



Joint Transportation Board

Notice of a Meeting, to be held in the Council Chamber, Civic Centre, Tannery Lane,
Ashford, Kent TN23 1PL on Tuesday 10th March 2015 at 7.00pm

The Members of this Board are:-

- Mr C Simkins (Chairman)
- Cllr Heyes (Vice-Chairman)
- Cllrs. Burgess, Davey, Feacey, Mrs Martin, Robey, Labour Vacancy
- Mr M J Angell, Mr P M Hill, Mr S J G Koowaree, Mr D Smyth, Mr J N Wedgbury,
- Mr M A Wickham
- Mr K Ashby – KALC Ashford Area Committee

NB: Under the Council’s Public Participation Scheme, members of the public can submit a petition, ask a question or speak concerning any item contained on this Agenda (Procedure Rule 9 refers)

Agenda

	Page Nos.
1. Apologies/Substitutes – To receive Notification of Substitutes in accordance with Procedure Rule 1.2(iii)	
2. Declarations of Interest:- To declare any interests which fall under the following categories, as explained on the attached document:	1
1. Disclosable Pecuniary Interests (DPI)	
2. Other Significant Interests (OSI)	
3. Voluntary Announcements of Other Interests	
See Agenda Item 2 for further details	
3. Minutes – To approve the Minutes of the Meeting of this Board held on the 9 th December 2014	
4. To receive any Petitions	
5. Transportation, Highways & Engineering Advisory Committee – 16 th January 2015	
6. Lorry Parking Update - Clamping	
7. Tracker Report	
8. M20 Junction 10A Scheme Update – A Presentation by the Highways Agency	



Part I – For Decision

9. Review of Prioritised Parking List and New Process

Part II – For Information

10. Bank Street Shared Space Works - Update
 11. Highway Works Programme 2014/15
 12. Highway Drainage
 13. Future Roles and Responsibilities
-

DS/AEH
27th February 2015

Queries concerning this agenda? Please contact Danny Sheppard:
Telephone: 01233 330349 Email: danny.sheppard@ashford.gov.uk
Agendas, Reports and Minutes are available on: www.ashford.gov.uk/committees



Declarations of Interest (see also “Advice to Members” below)

- (a) **Disclosable Pecuniary Interests (DPI)** under the Localism Act 2011, relating to items on this agenda. The nature as well as the existence of any such interest must be declared, and the agenda item(s) to which it relates must be stated.

A Member who declares a DPI in relation to any item will need to leave the meeting for that item (unless a relevant Dispensation has been granted).

- (b) **Other Significant Interests (OSI)** under the Kent Code of Conduct as adopted by the Council on 19 July 2012, relating to items on this agenda. The nature as well as the existence of any such interest must be declared, and the agenda item(s) to which it relates must be stated.

A Member who declares an OSI in relation to any item will need to leave the meeting before the debate and vote on that item (unless a relevant Dispensation has been granted). However, prior to leaving, the Member may address the Committee in the same way that a member of the public may do so.

- (c) **Voluntary Announcements of Other Interests** not required to be disclosed under (a) and (b), i.e. announcements made for transparency reasons alone, such as:

- Membership of outside bodies that have made representations on agenda items, or
- Where a Member knows a person involved, but does not have a close association with that person, or
- Where an item would affect the well-being of a Member, relative, close associate, employer, etc. but not his/her financial position.

[Note: an effect on the financial position of a Member, relative, close associate, employer, etc; OR an application made by a Member, relative, close associate, employer, etc, would both probably constitute either an OSI or in some cases a DPI].

Advice to Members on Declarations of Interest:

- (a) Government Guidance on DPI is available in DCLG’s Guide for Councillors, at https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/240134/Openness_and_transparency_on_personal_interests.pdf
- (b) The Kent Code of Conduct was adopted by the Full Council on 19 July 2012, with revisions adopted on 17.10.13, and a copy can be found in the Constitution at <http://www.ashford.gov.uk/part-5---codes-and-protocols>
- (c) If any Councillor has any doubt about the existence or nature of any DPI or OSI which he/she may have in any item on this agenda, he/she should seek advice from the Head of Legal and Democratic Services and Monitoring Officer or from other Solicitors in Legal and Democratic Services as early as possible, and in advance of the Meeting.

Joint Transportation Board

Minutes of a Meeting of the Joint Transportation Board held in the Council Chamber, Civic Centre, Tannery Lane, Ashford on the **9th December 2014**.

Present:

Mr C Simkins (Chairman);
Cllr. Heyes (Vice-Chairman);

Cllrs. Davey, Feacey, Mrs Martin, Robey, Sims, Yeo.
Mr M J Angell, Mr P M Hill, Mr S J G Koowaree, Mr J N Wedgbury, Mr M A Wickham.

Mr K Ashby – KALC Representative.

In accordance with Procedure Rule 1.2 (iii) Councillor Sims attended as a Substitute Member for Councillor Burgess.

Apologies:

Cllr. Burgess, Mr. D Smyth, Lisa Holder (Ashford District Manager – KCC).

Also Present:

Cllrs. Miss Martin, Shorter.

Andrew Loosemore (Head of Highway Operations – KCC), Mark Carty (Head of Culture & the Environment – ABC), Sheila Davison (Head of Health, Parking & Community Safety – ABC), Ray Wilkinson (Engineering Services Manager – ABC), Jo Fox (Assistant Health, Parking & Community Safety Manager – ABC), William Train (Technical Administrative Assistant – ABC), Danny Sheppard (Senior Member Services & Scrutiny Support Officer – ABC).

Prior to the commencement of the meeting the Chairman advised that this would be the last Joint Transportation Board meeting for Ray Wilkinson who was retiring at the end of February after 40 years' service at Ashford Borough Council. Ray had been this Board's lead Officer for many years and had overseen so many positive changes to the local highways and public transport networks since the early 1970s. Ray had truly made a special contribution to the growth and development of the Borough as well as the championing of the Ashford Quality Bus Partnership and many other achievements too numerous to list. This would all be acknowledged by the presentation of a gift this evening and the Chairman asked the Board to join him in giving Ray their thanks and wishing him a wonderful retirement. Members applauded.

277 Declarations of Interest

Councillor	Interest	Minute No.
Feacey	Made a Voluntary Announcement as he attends the Quality Bus Partnership meetings.	282, 283, 284
Heyes	Made a Voluntary Announcement as he attends the Quality Bus Partnership meetings.	282, 283, 284
Mr Simkins	Made a Voluntary Announcement as he attends the Quality Bus Partnership meetings.	282, 283, 284
Mr Wedgbury	Made a Voluntary Announcement as a Member of Kingsnorth Parish Council and the Park Farm South Ward.	282

278 Minutes

Resolved:

That the Minutes of the Meeting of this Board held on the 9th September 2014 be approved and confirmed as a correct record.

279 Transportation, Highways & Engineering Advisory Committee – 27th October 2014

In response to a question about the potential to resurface the M20 between Junctions 8 and 9 to relieve the impact of the noise for residents in the area, the Chairman of the Advisory Committee advised this was a Highways Agency issue and there was little either Council could do to influence this at present.

Resolved:

That the Minutes of the Meeting of the Transportation, Highways & Engineering Advisory Committee held on the 27th October 2014 be received and noted.

280 Lorry Parking Update

Mr Loosemore introduced the report which brought Members up to date on KCC's work to address inappropriate overnight lorry parking and the impact of Operation Stack. It also advised of the joint work being undertaken with ABC on enforcement. He confirmed that the first of the proposed network of smaller scale lorry parks had been approved at Westenhanger at Junction 11 of the M20.

In response to a question Mrs Fox advised that ABC now had permission to clamp vehicles at specific agreed locations and clamping was expected to begin in January 2015. There would be a report back on this issue to the Board in March 2015.

Resolved:

That the report be received and noted.

281 Tracker Report

The Chairman drew Members' attention to the Tracker of Decisions.

A Member mentioned the highway safety scheme that had been implemented for Downs View Infant and Kennington Junior Schools back in February 2013 and asked for an approximate date for the post implementation review. Mr Wilkinson advised that this did appear on the prioritised list of works but there had been a number of hold ups on schemes on that list this year. There would be a decision to be taken in March when that list was reviewed about whether the Board wanted to pursue more new schemes or prioritise reviews of the schemes already in place.

Another Member raised the long standing issue of proposed traffic calming measures in Bluebell Road and Roman Way, Park Farm and Church Hill, Kingsnorth. He now understood that all of the Section 106 money had been spent, but not on the measures that local people wanted, and without consultation with the local Members. He asked for this issue to be investigated and that he receive a full breakdown of how the money had been spent and an explanation as to why this had not been discussed with local Members. Mr Loosemore said he would pass this issue on to Andy Corcoran and James Hammond as the Officers involved.

Resolved:

That the Tracker be received and noted.

282 Park Farm Order 2014 – (Bluebell Road and Violet Way) Update Report

Mr Train introduced the report which provided an update to the Park Farm Order 2014. The Board had taken the decision at its last meeting to defer a decision on the proposed parking controls for Bluebell Road, Ashford pending a Members' Site Visit. The report summarised the results of the previously held formal consultation on the proposals for Bluebell Road and presented details on the B-Line bus service, the intention behind extending the service into Park Farm South and East and assessments of two alternative bus routes. The Site Visit had taken place on the 4th December and a summary of that visit had been tabled as an Addendum paper. This summary included responses to three subsequent questions that had been raised by a Member.

In accordance with Procedure Rule 9.3 Mr Foreman, a local resident spoke in objection to the proposals. He also circulated some photographs to illustrate the points he was making. He said that the residents of Bluebell Road still had serious concerns over the proposals to introduce parking restrictions and a bus route extension via Bluebell Road and the accommodation bridge into Park Farm East.

Residents were grateful to the Board for carrying out a Site Visit to assess their concerns but they had been disappointed that they had only been privy to the route in question rather than the alternative routes suggested, and did not have the opportunity to view the back of the houses as they would have hoped. However he hoped that the limited experience had enabled Members to visualise the reality residents were facing surrounding parking at their homes which was also in conflict with the current ABC Residential Parking and Design Guidance adopted in 2010. It was worth re-iterating those items they felt were relevant such as garages not being counted as a parking space in suburban areas, minimum garage sizes which were considerably wider than those at the rear of the properties and a minimum of two parking spaces needing to be provided for three and four bedroom houses. They had also previously highlighted issues relating to safety and the policing of the bridge and during their Site Visit Members would have witnessed three mopeds illegally using the bridge. This was a regular occurrence and thus remained a major concern. He said that residents who would be affected by the parking restrictions did need their cars. It seemed to be accepted from all sides that the parking restrictions would displace vehicles to other areas, but there was a real absence of any solution to deal with that displacement. He hoped that the Site Visit had allowed Members to appreciate the residents' concerns in this area. The Board had often been reminded that parking on the approach to the bridge was in contravention of the Highway Code but Officers did not appear to appreciate that these parking practices had been followed by all residents since the houses had been built without any incident or problems. He considered the parking practices would only become a problem with the introduction of a bus route.

