

Joint Transportation Board
11th June 2013

Addendum Paper

Agenda Item 6 – Update from Member Working Group on Lorry Issues

Cllr Burgess, Chairman of ABC's new Truck Stop Pilot Task Group, is unable to attend this evening. He has however submitted an update following the first meeting of the Group on 4th June 2013.

Update on Truck Stop Pilot Task Group

Notes of Task Group meeting held on 4th June 2013 at Civic Centre

- 1. 3 Members of Task Group and Chairman of Transportation, Highways & Engineering Advisory Committee present. Unfortunately the KCC Member was unable to attend.*
- 2. Members had a discussion to agree position to date. The Feasibility Study, but dealing with Ashford Borough only, was possible next move, but finance from ABC had not confirmed by Cabinet.*
- 3. Discussion then took place about possibility of using existing data from previous feasibility studies and other data which it was felt may be provided/ requested from by KCC. Obviously any naming of possible sites would need to be kept confidential.*
- 4. The Chairman gave the group an update on the expansion of the Truck Stop at J11 of M20, which now had complete facilities for 180 vehicles and drivers, including Custom Clearance, fully automated booking system and security.*
- 5. The Group was unanimous that there was a need to incorporate KCC members and officers in forwarding these tasks. KCC Cllr. David Brazier, Portfolio Holder for Highways, had expressed his interest, at a KCC meeting, in continuing the work started with the previous Portfolio Holder and the officers were content to continue.*
- 6. The group agreed that the next meeting should ideally include KCC input to achieve bullet point 3 and to discover whether KCC finance, which has been temporarily withdrawn because of the pending elections, was available.*
- 7. The Next meeting of the Task Group is on 2nd July 2013 at 10.00 am*

Post Meeting Notes.

1. *It has been confirmed that the Task Group will have an officer from ABC Strategic Planning who will be the point of contact to assist taking the Group in taking this project forward.*
2. *It has been confirmed that KCC Transport Planning delivery Manager Ann Carruthers and KCC Cllr. David Brazier, Portfolio Holder for Enterprise & Environment are available to attend the next meeting on July 2nd.*

Agenda Item 7 – Update on Goat Lees Parking Scheme

Two people have registered to speak on this application: -

Mr Gerry Moore – Local Resident

Mr Jason Matthews – Chairman of Boughton Aluph & Eastwell Parish Council

The Ward Member, Cllr Michael, is unable to attend this meeting as he is overseas on business. He has contacted the Chairman of the Board and given his comments on the report and states that: -

“The report before the Board regarding Goat Lees parking is not supported by me the Ward Member. I ask the Board to reject the report.

I trust that the Board takes on board what has transpired, supports residents and their elected representatives to reject the report and defer consideration until September to allow for further discussions to take place between Officers and local elected representatives on the options available.”

Please also find appended the comments of Mr and Mrs Thompson which they have asked be tabled this evening.

RE: JTB Agenda 11.06.13; Item 7 – Update on Goat Lees Parking Scheme

The agenda for the JTB on 11 June 2013 indicates that a decision will be made on the Goat Lees Parking Scheme based on Ray Wilkinson's report. There is confusion locally as to whether this report will actually be tabled or an amended proposal discussed, due to there being no authority provided to Mr Wilkinson to file the report.

I therefore need to respond, as a Dunnock Road resident on the basis that Ray Wilkinson's report will be used for the discussion. Although there has been limited time to review the report, due to lack of communication, the following points need to be noted:

1. **Response Rates:** Ray Wilkinson subjectively observes that the 20% response rate is surprisingly low. However, having commissioned paper questionnaire surveys myself many times before, it is known in the market research industry that a 20% response rate is considered 'good'. As Mr Wilkinson himself points out, there were actually significantly high response rates in the affected streets.
2. **Engineering a result:** In my opinion, the views expressed in the survey have been deliberately watered down because of the decision about the size of the area covered in the survey, along with the nature of the two options on offer. It is wholly transparent that Ray Wilkinson was trying to engineer the result to support his favoured option by involving those with no view of the parking problem, or even already have their own parking restrictions already in place (for which we weren't reciprocally consulted). I responded as such on my reply to the survey. Please see Annex A.
3. **Recommendation ignores clear mandate:** The results of the survey provide a clear vote for Option 2 but Mr Wilkinson has chosen to ignore this, probably because they don't meet what he was anticipating. Instead he has tried to extrapolate for which option persons who did not vote would have/should have voted. This shows a perverse logic and I'm sure councillors who 'won' at the last election when there wasn't a 100% turnout would equally be up in arms if another candidate was awarded the result because of extrapolations as to what non-voters actually meant.

Conclusion: Despite the reports flawed recommendations, it is obvious that the results of the survey provide a clear mandate to progress with Option 2. This can initially be limited to the affected streets and phased in wider if the problem migrates.

Progress on this issue todate had been glacial as it has been going on for years with no effective response from the council or business park, dealing with an issue of their joint creation. I would urge expedited action to resolve this.

Kind regards

Kevin and Karen Thompson

Dunnock Road

Annex A: Extract of feedback about survey

This consultation is so obviously weighted so that the town council receives the 'support' for the option it wants – Option 1. It is unacceptable to have options presented which:

- Fail to mention the future expansion of the business park (therefore lulling those further away from the business park into a false sense of security).
- Superficially propose their difference as being one being a safety scheme and one being a parking management scheme. For a true choice between the two headline differences of these schemes, Option 1 needs to have the safety markings covering the same area as Option 2. Naturally the double yellow lines highlight unsafe areas to park so what is it about Option A mean that these same areas are safe in Option A where unmarked? The only reason you would want them different is to influence the consultation.
- It is obvious that the coverage of option 2 compared to option 1 means that those **currently** unaffected by the parking will superficially vote for option 1 as they will only see restrictions for themselves compared to now. The council appears to be relying on human nature, with an extension of coverage that will tip the overall numbers in favour of Option 1 to meet their own agenda - this being backed up by their lack of information in the consultation about the planned extension of the business park and the impacts that will be felt by those residents more distant without their knowledge.