the MHF. He also undertook to circulate the list of areas being investigated by KCC for potential schemes.

Members were advised that the policy had been approved by KCC's Cabinet in October 2013 and, therefore, any lobbying for changes would have to be done by KCC Members through the relevant KCC Cabinet Member.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

696 DOVER BUS RAPID TRANSIT PROGRESS UPDATE

The Strategic Transport and Development Planner introduced the report which updated Members on plans for a bus rapid transit system between Whitfield and Dover town centre. Councillor Cowan welcomed the scheme which would provide important public transport linkage between Whitfield and the town centre. Similar schemes elsewhere had proved very successful.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

697 HIGHWAY AND DRAINAGE ASSET MANAGEMENT REPORT

The Dover District Manager (DDM) presented the report which informed Members of KCC's approach to maintaining and improving the highway drainage system, and elaborated on a verbal report Board members had received at the meeting held in December 2014. Members were referred to paragraph 1.5 of the report and to the table on page 24 which set out the categories of roads and frequency of cleaning.

Urban roads would be the subject of targeted cleaning, with data gleaned from routine walking inspections conducted annually. Minor rural roads tended to get blocked more frequently but it was not financially viable to include these in the routine cleaning schedule. They would be inspected by highway stewards on receipt of a report from a member of the public or a Member. An assessment of the risk to property would be carried out and the drainage team would decide what level of cleaning was required. In respect of a query on whether the cleaning schedule could be put on KCC's website, the DDM advised that there was a reluctance to do this, not only because of the finite resources available but also because it might not always be possible to update data in a timely manner. Members were advised to contact KCC's Highways Drainage Manager direct who could tell Members when roads were scheduled to be cleaned or include them in the schedule.

In response to Councillor Bond, the DDM explained that urban drains were less likely to become blocked than rural ones because, in a hard paved environment, water ran off pavements into drains and, in the process, had a cleansing effect on drains and pipes. Moreover, urban water was less silted than that in rural areas. It was stressed that only those places that had been reported would be targeted, once an assessment had been made as to whether property was at risk or there was a danger. In summary, a risk-based approach was taken and locations then targeted based on evidence and the need to give best value for money.

The DDM went on to advise that flooding problems in Deal were caused by a lack of capacity in Southern Water's sewers but KCC could not force them to increase capacity. It was KCC's responsibility to clean its gullies and carrier pipes.

In response to a query from Councillor Cowan, the DDM informed Members that, in some cases, double pipes were installed to cope with higher run-off levels, but schemes were assessed on a case by case basis and solutions were designed to address the nature of the problem at individual locations. The increased installation of hard-standings and impermeable areas, coupled with more intense downpours, had led to a rise in instances of flooding. Shared sewers, combining foul and surface water, were also a problem. Older sewers also presented problems since their joints were sometimes porous which meant that the water table found its way in, reducing the capacity of the sewer and causing flooding to property.

In respect of flooding on the A2 near Guston, the Highways Agency had advised that a drainage scheme to rectify the problem would be implemented this year. In response to a query from Mr Carter, the DDM advised that the hotspots in the table comprised a variety of sites with differing problems, some of which could be solved relatively quickly and others which required a longer term solution. During periods of heavy rain/wind, machines would be deployed to these sites as a precautionary measure to keep them clear. Examples of different categories of roads were given: the A299 and A256 were strategic routes; other A roads and some B and C roads were classified as locally important. All others were regarded as minor urban or minor rural routes. KCC was aware of problems on the A256 and, as part of the capital drainage programme, additional soakaways would be installed to tackle these.

In response to Councillor F J W Scales who noted the absence of any reference in the report to pedestrian access, the DDM advised that the report gave examples only and sites prone to flooding would be assessed on a range of criteria, including the effect on access and safety.

Councillor Scales, as Chairman of the Planning Committee, advised Members that Southern Water's consultation responses within the Planning process were often brief and appeared to lack meaningful consideration of wider infrastructure requirements. However, drainage conditions were now much tighter as a result of the problems experienced with Phase 1A of the Whitfield development.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

#### 698 ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN

In the absence of the Chairman (and Vice-Chairman) who had withdrawn from the meeting during consideration of Agenda Item 8 on the grounds of predetermination, nominations were sought for a Chairman to preside at the meeting.

RESOLVED: That Councillor G Cowan be elected as Chairman.

699 PROPOSED RESIDENTS' PARKING SCHEME - ATHOL TERRACE, DOVER

The Head of Community Safety, CCTV and Parking (HCSCP) introduced the report which outlined options for a residents' parking scheme covering Athol Terrace, East Cliff and Marine Parade. Members were advised that the options had been advertised and residents consulted. In summary, all Athol Terrace residents had indicated that they wanted an exclusive zone for their road. 50% of respondents from East Cliff had indicated support for a wider zone, but had questioned the removal of the limited waiting period.

In response to Councillor Scales who queried the report's reference to the need to limit one-street schemes, the Highways and Parking Team Leader (HPTL) clarified that the rationale behind the Snargate Street scheme was that it was the only residential street in that area, geographically restricted by the presence of the cliff behind.

Councillor Bond indicated his objections to an exclusive scheme for Athol Terrace which, if implemented, would create more parking spaces than there were residents in the road. This was particularly unfair given the shortage of parking in the area generally. In his view, small parking zones should only be created where there was a strong need and this was not the case with Athol Terrace. Both Councillor Bond and Councillor P Walker emphasised the fact that Athol Terrace was a public road, owned by Dover District Council and KCC and not for the exclusive use of residents. The HCSCP clarified that East Cliff parking was limited and oversubscribed whereas parking in Athol Terrace was undersubscribed.