Mr Foreman said that the case for implementation of the proposals seemed to be predominantly based on the fact that 'this was what was originally planned in 2003' prior to any families moving in. He said he would ask the Board if that was a sufficient argument. Just because that was what was originally planned did not mean that it was the correct thing to do in 2014. Whilst they understood that the Officers had a role to fulfil, residents reluctantly found themselves questioning their motivation when the wellbeing and safety of the Borough's residents were put second to the desires of large companies like Stagecoach. In the report itself Stagecoach had admitted that the design of the road was odd for a bus route, which seemed to suggest that the original designs did not necessarily completely consider the practicalities of the proposed bus route or the evolution of the road once the properties became occupied. At the previous meeting residents had proposed two alternative bus routes which had been considered and dismissed by Stagecoach. Whilst it was acknowledged that the route via Poppy Mead would have more frontages affected, both Poppy Mead and Finn Farm Road already had off road parking at the front of the houses, which would not be provided to the residents of Bluebell Road. The report argued that re-routing the buses via Finn Farm Road would require several trees to be cut back which would alter the character of the road, however this was not a residential road like the quiet cul-de-sac of Bluebell Road which would also be significantly altered should the bus route be approved. Additionally, the route via Poppy Mead was currently the main access road. Finn Farm Road was also currently the only route for the residents of Park Farm East to access the estate and their homes. Therefore they believed that there would be added benefits to other residents of Park Farm if parking restrictions allowed the bus to use this route, something that would not be the case by using the accommodation

bridge. He said that there had been incidents relating to the current parking arrangements on this busier through road and residents there did have major safety concerns. Therefore he considered those issues would need to be addressed by this Board in the near future even if the accommodation bridge route was adopted. That is why he considered that this route should be considered further rather than being dismissed for financial reasons, not only for the benefits of the extended bus route, but also for the benefit of residents on both sides of the estate. In conclusion Mr Foreman said he would like to make the Board aware that a social media group had been set up for residents of Bridgefield to discuss the proposed route, and whilst most people on both sides understood the need for a bus service, most were concerned that this was not the correct solution and many were bemused by the lack of consideration of other routes and the lack of discussion and debate with affected residents. He asked the Board to not overlook the concerns of residents and completely satisfy themselves that the accommodation bridge was the correct and safe option, something that the residents who would have to live with this decision on a day to day basis could not. He said that the impact of the decision made tonight would make the difference between many staying, or having little choice but to sell their homes. He therefore asked the Board to vote to refuse the proposals.

The ABC Ward Member for part of the area spoke in objection to the proposals. He said that when the facts changed, people should change their minds. He understood that the proposed route was part of the original Smartlink Rapid Bus Transit Scheme which had been defunct for at least five years now. He also understood that residents on both sides of the A2070 needed a bus route, but one using the accommodation bridge was not the answer. It was not fair to the residents of Bluebell Road who had been living there quite happily for some years and deserved to be able to access the front of their properties safely from the road. He proposed that the scheme be refused and for alternative bus routes to be looked at properly.

The KCC Divisional Member for the area said he would like to second refusal. Firstly, he said the issue of a potential Rail Halt at Park Farm should be dismissed as Network Rail had made it quite clear that this was not going to happen. With regard to the accommodation bridge itself, he considered this should be re-classified as a byway or bridleway to protect it from inappropriate uses such as buses and heavy traffic, which should then use alternative routes such as Finn Farm Road. He knew the residents of Bridgefield had concerns over the way their development had come forward and they did need a bus service, but he did not consider that this was the correct route and in his view Officers had to deal with the realities of the situation as it was today and consider the alternative routes as put forward by the residents.

Councillor Shorter advised that he had attended to speak as a Kingsnorth Parish Councillor who covered the area the other side of the bridge (Bridgefield/Park Farm East) and he knew that residents there had a lot of concerns over transport issues including bus routes and services. He said that the crux of the problems was that bus routes were not coming forward quickly enough. They had been so slow in coming forward that many had already got used to having to use their cars and then it had been difficult to get bus services up and running. He advised that the ABC Ward Member for the area supported the proposals and he asked the Board to support and promote this bus service to Bridgefield as he considered the benefits of the

proposed scheme outweighed the merits of the objections received, so implementation of the proposed restrictions should go ahead.

In the course of the debate a Member said that the issue should be about amenity over profit. The area had been poorly designed and they had to now make the best of what they had. It had to be accepted that people wanted to own cars and the bus was not a suitable alternative for all or indeed many at all. The garages were too small and there was a need for parking at the front of the properties to enable people, especially the disabled, those with young children or even those with bulky shopping, to access their houses safely and easily. Therefore she considered the parking should remain and an alternative route found for the buses. If prohibited, the parking would just spill in to other areas and cause chaos there which was short sighted and if it was to be properly enforced, Officers would have to be there almost permanently which was unrealistic. She said they had to be fair and deal with the situation as it was today, not what was on paper some 15/20 years ago. Another Member said that as far as he was aware nobody bought these properties because of the bus services and the number of people who had to use buses was minimal. Bus patronage was low and the Board should consider the wishes of the majority not the minority. A Member said that special dispensations had been made in other areas such as Greenwich to allow parking on the pavement where it was safe and suitable to do so and he believed there was a case to allow that here.

Other Members said it was important to consider the broader picture. A Member said that this bus service had been long in the planning and was a part of the important planned strategic bus route linking the town centre, Park Farm and the William Harvey Hospital. It would be of enormous benefit to a number of people and whilst he sympathised with the points made by the residents this bus route was always planned and parking in front of the houses had never officially been permitted. With regard to the Council's current Residential Parking and Design Guidance, he advised that this was adopted in 2010 and the building of this part of Park Farm did meet the relevant standards at that time, which were unfortunately much less than now. If the estate was built today, it would be built to very different standards. Another Member said that thinking strategically there were an enormous amount of people who were being deprived of a bus service and another large group who would be inconvenienced if the proposed bus route were to be moved somewhere else. He said it was important to note that roads were for people to move around on rather than park on and it was important to consider all residents. He said there was potentially an argument to move the actual proposed bus stop out of that part of Bluebell Road to minimise the impact, but he considered the bus route should go through as proposed.

In response to some of the points raised Mr Wilkinson advised that they had fully examined all of the proposed bus routes and in their opinion the one via the accommodation bridge was the only realistic and viable option. Indeed it had always been the intention to run a bus service on this route. It was vital to minimise the length of the route to provide the most frequent and cost effective service possible and it was important to bear in mind that KCC were not prepared to provide ongoing financial support for this service so, after the initial three year developer funding had run out, the bus service would have to be self-supporting. Additionally, diverting the service elsewhere would also force buses in to other residential roads without any

prior notice or warning to those residents. As had already been mentioned there was a strong desire to retain and improve east/west and west/east bus links through Park Farm to the hospital and other upcoming developments near Junctions 10 and 10A of the M20. At the moment there was additional funding from the hospital to run the K-Line service but that would also run out in three years and the proposed extension of the B-Line would include the William Harvey Hospital and help to solve that issue. It did take time to establish bus routes which is why the developers were prepared to provide funding for this purpose and the figures for that were in the public domain. In terms of loading and unloading of vehicles, there was an exemption to do this on double yellow lines so residents would still have that option. In terms of enforcement he said that use of the bridge would be limited to buses, taxis, emergency services, cyclists, pedestrians and equestrians. The bridge itself was owned by the Highways Agency and Officers had received assurances from them that buses could safely negotiate the bridge and that they were assessing the parapet heights to allow equestrian use. He said that he understood that this was a difficult issue, but assured Members that they had fully examined all of the options and this was the optimal link for a quick and frequent bus service in that area.

Being the only motion proposed and seconded, the motion to refuse was then put to the vote whereby it was: -

Resolved:

That after considering the results of the formal consultation and the findings of the Members' Site Visit of the 4th December 2014, the Board rejects the implementation of the proposed restrictions and asks Officers to look at alternative bus routes that do not impact this part of Bluebell Road.

283 Godinton Ward Order 2014

Mr Wilkinson introduced the report which detailed the results of a formal consultation conducted between 23rd October and 14th November 2014 on a proposed scheme of parking controls for certain roads within the Repton Park residential estate, Cobbs Wood industrial estate and Godinton Park residential estate (Loudon Way), presenting Officer's analysis and further recommendations. He ran through the results of the consultation and advised that full details of the representations were appended to the report, and he outlined the detail of the proposed schemes for the Board using maps and plans.

The two ABC Ward Members for the area spoke in support of the proposals. They advised that the proposals had the support of the local residents' association who had been asking for the measures around Repton Park in particular for some time and the businesses on Cobbs Wood. They did request two small amendments to the plans in that the restrictions in Loudon Way opposite the junction with East Lodge Road be lifted to retain some additional parking, and that one of the proposed parking bays in Carlton Road be removed and the existing single yellow lines retained to allow large vehicles to be able to turn into a business yard.

Mr Wilkinson advised that on the first point the police had confirmed that they would object to the scheme if it did not prohibit parking opposite a junction like East Lodge

Road which was prohibited under both the Highway Code and the Road Vehicle Lighting Regulations (1989), however it was up to the Board to decide on these matters. The Vice-Chairman said that there were other areas where parking opposite junctions took place and there had never been any incidents at this location which required a solution. It did appear overkill.

Resolved:

That after considering the results of the formal consultation, the proposed restrictions be implemented subject to the lifting of the restrictions in Loudon Way opposite the junction with East Lodge Road and that one of the proposed parking bays in Carlton Road be removed and the existing single yellow lines retained.

284 Informal Consultation on the Introduction of Bus Stop Clearways for the H-Line

The report detailed the results of an informal consultation conducted between the 10th September and 17th October 2014 regarding the introduction or extension of bus stop clearways in various locations within Willesborough and Kennington, Ashford, presenting Officer's analysis and recommendations. Mr Wilkinson introduced the report and explained that whilst there was no statutory requirement to consult on bus stop clearways, it was considered good practice and Members were asked to consider the two contested sites of the original 15 that had been consulted upon. These two consisted of existing stops that had not been put in at the appropriate length and thus needed to be extended to allow buses to pull up parallel to the kerb. In response to questions he advised that there would be no changes to either any bus routes or the location of any bus stops.

Resolved:

That having the considered the results of the informal consultation the Board recommends implementation of the extended bus stop clearway markings.

285 Bank Street and Shared Space Works – Statement from the Chairman

The Chairman read out a statement giving an update on the latest situation. He advised that KCC Officers were investigating various options relating to the relaying of the footway paving on the east side of Bank Street and part of Elwick Road and Tufon Street.

Trial holes were being dug to establish the sub surface ground conditions, underground services that may be encountered and to establish whether the 'as constructed' drawings were accurate. Alternative materials similar to the existing granite placed were also being investigated as well as the impact of the re-laying operation on businesses, residents and service providers such as bus companies.

A meeting was planned for January 2015 at which time KCC Officers would present the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Joint Transportation Board and ABC Officers with their proposals, with a view to finalising a solution and way forward. A report would then be submitted to the Board in March 2015 to update on progress. In the event that a solution was not agreed upon at the January 2015 meeting, it was recommended that a special meeting of this Board be convened later in January to progress any outstanding issues. It was anticipated that work could still commence in May 2015 subject to the necessary agreement being reached.

The Board was therefore requested to agree the above arrangements and delegate power to the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Joint Transportation Board to agree a solution if possible.

Resolved:

That the update be received and noted and the Board delegate power to the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Joint Transportation Board to agree a solution if possible at their meeting with Officers on January 2015.

286 Highway Works Programme 2014/15

The report updated Members on the identified schemes approved for construction in 2014/15. Mr Loosemore drew Members' attention to two issues – the installation of a new pumping station at the Henwood Industrial Estate, and the installation of new catchpits at Willesborough Road, Ashford, where there had been delays due to work of a higher risk having to take place, but both of these should be resolved by the end of February 2015.

Mr Loosemore agreed to feed back more information to Members on the following matters surrounding the Highway Works Programme: -

- Members understood that a new pedestrian crossing at the junction of Church Road/Bentley Road/Osborne Road was proposed but they were surprised not to see it in the programme.
- Requests for the effective clearance of drains and gullies in Kenardington had not been referenced in the report.

In response to a question about grips and gullies Mr Loosemore advised that a report on this issue had been presented to the KCC Cabinet Committee on 5th December 2014 and a copy could be sent to the KALC Representative. He understood that work was in progress to draw up definitive plans of drains and gullies across the County and that was being undertaken by KCC's Drainage Manager Katie Lewis.

Resolved:

That the report be received and noted.

287 Local Winter Service Plan

The report outlined the arrangements that had been made by KCC to provide a local winter service in the event of an operational snow alert in the District. Mr Loosemore advised of KCC's budget for winter service and the arrangements for salting and gritting. He said that each District had its own District based winter service plan as a supplement to the wider plan and Ashford's was attached for information. It was a working document which would evolve and be revised as necessary throughout the year.

The following responses were given to questions and comments: -

- Mr Loosemore would find out and report back on whether all bus routes were classed as priority routes.
- Pavements were not routinely cleared as part of KCC's primary salting programme. There was an arrangement whereby ABC staff could be called upon to assist, but this was only in the most extreme cases and when they were not needed elsewhere.
- The local salt depots were all fully stocked and ready to go.
- A Member considered there should be more consultation with local Members over the salting routes in the plan given their knowledge of the local areas. Mr Loosemore agreed to feed that back to the Cabinet Member.
- Precipitation in all its forms caused flooding. Last year it was extreme rain but this could happen if there was heavy snow as well. The KALC Representative said he was concerned that new grips had still not been made in the rural areas and there was still nowhere for the precipitation to go. There were options to use machinery to do this that was not resource intensive and he could not understand why requests to do this continued to be ignored. He said that if they were not able to get the water off roads in the rural areas there would be huge problems again.

A Member said he would like to publicly thank the Officers for the hard work they put in on this issue. There was a difficult balance to strike as the area did not always get snow. Last winter was a good example of this, but the right arrangements had been in place.

Resolved:

That the report be received and noted.

288 Disabled Persons Parking Bay – Lockholt Close, Ashford

The report gave an update on the progress of an application for a disabled persons parking bay at Lockholt Close, Ashford.

Mr Loosemore read an email from the report author Lorna Day. She stated that she understood some Members may have some queries with regard to the due process required for the appeals relating to the introduction of a disabled persons parking bay but she considered that this Board and in particular, this agenda item was not the correct forum for those queries. The decision with regard to the disabled bay at Lockholt Close had been reached by the KCC Cabinet Member, Mr. David Brazier and the report was purely to update Members of Ashford's JTB on progress.

Members said that they considered that this whole issue called into question the governance of the Joint Transportation Boards. A Sub-Committee of the Board had made a decision on this appeal which was upheld by the full Board. For that decision to then be overturned by the KCC Cabinet Member seemed un-democratic and against the principles of Localism.

Resolved:

That the report be received and noted.

289 Councillor Paul Clokie

The Chairman advised that ABC Member Paul Clokie was currently seriously ill in hospital and asked Members to keep Paul in their thoughts at this time.

DS

Queries concerning these Minutes? Please contact Danny Sheppard:
Telephone: 01233 330349 Email: danny.sheppard@ashford.gov.uk
Agendas, Reports and Minutes are available on: www.ashford.gov.uk/committees

Transportation, Highways and Engineering Advisory Committee

Minutes of a Meeting of the Transportation, Highways and Engineering Advisory Committee held in the Council Chamber, Civic Centre, Tannery Lane, Ashford on the 16th January 2015.

Present:

Cllr. Heyes (Chairman);
Cllr. Feacey (Vice-Chairman);
Cllrs. Mrs Dyer, Michael, Robey, Wedgbury.

In accordance with Procedure Rule 1.2 (iii) Councillor Mrs Dyer attended as Substitute Member for Councillor Burgess.

Also Present:

Cllr. Sims

Dutch Docherty – Stagecoach in East Kent, Derek Goodwin – Ashford Driving Instructors Association, Ben Ward – Southeastern, James Hann – Ashford Borough Council, William Train – Ashford Borough Council, Danny Sheppard – Ashford Borough Council.

Apologies:

Cllrs. Burgess, Yeo.

Stephen Gasche – KCC, Yvonne Leslie – Southern.

320 Minutes

Resolved:

That the Minutes of the Industry Updates and Discussion Meeting of this Committee held on the 11th July 2014 be approved and confirmed as a correct record.

321 Industry Updates and Discussion

Stagecoach

Dutch Docherty said this coming Sunday (18th January), would see the launch of the revised E-Line and new G-Line services. The existing 517 service would become redundant. There had been some concerns raised about the effect of these changes from residents of Little Burton Farm, particularly around services to and from Sainsbury's and the New Hayesbank Surgery. At present, as a temporary solution, customers were being advised to go in to town and change to C-Line services, but the situation was being looked at with KCC. Changes would also be introduced to the 1 and 2 services, whereby the 1 service from Canterbury to Ashford would be advanced by 10 minutes in order to give the connecting 2 service from Ashford to

Tenterden a fair chance of keeping to timetable. He was pleased to report that the rest of operations in the Ashford area were going to plan.

Mr Docherty said that they were continuing to look at the issue of buses standing with their engines running in Bank Street. Drivers had been advised to keep their engines off due to previous complaints, but passengers were now complaining that they were cold whilst waiting to depart. They would keep this under review.

A Member referred to the letter that had appeared in the local paper from Jeremy Cooper, Commercial Director of Stagecoach East Kent, criticising the Joint Transportation Board's decision to reject the implementation of parking restrictions in Bluebell Road, Park Farm and to ask for alternative bus routes to be examined in this area. He considered it was regrettable that the letter had criticised a decision taken as part of the democratic process. He said that buses were welcome in Park Farm, but just not on that particular road and he considered that Mr Cooper should apologise for the content of that letter.

The effect of the new G-Line services on the elderly residents of Loudon Court was mentioned. There were 56 residents in the sheltered accommodation and they did use the bus services regularly and they had concerns about the proposed changes. The bus stops had been re-positioned slightly further away from the building which meant that residents would now have to walk further and cross a road to catch the bus. One suggestion was that every other bus (i.e. one an hour) could alter its route and go right past the home. Mr Goodwin said he had some concerns about the siting of the new bus stops affecting visibility at the Loudon Way/Springwood Drive junction. Mr Docherty explained that it was a difficult balance. Previous plans to position the bus stops nearby had been objected to by residents because they would be outside their homes. The current location had been chosen because it was in an open area with no houses. He had personally raised a concern about sight lines here but had been assured that the proposed location was acceptable. Mr Train said he would endeavour to find out more detail on KCC's consultation process for the location of these bus stops and report back. A comment was also made about there perhaps needing to be more synergy between the E-Line and G-Line timetables. It was agreed that these issues should be discussed further at the next Quality Bus Partnership (QBP) meeting.

With regard to the comments about Little Burton Farm, a Member asked if any thought had been given to re-directing the H-Line to accommodate one stop in Little Burton Farm. Mr Docherty said that he would take that suggestion back, along with a potential diversion of the 1 service also. This was perhaps another topic for discussion at the next QBP meeting.

A Member asked about the age of some of the buses on the Ashford fleet which were relatively old considering the overall investment in the Ashford network. Mr Docherty responded that Stagecoach were well aware of the Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) rules which meant that all buses would have to be fully DDA compliant by 2017. Therefore, there was an ongoing process of renewal, with some 25 newer buses already about to come in to the East Kent and East Sussex fleet with more to follow. Some of those would be allocated to Ashford. All non DDA compliant vehicles would be redundant by 2017.

Southern

Yvonne Leslie had e-mailed to advise that she was planning to attend the meeting but was now required in the office given the ongoing issues with London Bridge work and Southern's service and communications around that. Her e-mail advised that the key item she wanted to highlight was a reminder about Southern's current consultation on proposals for amendments to the December 2015 off-peak timetable. The details were on Southern's website – www.southernrailway.com and the consultation document could also be emailed to any interested parties. The deadline for responses was Friday 30th January 2015. She also advised that she would be happy to take any questions on any aspects on Southern's service and report back.