Councillor M J Ovenden commented that much of the parking congestion in roads adjacent to the Eastern Docks was caused by Dover Harbour Board staff leaving their vehicles there during working hours. Local residents were being disadvantaged as a result. The HPTL suggested that option (ii) set out in the report would address concerns raised by East Cliff residents about the removal of limited waiting.

Councillor Scales stated that option (ii) was the best option but it would be improved by amending it to 24 hours, with which Councillor Bond agreed. The HPTL advised that a 24-hour restriction would remove the ability of second householders to park without charge at night. In addition, expecting DDC to enforce a night-time ban was unrealistic. However, if Members were minded to recommend this option, there was the possibility of using the Marine Parade service road for restricted parking for second vehicles. With Members' agreement, the consultation could make it clear that an exclusive zone for Athol Terrace residents was not an option.

It was proposed by Councillor F J W Scales and duly seconded that the proposal be re-advertised covering all 3 roads with a change that the scheme operates daily for 24 hours and includes a 1-hour limited waiting period for non-permit holders. The Marine Parade service road would be made available for second householder parking between the hours of 5.30pm and 08.30am.

There being an equality of votes, the Chairman used his casting vote and the motion was LOST.

The Chairman and Councillor Walker expressed their wish that further consultation be undertaken with residents to hear their views. However, Councillors Bond and Scales questioned what this would achieve given that extensive consultation had already been undertaken. Residents' views were likely to be entrenched and it was unlikely that they would respond any differently to further consultation. However, Councillor Bond suggested that it would be worthwhile for the Board to indicate that it was opposed to an exclusive parking zone for Athol Terrace only. Should further consultation be undertaken, residents would be more likely to respond in a different, more positive way if they knew that their preferred option was a non-starter.

It was proposed by Councillor F J W Scales and duly seconded:

(a) That the Board wished to state its firm opposition to a residents' parking scheme exclusively for Athol Terrace.

(b) That the proposal be re-advertised and informal consultation undertaken, covering all 3 roads with a change that the scheme operates daily for 24 hours and includes a 1-hour limited waiting period for non-permit holders. The Marine Parade service road would be made available for second householder parking between the hours of 5.30pm and 08.30am.

With the proposer's agreement, the motion was split into two parts and separate voting took place as follows:

(a) That the Board wished to state its firm opposition to a residents' parking scheme exclusively for Athol Terrace.

On being put to the vote, the motion was CARRIED.

(b) That the proposal be re-advertised and informal consultation undertaken, covering all 3 roads with a change that the scheme operates daily for 24 hours and includes a 1-hour limited waiting period for non-permit holders. The Marine Parade service road would be made available for second householder parking between the hours of 5.30pm and 08.30am.

There being an equality of votes, the Chairman used his casting vote and the motion was LOST.

Councillor G Lymer suggested that DDC should approach Dover Harbour Board to discuss parking arrangements for its staff. The Chairman and Councillor Walker agreed with this proposal.

Following further discussions, the HCSCP suggested that Officers could undertake further informal consultation with residents, emphasising that an exclusive parking zone for Athol Terrace was not an option but offering them a specific range of alternative options including a 24-hour zone, a typical residents' parking scheme and the service road for second householder parking.

Councillor Walker expressed concerns that the Board was rushing through a solution which might not be the most equitable. However, the Chairman commented that the Board needed to find a solution, albeit one that might not meet with the approval of all residents.

RESOLVED: (a) That further informal consultation be undertaken with residents on alternative schemes not listed in the report, in consultation

with Councillor G Cowan, Acting Chairman of the Joint Transportation Board.

- (b) That Officers be charged with writing to the Dover Harbour Board to seek information about parking arrangements for its staff.

700 HIGHWAY WORKS PROGRAMME 2014/15

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

In respect of Appendix A, Councillor Bond expressed concerns about the disruption caused by emergency cable works carried out on the A258 the preceding week. The DDM advised that KCC's proposed works on the A258 would be carried out at night and would therefore be less disruptive.

In respect of Appendix B, Members were advised that contractors were on site at Elms Vale Road and work was due to start the following week, as was the case with works at Alkham Valley Road. Works at Forge Lane had been completed. As a correction to Appendix C, it was clarified that column replacements at Buckland Terrace and London Road were due for completion by March 2015. In respect of public rights of way, works on the EB10 would commence by the end of the financial year.

In respect of Appendix H, it was clarified that the schemes detailed were those that had been signed off by the relevant Member and KCC's Director of Highways by 25 January 2015. However, there were a number of other schemes being prepared for Councillors Brivio, Cowan and Eddy and, as advised at the meeting, Councillor Rowbotham. The Board was advised that upgrade works to the zebra crossing on the A258 near Marke Wood had been completed. The installation of a salt bin at Green Lane had also been carried out. On being advised that contractors were on site to widen St Richards Road, Councillor Rowbotham raised concerns about the opposite side of the road which was rutted and muddy.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

701 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.

702 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 three parking bays which were no longer required.

The Board was advised that no letters of objection had been received in respect of Applications A to F which had been the subject of informal consultation with neighbours. Since the applications met all the criteria, it was recommended that the applications proceed to formal advertisement and, thereafter, be sealed by Kent County Council 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.

- RESOLVED: (a) That it be recommended that Applications A to F be formally advertised and, in the event that no objections are received, 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 three disabled persons' parking bays detailed in Item G of the report be formally advertised with the intention of removing them and that, 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 8.37 pm.