Southeastern

Ben Ward advised that, as with Southern, Southeastern had implemented a new timetable to reflect the Thameslink work and the rebuild at London Bridge. It was early days but Southeastern's own timetable appeared to be holding up pretty well in terms of performance and had so far proved robust. This was clearly going to be an ongoing issue and the first set of passenger loading data would be received later that day and would be analysed for any adjustments that may be necessary. A Member said there was concern about the knock-on effect the London Bridge work was having on services to Cannon Street with many choosing to use those trains and causing overcrowding there. He asked if a 'workers ticket' had been considered as a temporary solution to combat general overcrowding on peak services, whereby tickets could be reduced in price as an incentive to use earlier services and get in to London before 7.30am. Mr Ward said that it was inevitable that Cannon Street services would be busier during the period of the works and services arriving between 8am and 9am had been strengthened. They would be looking at the first set of passenger data when received to see what else could be done. With regard to the 'workers ticket' he knew there was an 'early-bird' ticket for passengers from Gravesend where there was a cheaper rate pre 7.30am, but this was not widely used. He did not know why this had not been rolled out to other areas but suspected it was to do with Southeastern's franchise being based on set fares and revenues which would need to be born in mind if there were any proposals to reduce ticket prices.

Mr Ward reported that the High Speed Services continued to see an increase in usage. Three new stations had been added to the HS1 routes (Snodland, Walmer and Martin Mill) and as the number of passengers continued to rise, Southeastern would be looking to strengthen their peak services wherever possible. The removal of splitting and joining services at Ashford and Faversham had helped in this regard and other opportunities across the network would be examined. A Member mentioned that he often had to stand on HS1 services which was particularly galling when you had paid a premium for the ticket and wondered if there was enough rolling stock for the High Speed trains. Mr Ward responded that there was a limited amount of High Speed carriages and they were currently running at an absolute maximum. Southeastern were making a bid to the Department for Transport to lease some additional stock from First Capital Connect, although this would not be High Speed rolling stock and there would be strong competition for these from other areas.

Mr Ward further advised that Southeastern would shortly be going out to consultation on its May 2016 timetable and would like feedback from all passengers and stakeholders. They were planning two stakeholder events during March (one in London and one somewhere in Kent) and more details of those would be provided when confirmed.

There had been an increase in fares across the network of 2.2% this January. Super off-peak fares had been frozen this year and Southeastern continued to try and promote off-peak travel. Another important point to make was that Southeastern would this year be pressing ahead to deliver on its obligations and commitments from its direct award contract. That included employing 100 additional members of staff, a deep clean of all stations to be completed by September 2015 and a deep clean of all trains to be completed by June 2015. The Chairman said he had welcomed the super off-peak saver tickets, but had been a bit disappointed that the pre-Christmas on-line 20% discount on these tickets had not been valid with rail cards. Mr Ward said he would feed that back.

With regard to the discussion about the toilet facilities on Southeastern trains at the last meeting, Mr Ward advised that there had been an increase in the frequency of bringing the units in for emptying and hoped passengers would have noticed the improvement. The Chairman said that he had certainly seen an improvement in the last few months in the availability of toilet facilities on trains and, coupled with increased passengers, this was a good achievement.

A Member said that public perception seemed to be that they were paying more but getting a worse rail service. He considered that any further increase in fares next year would have to be carefully justified. Mr Ward advised that the increase in the regulated (peak) fares was set by Government so they did not have a lot of say on that. They had attempted to make concessions where they could as evidenced by the freeze on super off-peak fares.

Ashford Driving Instructors Association

Mr Goodwin referred to the previous Industry Updates and Discussion meeting of this Committee, where he had raised concerns about two particular road junctions – Canterbury Road/Simone Weil Avenue, and Brookfield Road/Leacon Road as well as a number of worn out road markings. He considered that the response from KCC had been quite muted and dismissive, but they had re-phased the lights slightly at Canterbury Road so whilst the issue still existed, the likelihood of it occurring had been significantly reduced so that was at least some progress. There was still some disagreement about whether there had ever been a sensor in the road at this location, but he, along with Driving Examiners and Officers at ABC were sure that there had been.

With regard to the Brookfield Road/Leacon Road issue, there had been no change and there was again still some disagreement about what the camera on this junction was there to do. He considered it had been installed to detect right turning vehicles but KCC denied this.

On the wider issue of road markings around the town, Mr Goodwin considered this was getting worse and some were now almost transparent. When it was wet they were very difficult to see and many were at important junctions and roundabouts.

The roundabout at Magazine Road was given as an example. He said that if road markings were supposed to be there and were not then this was a safety issue and they should be re-painted as a matter of urgency. KCC had previously said that if they were not reported they would not be re-painted, but he did not think this was a satisfactory response. Surely their Officers were using the same roads as everybody else and could notice the worn out lines themselves, or would it be necessary to report 'the whole of Ashford' as needing attention?

322 Date of Next Meeting

Monday 27th April 2015, 7.00pm (Evening Meeting on Strategic Issues)

DS

Queries concerning these minutes? Please contact Danny Sheppard:
Telephone: 01233 330349 Email: danny.sheppard@ashford.gov.uk
Agendas, Reports and Minutes are available on: www.ashford.gov.uk/committees

Report To: Joint Transportation Board
Date: 10th March 2015
Report Title: Lorry Parking Update – Clamping
Report Author: Jo Fox, Health, Parking & Community Safety Manager

Summary: Report to update JTB on the lorry clamping project.

Background

1. Ashford is the only borough in Kent that actively enforces the on street overnight parking of HGVs. Ashford has a particular problem with regard to overnight parking compared to other Local Authorities in Kent due to the tacographs on HGVs forcing drivers to stop at certain points, this generally being within the Ashford Borough after a trip across the Channel. Enforcement is now being taken to the next level and Ashford Borough Council has been successful in receiving authority from Kent County Council for a pilot period to clamp HGV's within the borough.
2. Some years ago the problem of HGVs parking overnight on two of the towns business parks the Orbital Park and Ashford Business Park at Sevington were identified, An overnight waiting ban was introduced prohibiting parking of HGVs of 5 ton and over between 8pm and 7am.
3. Preventing British registered vehicles from parking was very successful however preventing foreign registered vehicles from parking proved more difficult primarily because there is no reciprocal agreement with most European countries to supply Registered Keeper details.
4. To overcome this Ashford Borough Council employed a firm of Bailiffs (EPC) who operate in mainland Europe to assist in chasing outstanding fines. We also mounted several 'Clean Sweep' operations with EPC and Kent Police to target foreign registered HGVs who persistently evaded paying their parking fines. This was successful however not sustainable as whilst compliance with the parking restriction temporarily improved quite quickly the numbers illegally parking again increased.
5. Over recent years the problem has spread to other areas in the town in particular to other nearby business parks such as Henwood, Ellingham and Cobbs Wood. None of these areas are covered by an overnight waiting ban however there are 'no waiting at any time' restrictions in some areas. These are particularly ignored

within the Henwood estate meaning that enforcement action is necessary. In addition, there are a number of laybys across the Borough that are regularly used by HGVs for overnight parking. Some of these have restrictions and others don't.

The Clamping Project

6. ABC has been working closely with KCC Highways to try and address this ongoing problem and KCC intend to facilitate the building of another lorry park on the M20 corridor.
7. Parking Services regularly visit and carry out enforcement in Orbital Park, Sevington and Henwood. They also monitor the availability of space at the Ashford Lorry Park and on most occasions there is capacity to take all of the vehicles we find parking in contravention of the overnight waiting ban.
8. During the discussions with KCC it was decided that the only way to fully address the problem of illegally parked HGVs in areas where all other efforts such as education, the introduction of specific parking restrictions and active enforcement have failed, was to clamp persistent offending vehicles.
9. Enforcement protocols have now been agreed with KCC, as was a policy to decide what action should be taken when an HGV parking problem was identified anywhere in the county. This is a measured approach including exploring all other options before a borough or district council can request clamping. One of the concerns of implementing a blanket and rigidly enforced prohibition of HGV parking in business parks was that the problem could be displaced into residential areas.
10. It has been agreed that ABC will pilot a six month clamping scheme and the outcomes will be reviewed. During this six month period ABC Civil Enforcement Officers (CEOs) will be working with an accredited clamping company (a partner of EPC) and will be clamping according to the agreed protocols.
11. We have been working closely with our partners with EPC and the Kent Police Specialist Goods Vehicle Department to put together a launch operation where the Civil Enforcement Team will be working alongside a team of our multi lingual bailiffs (EPC) and Kent Police. Both have agreed to support this operation. This initial operation will not be to clamp vehicles but to advise drivers of the imminent clamping operation direct them to the Ashford Truck Stop and inform them of alternative truck stops along the M20 corridor. We will be distributing warning notices in several languages to the drivers.

Current position

12. A date for the launch and education has been agreed. We are also working with the Ashford Truck Stop to ensure availability of space for HGV's during this pilot. The problem is at its worst at the weekend so our operation is likely to have a greater focus at this time.
13. After the initial educational operation our CEOs will be working closely with the clamping company to enforce on a regular basis.

Risks

14. It should be noted that a number of concerns relevant to HGV's relate to anti-social behaviour, littering and noise. The proactive approach being taken will assist with moving those HGV's that are illegally parked into the Lorry Parks; however, it will not have any impact on those that are legally parked. All areas of restrictions will be reviewed as part of this pilot and reported within the findings at the end of the 6 months. The waste facilities required for each area will also be identified and reviewed. As well as issuing warning notices to drivers who are illegally parked. The CEOs will also be distributing warning notices in multiple languages to all HGVs parked on the highway in areas affected by the waste they leave behind warning them that littering is a Criminal offence and advising them to dispose of their waste properly or to take it away with them.
15. The risk of HGV's moving to other areas, such as residential, during this pilot is also going to be monitored. The risk of displacement is high but cannot be identified until the pilot is underway.
16. This is a pilot period that will be positive in increasing compliance but is also likely to identify further areas for concern. A six month period provides time to identify these areas and contain them to be addressed at the review stage.
17. The data collected will also provide a more accurate and very useful picture for the necessity of a further Lorry park on the M20 corridor.

Contact: Jo Fox

Email: jo.fox@ashford.gov.uk

ASHFORD JOINT TRANSPORT BOARD – TRACKER OF DECISIONS
Updated for the meeting on: 10.03.2015

Minute No	Subject	Responsible Officer	Decisions of the Board	Update
377 12/12/06	Proposed traffic calming measures in Bluebell Road & Roman Way, Park Farm and Church Hill, Kingsnorth.	Andy Corcoran (KCC)	<p>RESOLVED: That</p> <p>2. subject to agreement of the Local Planning Authority & Ashford Borough Council's legal team, the proposed pedestrian crossing on Ashford Road, at the junction with Church Hill, be deferred for a period of two years and the money saved be ring-fenced in an attempt to secure further external funding so that ultimately traffic lights can be erected at the junction.</p>	<p>£145,000 from the development is still available. KHS are looking into options for the expenditure of this money to discuss with Members and Parish Council.</p> <p>At the meeting held on 10.12.13 Mr Wilkinson advised officers were awaiting a report from ABC's Planning Department on whether this expenditure was an appropriate use of S106 money & they would keep the County Member informed of developments.</p> <p>KCC has confirmed that the S106 funding was apportioned in the following manner: £15,000 towards updating street lighting equipment on Ashford Road £20,000 towards installing two Vehicle Activated signs on Ashford Road (refer to description above) £130,000 towards major resurfacing of Park Farm Road, Ashford. As part of a Countywide programme, the additional surfacing of an existing scheme of Park Farm Road, Ashford demonstrated better value for money owing to the expansion of existing proposals, which reduced mobilisation costs.</p> <p>ABC's Planning Department has certified that the S106 money was secured for a Traffic Calming Scheme "traffic calming and traffic management of the adopted public</p>

Minute No	Subject	Responsible Officer	Decisions of the Board	Update
377 12/12/06 (cont....)				highways both within the Existing Park Farm Development and otherwise in the vicinity of the Application Site to be agreed in accordance with paragraph 3 of Part 1 of the Second Schedule generally as shown on drawing number Y221/112A attached to this Agreement at the Fifth Schedule” At the meeting held on 09.12.14 Mr Loosemore, Head of Highway Operations advised that he would pass this issue on to Andy Corcoran and James Hammond as the Officers involved.
407 08/03/11	Proposed Introduction of New & Amendment of Existing Parking Restrictions in Victoria Way	Jamie Watson (KCC)	RESOLVED: That 4. the above Orders be reviewed one year after implementation.	
256 11/12/12	A28/A262 Safety Improvement Proposals	Steve Darling (KCC)	RESOLVED: That: (i) the decision not to proceed any further with proposals for Oak Grove Lane at this time be noted. (ii) the installation of traffic lights at the junction of the A28 and the A262 be rejected (iii) the new 50mph speed limit for the A28 & the A262, as originally advertised under ‘The Kent County Council (Various Roads, Borough of Ashford) (20mph, 30mph, 40mph, 50mph Speed Limits and Restricted Roads) Amendment No. 6 Consolidation Order 2012’ be endorsed, however, Officers should take the whole scheme away, look at it in the round and work up a new proposal which will find favour with local residents, Parish Councils & Members. This should include traffic calming measures at the junction and the possibility of installing a 40mph speed limit.	Revised proposals planned for a future JTB.

Minute No	Subject	Responsible Officer	Decisions of the Board	Update
257 11/12/12	A2042 Faversham Road, Ashford – Proposed Waiting Restrictions	Steve Darling (KCC)	RESOLVED: That the Board rejects the proposal to proceed with the new parking restrictions shown in Appendix B to the report , and as originally advertised under ‘the Kent County Council (Various Roads, Borough of Ashford) (Waiting Restrictions and Street Parking Places) (Amendment No. 27) Order 2012’.	Revised proposals planned for a future JTB.
329 19/02/13	Downs View Infant & Kennington Junior Schools – Highway Safety Scheme	Ray Wilkinson (ABC)	RESOLVED: That: ii) Subject to post-implementation review of the scheme, a separate consultation be held on the introduction of a length of “no waiting at any time” restriction on both sides of the carriageway along the section of Church Road between its junctions with Studio Close and Ulley Road/ The Street where the road width is less than 4.8 metres.	
375 12/03/13	A Common Sense Plan for Safe & Sensible Street Lighting	John Burr (KCC)	RESOLVED: That: i) the sites selected for the trial switching off of surplus lights be supported. iii) the exclusion criteria used for the part-night lighting initiative be supported. iv) the hours of switch off for part-night lighting be supported.	Report at the end of the trial.
21 10/06/14 & 256 10/12/13 &	Highway Works Programme 2014/15	Toby Howe KCC	RESOLVED: That the report be received & noted and the Board send a letter to David Brazier on the Mace Lane underpass issue.	A copy of the response from the KCC Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport dated 4 th July 2014 was submitted put to the Board at its meeting of 09.09.14, advising that there was a need to assess future options for the underpass including the possibility of Ashford School taking on full responsibility.

Minute No	Subject	Responsible Officer	Decisions of the Board	Update
28 10/06/14 & 351 11/03/14	Bus Gate Camera Enforcement		RESOLVED: That the current position regarding Bus Gate Camera enforcement be noted and the Board send a letter to David Brazier expressing its concerns and asking for the cameras to be put in place as soon as possible.	A copy of the response from the KCC Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport dated 4 th July 2014 was submitted to the Board at its meeting of 09.09.14, advising that the Leader of KCC has taken the decision that no further camera enforcement would be commenced in Kent until the Tunbridge Wells pilot has been completed and the results analysed. The response also advised that central Government had taken the decision for cameras to be used for enforcement only at Bus Stops, Bus Lanes, Red Routes and School Zig Zags; and so any wish to move forward with camera enforcement at these sites would need to establish if it is possible to make both sites Bus Lanes.
297 09/12/14	Transportation, Highways & Engineering Advisory Committee (THEAC) – 14 th October 2014	Cllr Heyes ABC	RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting of THEAC held on 27 th October 2014 be received and noted.	
280 09/12/14	Lorry Parking Update	Ann Carruthers KCC	RESOLVED: That the report be received and noted.	
282 09/12/14 & 138 09/09/14	Park Farm Order 2014 – (Bluebell Road & Violet Way) Update Report	William Train ABC	RESOLVED: That after considering the results of the formal consultation and the findings of the Member's site visit on 4 th December 2014, the Board rejects the implementation of the proposed restrictions and asks officers to look at alternative bus routes that do not impact this part of Bluebell Road.	

Minute No	Subject	Responsible Officer	Decisions of the Board	Update
283 09/12/14	Godinton Ward Order 2014	William Train ABC	RESOLVED: That after considering the results of the formal consultation, the proposed restrictions be implemented subject to the lifting of the restrictions in Loudon Way opposite the junction with East Lodge and that one of the proposed parking bays in Carlton Road be removed and the existing single yellow lines retained.	
284 09/12/14	Informal Consultation in the Introduction of Bus Stop Clearways for the H-Line	William Train (ABC)	RESOLVED: That having considered the results of the informal consultation the Board recommends implementation of the extended bus stop clearway markings.	
285 09/12/14	Bank Street and Shared Space Works – Statement from the Chairman	KCC	RESOLVED: That the update be received and noted and the Board delegate power to the Chairman & Vice-Chairman of the JTB to agree a solution if possible at their meeting with officers on January 2015.	The Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Officers from ABC and KCC met on 20 th January 2015 to discuss KCC's proposals for the works to the eastern footway of Bank Street and an update report on these works is due to be presented to the Board at its meeting of 10 th March 2015.
286 09/12/14	Highway Works Programme 2014/15	Lisa Holder KCC	RESOLVED: That the report be received and noted.	
287 09/12/14	Local Winter Services Plan	Andrew Loosemore KCC	RESOLVED: That the report be received and noted.	
288 09/12/14	Disabled Persons Parking Bay – Lockholt Close, Ashford	Lorna Day KCC	RESOLVED: That the report be received and noted.	

Joint Transportation Board

10th March 2015

M20 Junction 10A Scheme Update

As Members will be aware the Highways Agency is proposing to provide the M20 Junction 10A scheme. The scheme will consist of a new gyratory roundabout over the M20, approximately 700 metres east of the existing Junction 10, as well as a new link road to the A2070 Southern Orbital Road. The new junction will consist of two bridges over the motorway along with four new slip roads. The existing east facing slip roads at Junction 10 will be closed and a number of nearby properties will also be demolished.

The Highways Agency is currently progressing with the preliminary design and the consultation towards their application for planning permission through the Development Consent Order process, and has appointed Mott MacDonald Grontmij joint venture (MMGjv) as their technical consultant. They will be carrying out consultation during 2015 and will be holding public consultation exhibitions. As part of that consultation they have agreed to attend and present to this meeting of the Joint Transportation Board.

There is a scheme website which can be found at <http://www.highways.gov.uk/roads/road-projects/m20-junction-10a/>
This will be updated when needed and you can also subscribe to e-mail update alerts for the scheme.

10th March Meeting

Representatives from the Highways Agency and MMGjv will be present at the meeting to explain the scheme, the programme and the consultation process and field questions.

Report To: Joint Transportation Board
Date: 10th March 2015
Report Title: Review of Prioritised Parking List and New Process
Author: Jo Fox, ABC Health, Parking & Community Safety Manager

Summary: Report addressing the process for dealing with new requests for on street parking controls
--

Background

1. Previously the Joint Transportation Board (JTB) has, in March each year, been presented with a list of requests for new parking controls for investigation and possible implementation.
2. The way in which the investigation and delivery of these requests are dealt with is currently being reviewed and a full report detailing the future processes will be brought to the JTB in June 2015. The reason for the review is to ensure that those requests that have the highest probability of being implemented are presented in full to the JTB with all necessary background information. The requests will have been jointly screened by ABC and KCC officers who will then work together on delivery, subject to the support being received following public consultation.
3. We are currently benchmarking how requests to introduce new parking schemes are dealt with across the South East of England so that we can take on board identified best practice and implement a streamlined process going forward. We are also reflecting on why a number of requests for new schemes have not been supported at the point that they go out for public consultation; the outcome of which has resulted in wasted officer and Ward and Board Member time, frustration for residents and in some cases possible avoidable costs.

New process

4. The intention is to develop a process that is SMART ie specific, in that it is clear which projects we will be actively pursuing; measurable, in that our success delivering projects is clear; assignable, in terms of knowing who the leads are for the projects; realistic and therefore aligned to available resources and time related specifying what results can be achieved and by when. By doing this we will be able to provide those requesting a new parking scheme and members clarity over what is, and just as importantly, isn't happening.

5. We will build into the process a mechanism to keep members updated on where each request is in the overall programme. We also intend to draw together information on what makes a successful parking scheme and develop much more guidance for communities making requests so that they understand the process and are realistic about what can and can't be achieved.
6. The new process aims to incorporate a 'full circle' approach so that Members are fully aware of the ongoing impact when implementing new parking controls. These include increased enforcement costs, maintenance and the need to review the requirement for the controls in future years.
7. Finally the intention is to work more closely with our planning colleagues in order to ensure that on street parking schemes are implemented at an early stage in order to try and avoid having to retrofit parking schemes which is clearly more challenging. This work will be progressed with the support of the Planning Policy Task Group which is currently reviewing residential parking standards.

Focus between now and June

8. Between now and the June JTB meeting ABC and KCC officers will be working primarily on the parking schemes in Wye and Tenterden. This will allow requests that have been outstanding and supported for a considerable amount of time to be actively progressed; while at the same time undertaking the review outlined within this report.
9. The outcomes of the wider review will be reported to the June JTB meeting and Board Members will also be able to provide feedback on the new process, should they wish to do so.

Contact: Jo Fox
Email: jo.fox@ashford.gov.uk

To: Ashford Joint Transportation Board
By: Andy Padgham
Date: 10th March 2015
Subject: Ashford Shared Space: Bank Street/Elwick Road
Classification: For information

Summary Bank Street footway remedial action – update

At its December meeting, the board resolved to delegate power to the Chairman and Vice-Chairman to agree a solution at a meeting with officers in January 2015.

That meeting took place on 20th January 2015. The KCC Project Manager presented the proposed outline construction details to the board members and ABC officers. The design utilises a standard KCC construction detail appropriate for the road type in this location with increased thickness of sub-base and base course to enhance durability into the future.

The KCC preferred option for the type of stone to be used in the new surface is 'Kobra' Chinese granite, which is the type already in-situ. The benefits of this would be colour matching of the new surface with other paving in the area and the opportunity to recycle undamaged slabs claimed from the site in some areas.

The use of the 'Kobra' granite was agreed by ABC with the condition that KCC takes all reasonable steps to ensure recycled slabs begin their service life in the new construction in as clean condition as possible. At the time of writing, KCC is investigating whether cost-effective means of achieving this are possible; however it is likely that all new granite slabs will be used.

The subject of the possible retention of all or part of the flume feature was discussed. The laminated slabs that were used to produce the feature are the source of the majority of damage leading to the necessary remedial measures. It was therefore agreed the best solution for the future durability of the shared surface in this street is to completely and permanently remove the flume feature from Bank Street/Elwick Road.

The Chairman and Vice-Chairman were content to accept KCC's recommendations, subject to conditions detailed above, in line with powers delegated to them by the Board.

At the 20th January meeting, ABC offered to assist KCC during preparation of the scheme, particularly with public relations. It was therefore decided to form a joint Project Team utilising specialist officers from both authorities. The first meeting of that team was held on 9th February 2015. The importance of effective public information during the period leading up to the construction phase and beyond was acknowledged by all members present. The team will be working particularly closely with businesses affected by the works and early contact was agreed as essential.

The target construction start date is Tuesday 26th May 2015. Subject to detailed design, the construction phase at the time of writing is expected to be approximately 20 weeks. This would mean completion around the middle of October 2015 and ABC has emphasised the importance of completion before the busy Christmas shopping period commences.

The JTB will be kept informed of further progress.

Contact Officer: Andy Padgham

To: Ashford Joint Transportation Board
By: KCC Highways and Transportation
Date: 10th March 2015
Subject: Highway Works Programme 2014/15
Classification: Information Only

Summary: This report updates Members on the identified schemes approved for construction in 2014/15

1. Introduction

This report provides an update and summarises schemes that have been programmed for delivery in 2014/15

Footway and Carriageway Improvement Schemes – see Appendix A

Drainage Repairs & Improvements – see Appendix B

Street Lighting – see Appendix C

Developer Funded Works – see Appendix D1

Willesborough Road Pinch Point – see Appendix D2

Transportation & Safety Schemes – see Appendix E

Public Rights of Way – see Appendix F

Traffic Systems – Appendix G

The Combined Member Grant – see Appendix H

Conclusion

1. This report is for Members information.

Contact Officers:

The following contact officers can be contacted on **03000 418181**

Kirstie Williams	Highway Manager (East)
Lisa Holder	Ashford District Manager
Alan Casson	Resurfacing Manager
Katie Lewis	Drainage Manager
Sue Kinsella	Street Lighting Manager
Toby Butler	Intelligent Transport Systems Manager
Steve Darling	Transportation, and Safety Schemes
Melvyn Twycross	PROW
Tony Ambrose	Structures Manager
James Hammond	Developer Funded Work

Appendix A – Footway and Carriageway Improvement Schemes

The delivery of these schemes is weather dependent; should it prove not possible to carry out these works on the planned dates, new dates will be arranged and the residents will be informed by a letter drop to their homes.

Surface Treatments - <i>Contact Officer Wendy Boustead</i>			
Micro Asphalt Schemes			
Road Name	Parish	Extent of Works	Current Status
Sole Street	Crundale	From its junction with Olantigh Road to its junction with Denwood Street	Completed
Earlsworth Road	Ashford	East Stour Primary School to its junction with Cudworth Road	Completed
Machine Resurfacing – <i>Contact Officer Byron Lovell</i>			
Road Name	Parish	Extent of Works	Current Status
A28 Rolvenden Hill	Rolvenden	Rolvenden level crossing to Mounts Lane	Programmed February 2015
A28 Ashford Road	High Halden	Cripple Hill to Bramley Cottages (around the sharp bends)	Completed
A28 Canterbury Road	Boughton Aluph	Rolvenden level crossing to Mounts Lane	Completed
A28 Templar Way	Ashford	Waitrose entrance to roundabout jnt A28 Chart Road (tank roundabout)	Completed
A28 Simone Weil Ave	Ashford	Junction with Warren Retail Park	Completed

Footway Improvement - Contact Officer Wendy Boustead

Road Name	Parish	Extent and Description of Works	Current Status
Hythe Road	Smeeth	From its junction with Smeeth Crossroads to Bob Fishers Garage – Removal of existing surface and replacement with new asphalt surface. Site clearance works to take place prior to construction	Works commenced 8 th January 2015

Appendix B – Drainage Repairs & Improvements

Location	Description of Works	Job Status	Timescale for Completion
Henwood Industrial Estate	Installation of new pumping station	Works Programmed	March 2015
Willesborough Road, Ashford	Installation of new Catchpits	Works Programmed	March 2015
Canterbury Road, Molash	Repair defective pipework and regrade verge	Works Complete	
Canterbury Road, Brabourne	Installation of gullies and discharge into disused chalk pit	Works Complete	
Hythe Road, Mersham	Installation of new Soakaways	Works Complete	
Ashford Road, Bethersden	Replace blocked or broken pipework	Works Complete	
Church Road, Ashford	Installation of Additional Gullies	Works Complete	
Cranbrook Road, Tenterden	Pipe spring water to nearest highway gully	Works Programmed	March 2015
Feather Bed Lane, Mersham	Upsize existing culvert and install new culvert to link drainage ditches under highway	Works Complete	
New Road Hill, Ashford	Install new gullies and connect into ditch	Works Complete	
Knockwood Lane, Molash	Installing new gullies	Works Complete	

Appendix C – Street Lighting

Structural testing of KCC owned street lights has identified the following as requiring replacement this financial year. A status of Completed identifies that the column replacement has been carried out. Programme dates are identified for those still requiring replacement.

Street Lighting Column Replacement – Contact Officer Sue Kinsella			
Road Name	Column Ref	Location	Status
BRUNSWICK ROAD	MBFA020	SIDE OF UNIT 6 ST GEORGES BUSINESS CENTRE	COMPLETED
BRUNSWICK ROAD	MBFA032	SIDE OF MPT HOUSE RHS	COMPLETED
BROOKFIELD ROAD	MBFY025	J/W CLOCKHOUSE RHS	COMPLETED
BROOKFIELD ROAD	MBFU056	J/W BEAVER LANE	COMPLETED
BROOKFIELD ROAD	MBFU057	J/W BEAVER LANE	COMPLETED
SINGLETON HILL	MBGP003	JUNCTION THE BULRUSHES RHS	COMPLETED
CHURCH ROAD	MCGF010	OUTSIDE 70	COMPLETED
CHURCH ROAD	MCGF008	OPP 136	COMPLETED
CHURCH ROAD	MCGF002	OPP 136	COMPLETED
GODINTON ROAD	MGCH004	OUTSIDE 124/126	COMPLETED
KNOLL LANE	MKBE030	OPPOSITE JUNCTION HARVEST WAY	COMPLETED
MACE LANE	MMAB006	OPPOSITE J/W KIWK FIT GARAGE	MARCH -15
MACE LANE	MMAB010	OPP J/W MACE IND EST	COMPLETED
MACE LANE	MMAB014	JUNCTION EAST HILL RHS	COMPLETED
MAGAZINE ROAD	MMAC019	REAR OF 13 THE WEALD	COMPLETED
NEW STREET	MNAN018	OUTSIDE 70	COMPLETED
NEW STREET	MNAN019	OUTSIDE 56/58 P/H	COMPLETED

NORTH STREET	MNBM005	ADJACENT SHELL PETROL GARAGE	MARCH -15
WELLESLEY ROAD	MWBE004	ADJACENT J/W MACE LANE	COMPLETED
WELLESLEY ROAD	MWBE011	JUNCTION PARK STREET LHS	MARCH -15
WELLESLEY ROAD	MWBE012	OPPOSITE J/W PARK ST. LHS	MARCH -15
BRAMBLE CLOSE	MBHM002	OUTSIDE 4	MARCH -15
BEAVER LANE	MBFV017	OUTSIDE 209	COMPLETED
CHARING HILL	MCBL023	J/W B2077	MARCH -15
CHART ROAD	MCBO041	J/W HOLTON ROAD	COMPLETED
CHART ROAD	MCBO069	J/W BROOKFIELD ROAD R-A-B	MARCH -15
CHART ROAD	MCBO071	J/W BROOKFIELD ROAD R-A-B	MARCH -15
EVANS ROAD	MEBE005	OUTSIDE 23	COMPLETED
HIGH STREET	MHCF003	OUTSIDE 5/7	MARCH -15
PARK STREET	MPAJ002	R/O COUNTY HOTEL HIGH STREET	COMPLETED
PARK STREET	MPAJ004	OPP CHARTER HOUSE LHS	COMPLETED
PARK STREET	MPAJ009	OPP REAR OFF 32 NORTH STREET	COMPLETED
WEST STREET	MWBI008	3 RD FROM J/W REGENTS PLACE SOUTH BOUND	COMPLETED

Appendix D

Appendix D1 – Developer Funded Works

Developer Funded Works - Section 278 Agreements				
File Ref:	Road Name:	Parish:	Description:	Current Status:
AS003007	Warren Site B - Fougères Way	Ashford	New Traffic Signals and entrance to John Lewis	Remedial list has been compiled waiting for start date
AS0419	Newtown - former railway site	Newtown, Ashford	New controlled pedestrian crossing and construction of site entrance	Waiting for start date and programme
AS2083	Missenden, Kingsnorth Road	Kingsnorth	New access to proposed housing development	Works complete and in maintenance period
AS2082	Goat Lees School, Hurst Road	Kennington	New access to school parking area	Adopted
AS2081	A28 Chart Road, Brunswick Road Junction	Godinton	Rearrange junction alignment	Works Complete and in maintenance period
AS003013	Brunswick Road	Godinton	Widen the junction to the EMR site	Works Complete and in maintenance period
AS2074	Sotherton Road	Willesborough	Amendments to the parking area	Works are completed and in maintenance period
AS003009	Knoll Lane	Singleton	Access on to new development and relocation of pedestrian crossing point	Works have commenced on site

AS003012	Farrow Court	Stanhope	New footway and relocation of pedestrian crossing facilities	Works have commenced on site, the controlled crossing will be implemented once construction has been completed on site
AS003014	Simone Weil Avenue	Ashford	Footway works to be completed along the frontage of the Ashford International Hotel	Remedial list has been compiled waiting for start date
AS003010	12-20 Hawthorn	Appledore	New arrangement to access road providing additional parking	Works Complete and in maintenance period
AS003020	Mill Road	Bethersden	Footway works along the frontage to tie in with the existing footway	Footway works completed however additional works required
AS003008	Chalk Avenue	Tenterden	New Access to development	Works Complete and in maintenance period
AS003049	Ashford Road	Chilham	New Development Access and Pedestrian Crossing	Technical approval granted waiting on start date
AS003024	Cudworth Road	Willesborough	New Access to development	Technical approval granted waiting on start date

AS003025	Appledore Road, Kenardington	Kenardington	New Footway and pedestrian crossing to a housing development	Approval granted - waiting on start date (Late February 2015)
AS003026	Dudley Road	Kennington	New Access for Development	Works completed and in maintenance period
AS003038	Ashdown Court	Ashford	New Access to development and footway works	Technical approval granted waiting on start date
AS003027	Manse Field, Brabourne	Brabourne	New Vehicle Access and realignment to the footway	Works completed and in maintenance period
AS003002	Warren Site A, Ashford Road	Ashford	Access to be updated for new housing development	Works have commenced on site
AS003011	Old Abattoir Site	Aldington	New Access	Works are continuing on site but no date given for the new junction off Roman Road
AS003028	Wesley School Road	Singleton	Change of road alignment to introduce on street parking	Works completed and in maintenance period
AS0418	Cheesemans Green PAR	Sevington	New principal road to developments	Works have completed on site in maintenance period (waiting on stage 3 safety audit)
AS003006	Kings Avenue	Ashford	New Housing Development	Preliminary works have commenced

				on site and technical acceptance has been issued. Kings Avenue is continually being monitored due to issue raised with mud on the highway
AS003036	Tenterden Site 1	Tenterden	New Proposed Housing Development	Still in early planning discussions
AS003054	Chilmington Green	Great Chart	New Proposed Housing Development	Still in planning stages
AS003044	Cryol Road	South Ashford	New Access for Ashford Housing site	Technical approval granted waiting on start date
AS00309	River view, Ashford	Ashford	New footway and parking arrangements	Technical approval granted waiting on start date
AS003033	Hopewell School, St Stephens Walk	Ashford	New vehicle cross overs and street lighting works	Technical approval granted waiting on start date
AS00309	River view, Ashford	Ashford	Amendments to the existing highway	Technical approval granted waiting on start date
AS003046	Willesborough Dykes, Sheepfold Lane	Kingsnorth	New cycleway/footway tying in to existing network	Works completed and in maintenance
AS003050	Calleywell Lane	Aldington	New footway	Technical audits not yet complete
AS003051	Dover Place	Ashford	Amendments to the junction	Technical approval

			and works to the footway required	granted waiting on start date
--	--	--	-----------------------------------	-------------------------------

Appendix D2 – Willesborough Road Pinch Point (Collingbrook/Kennington Road)

The County Council's technical consultant (amey) has progressed with the detailed design for a section of retaining wall. Ashford Borough Council have provided feedback on the style of acoustic fencing for incorporation as part of the widening scheme. Further discussions are now underway with the relevant third part landowners, after which the design can be finalised and work then completed to handover the scheme to the KCC Schemes Team. Ecological survey work has been undertaken during the summer months to ensure the programme for completion of the works is not delayed by a requirement for ecological surveys.

amey are working to a programme start date for the works on site of either Easter 2016 or Summer 2016. The final decision between the two will reflect the Traffic Management arrangements that can be agreed with KCC permitting team. However, to avoid any showstoppers the application for the permit will be processed over the next few months to safeguard the slot.

Appendix E – Transportation and Safety Schemes

The Traffic Schemes Team is implementing a number of schemes within the Ashford District, in order to meet Kent County Council's strategic targets (for example, addressing traffic congestion, or improving road safety). Casualty Reduction Measures (CRMs) have been identified to address a known history of personal injury crashes; for Members' information, these are specifically highlighted with an asterisk:

Local Transport Plan Funded Schemes - Contact Officer Steve Darling			
Scheme Name	Parish	Description of Works	Current Status
A2042 North Street / A292 Somerset Road*	Ashford	Modifications to traffic signals to improve pedestrian safety, in the form of staggered crossings	Detailed design work on hold. Awaiting trial hole data and costs from BT for the necessary relocation of their apparatus
A2042 Faversham Road (Trinity Rd to– The Pasture)*	Ashford / Boughton Aluph	Signing, lining & alterations to existing interactive sign	Works complete June 2014
A20 / Sandyhurst Lane*	Westwell / Hothfield	Interactive warning signs on approaches to crossroads	Works complete April 2014
A28 / A262 junction*	High Halden / Tenterden	Interactive warning signs, lower speed limits, weight limit for Oak Grove Lane	Works complete. Speed limit & weight restriction installed February 2014. Interactive signs installed October 2014
A2042 Station Rd / Elwick Rd*	Ashford	Secondary traffic signals for Station Road / Beaver Road approaches. Lane changes to allow all traffic to turn right from Elwick Road	Works complete July 2014
A2042 Romney Marsh Rd / Bad Munstereifel Rd*	Kingsnorth	Signing improvements	Works complete June 2014

A2042 Romney Marsh Rd / Kimberley Way*	Ashford	Signing improvements	Works complete September 2014
A292 Hythe Road / Church Road*	Ashford	Signing and lining improvements	Signing work complete July 2014. Lining works programmed February 2015
A20 Hythe Road / Station Road*	Smeeth	Signing, lining and resurfacing improvements	Works complete December 2014
A28 Ashford Road / Chilmington Green Road*	Great Chart with Singleton	Signing, lining and resurfacing improvements	Works complete December 2014

Appendix F – Public Rights Of Way

Public Rights of Way – Contact Officer Melvyn Twycross			
Path No	Parish	Description of Works	Current Status
AW51	Westwell	Surface improvements to byway	Complete
AW289	Bethersden	Surface Improvements to bridleway	Complete
AE36 (NDW)	Godmersham	Surface repairs to byway	Weather dependent – work due to start in early 2015
AT60	Rolvenden	Surface improvements to byway	Works in progress
AT61	Rolvenden	Surface improvements to byway	Works in progress
AE490	Aldington	Surface repairs to footpath	Weather dependent – work due to start in early 2015
AT49	Rolvenden	Surface repairs to footpath	Weather dependent – work due to start in early 2015
AT77A	Wittersham	Provision of stone surface to footpath	Works due to commence shortly
AT86	Wittersham	Provision of stone surface to footpath	Complete
AW340	Shadoxhurst	Surface repairs to byway	Works due to commence shortly
AW347 (NDW)	Charing	Surface repairs to byway	Works due to commence shortly
Path behind Hedge	Mersham	Provision of new stone surfaced footpath	Works due to commence shortly
Eureka Leisure Path to Bockhanger Lane	Ashford	Creation of new tarmac Public Footpath	Complete
AU105	Ashford	Creation of new Public Bridleway including new bridge, Blackwall Rd to Conningbrook Lakes	Complete

Appendix G – Traffic Systems

There is a programme of scheduled maintenance to refurbish life expired traffic signal equipment across the county based upon age and fault history. The delivery of these schemes is dependent upon school terms and holiday periods; local residents, businesses and schools will be informed verbally and by a letter drop of the exact dates when known.

Traffic Systems - <i>Contact Officer: Toby Butler</i>		
Location	Description of Works	Current Status
No traffic signal refurbishment work being carried out this year		

Appendix H – The Combined Member Grant programme update for the Ashford District

The following schemes are those which have been approved for funding by both the relevant Member and by John Burr, Director of Highways. It lists schemes that are at consultation stage, due to be programmed or have been recently built onsite, and is up to date as of 28 January 2015.

The details below are for Highway Schemes only. This report does not detail contributions Members have made to other groups such as Parish Councils or highway studies/surveys funded by Members. Schemes awaiting approval as at time of writing are also excluded from the list.

More detail on their schemes, including schemes not listed below that are currently under investigation, can be accessed by each Member via the online database or by contacting their Member Highway Fund Officer.

Mike Hill

Scheme	Cost	Status
Woodchurch Road, Appledore Heath. Residents are concerned vehicles are approaching the junction with Kenardington Road and School Road too fast	£500	Design in progress
Newenden Bridge 'Walkers in Road' warning signs	£1,022	Handed over for delivery
Feasibility investigation into the addition of a single lighting column along the Glebelands-Chalkhurst footpath	£500	Feedback provided with indicative cost for the lighting column. Investigation works complete

Mike Angell

Scheme	Cost	Status
Bilsington crossroads – Improvements – Remedial works to bring the give way out by a further metre	N/A	Complete
Installation of VAS o/s nos. 97-99 Front Road, Woodchurch	£5716.23	Handed over to the ITS Team for delivery
Feasibility investigation into the provision of 'Accompanied Horse' warning signs	£500	Feedback and indicative cost provided to Member and Parish Council. Investigation works

on Criol Lane and Bethersden Road		complete
-----------------------------------	--	----------

George Koowaree

Scheme	Cost	Status
Earlsworth Road Bus Shelter	500	Design complete and handed over. Mr Koowaree wishes to go ahead with the bus shelter, and we are currently seeking a quotation from Queensbury for an Arun shelter
Lees Road Parking Restrictions at M20 overbridge	500	Design complete and handed over to Mr Koowaree for consideration

Andrew Wickham

Scheme	Cost	Status
The Street, Brook – Proposed speed limit reduction 40mph – 30mph		Final phase due to commence 29 January 2015 (application of HFS and road markings)
Molash Garage – vehicles are parking across the access to the garage and obstructing pedestrian egress	150	Site visit complete and findings have been fed back to Mr Wickham
Branch Road, Chilham enhanced gateway		Handed over for delivery

Derek Smyth

Scheme	Cost	Status
Stanhope Road, Stanhope – Zebra Crossing and reconstruction of the highway		Works complete. The Parish Council has requested a quotation for the provision of advance warning signs and this has been provided. The advance warning signs were not included as part of the original design as they are only recommended for use where visibility to the crossing does not meet minimum standards, which is not applicable

		to the Stanhope Road Crossing
--	--	-------------------------------

Charlie Simkins

Scheme	Cost	Status
A28 Ashford Road, High Halden – Zebra Crossing		Onsite, awaiting UKPN power connections (planned for February)
The Street, Great Chart – relocation of an existing bus stop to include carriageway resurfacing at the new location and construction of dropped crossing		Design underway

1.1 Legal Implications

1.1.1 Not applicable

1.2 Financial and Value for Money Considerations

1.2.1 Not applicable

1.3 Risk Assessment

1.3.1 Not applicable

Contact: Lisa Holder 03000 418181

Agenda Item 12

To: Ashford Joint Transportation Board
By: Behdad Haratbar, Head of Programmed Works
Date: 5 January 2015
Subject: Highway Drainage
Classification: Information only

Summary: To update Members on the approach to maintaining and improving the highway drainage system whilst ensuring that the customer is provided with a quality service against a background of increasing severe weather events.

This paper was reported to the Kent County Council Environment and Transport Cabinet Committee on 5 December 2014

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The County Council is responsible for the maintenance of the 5,400 miles of public highway roads including 250,000 roadside drains (gullies) and associated drainage systems.
- 1.2 The primary objectives of the highway drainage system are:
 - a. Removal of surface water (from the carriageway) to maintain road safety and minimise nuisance,
 - b. Effective sub-surface drainage to prevent damage to the structural integrity of the highway and maximise its lifespan, and,
 - c. Minimise the impact of highway surface water on the adjacent environment including properties
- 1.3 In recent years, numbers of prolonged and heavy rainfall events have increased, notably the winter of 2013/14. As prolonged, heavy rainfall events have become more frequent, the number of customer enquiries has increased year on year. The volume of customer enquiries now stands at twice that of 2009. In the last 12 months, around 10,000 enquiries related to drainage and flooding have been received. Of these, 3,000 are related directly to highway flooding

and 500 related to incidents of highway flooding that had resulted in damage to private properties.

- 1.4 The Highway Drainage service is split into two functions:
- Maintenance
 - Repairs, renewals and improvements
- 1.5 The approach taken to delivering the service has been outlined in a document called “Asset Management in Drainage”. In summary, this details the steps that we take to manage our drainage asset. The series of questions and answers emphasise the need to spend the right amount of money at the right time and explain our focus on sites where the risk to road users and residents is the highest. This document can be found at Appendix A.
- 1.6 This year, the County Council has increased capital investment in drainage infrastructure to £4.3m. This is enabling completion of an additional 120 drainage improvement schemes in 2014/15. Investment has been prioritised on the basis of the following risks:
- Highway Safety
 - Internal flooding of properties
 - Network disruption

2. Financial Implications

- 2.1 The allocated budget for highway drainage cleansing is £2,408,300. This a saving of £300,000 made as part of the wider Highway, Transportation and Waste efficiencies for 2014/15. The maintenance regime outlined in this report has been developed on the basis of the current budget allocation and feedback from stakeholders to ensure a balance between the needs of the asset and the demands of the County Council’s customers.
- 2.2 The approach outlined for capital investment in highway drainage infrastructure ensures that the allocated budget is spent effectively

3. Policy Framework

- 3.1 The approaches to service delivery outlined in this report fulfil the principle of achieving value for money.

4. The Report

Maintenance

- 4.1 In December 2010, a change of approach to cleaning highway drains was approved. There was a transition from providing a purely reactive service to delivering routine maintenance on a cyclical basis.
- 4.2 At the point of moving from a reactive to a planned approach information about the quantum and location of drainage assets was limited. An understanding of the quantum of assets and traffic management required to carry out maintenance activities has been developed. This data is being used to inform planning and programming and enhance service delivery at an operational and strategic level.
- 4.3 The departure from a predominantly reactive service combined with very wet weather throughout 2012 resulted in an initial decline in customer satisfaction. However this improved significantly and by April 2013 customer satisfaction had reached 87%.
- 4.4 In 2013, the annual Tracker Survey asked:
- “How satisfied or dissatisfied are you that road drains/ gullies are kept clean and working in your local area?”
- Comments and feedback indicated that blocked drains were continuing to be a hot topic for Members and Parish Councils, particularly in rural areas.
- 4.5 In response to the feedback from the Tracker Survey and in light of the need to make significant revenue savings, the way in which drainage maintenance is delivered was subject to a further review. The table below details cleansing activities undertaken from September 2011 and the frequencies currently being trialled.

Road Type/ Risk Category	Road Length (miles)	Number of Gullies	Cleansing Frequency 2011	Cleansing Frequency 2014
Hotspots (250 locations)	NA	NA	Every 3-6 months	Every 3-6 months

High Speed Roads	160	8820	Every 6 months	Every 12 months
Strategic and Locally Important Routes	1370	41,191	Every 12 months	Every 12 months
Minor Urban Roads (estate type roads)	2190	112,776	Every 2 years	Targeted Cleansing
Minor Rural Roads	1650	85,078	Every 2 years	Targeted Cleansing
Totals	5370	247,865	-	-

- 4.6 The frequency of cyclical cleansing on high speed roads was reduced from six monthly to annually to be consistent with the frequency of maintenance on the County's other main roads. This was part of a service wide saving that came into effect on 1st April and applied to all routine maintenance on the high speed road network.
- 4.7 Drains on minor urban roads are generally less prone to becoming blocked due to protection by kerb lines, the nature of the traffic using the roads, street sweeping undertaken by District Council and self-cleansing capabilities of the carrier pipes. Examining the data collected from routine walked inspections undertaken by the Highway Inspectorate between April and September has emphasised this point. Blocked drains were reported on less than 10% of the roads inspected.
- 4.8 A targeted approach to cleansing is now being trialled on minor urban roads. Rather than a cleansing crew attending every road once every two years, each road is inspected at least annually and resources are focused where the need is highest.
- 4.9 Drains on minor rural roads are often more prone to becoming blocked. Gullies can become overgrown by verges and hedge rows and are particularly vulnerable during peaks in agricultural activities or when silt is washed off fields during prolonged or heavy rainfall. It is not financially viable to increase the cleansing frequency and therefore a community lead approach is being trialled.
- 4.10 The principle behind this approach is to utilise the good relationships that have been fostered by Highway Stewards with Members and

Parish Councils. Over the past three years, the Highway Stewards have developed a detailed knowledge of issues in their area. The intention here is to use this local knowledge of community issues to inform our programmes of gully cleansing.

- 4.11 Cleansing is now being undertaken in response to enquiries from Members, Parish Councils and customers. Each site is inspected by a highway steward, assessed and prioritised on the basis of highest risk first. The assessment criteria include, risk to highway safety and risk of internal property flooding.

Repairs, renewals and improvements

- 4.12 Highway flooding causes significant level of disruption; it affects movement of people and goods, therefore adversely affecting the local economy. It also causes significant damage to the highway network; at surface level, flood water scours the surface of the carriageway and footway, which will allow ingress of water to the layer below. In the short term it will result in cracking and development of potholes. Flood water also penetrates the lower layers of road construction washing away fine materials and in time results in large failures of the road structure which may require significant repairs or even reconstruction.
- 4.13 The weather last winter highlighted numerous pinch points in the drainage network. Some of these are being addressed by the implementation of an enhanced cleansing regime however in a large number of cases work is required to improve the functionality of the system.
- 4.14 The annual capital budget allocation in recent years has been around £2.7m. This has enabled the completion of around 800 priority minor repair and small improvements and a small number of larger improvement schemes each year. Nevertheless, there are many more sites that need attention and this has been demonstrated by the 3,500 enquiries received last winter.
- 4.15 Details of the schemes scheduled for completion by the 31 March 2015 can be found at Appendix B.

5. Conclusion

- 5.1 The regime adopted in September 2011 enabled us to develop a good knowledge of the drainage asset. Moving forward, we have

taken on board feedback from stakeholders and tailored the service to respond to customer demand, asset need and the financial challenges.

Recommendations

It is recommended that Members note this report

Background documents:

Appendices

Contact officer:

Kathryn Lewis
Drainage & Flooding Manager
03000 418 181
kathryn.lewis@kent.gov.uk

Asset Management in Highways

What asset management means for drainage assets

Introduction

This short guide outlines the steps that we take to manage our 'drainage asset'. This includes roadside drains, soakaways, ponds, lagoons, pumping stations, highway ditches and thousands of kilometres of connecting pipe.

This guide is set out in a series of 12 questions and answers we have developed from discussing asset management with the Public, elected Members and Parish/Town Councils.

1. What is Asset Management?

Asset management is the term used to describe a common sense approach to maintenance and future investment decisions for all the parts that make up our highway. It is about spending the right amount of money at the right time to keep our assets working properly to meet the needs of our customers now and in the future.

For example, if we spend £1,000 cleaning a soakaway every two years it will keep working for up to 30 years. If we don't clean the soakaway, we may need to spend £30,000 replacing it after just 10 years.

2. What are drainage assets?

The drainage asset is made up of:

Asset	The amount we look after
Roadside drains	250,000
Ponds and Lagoons	250
Pumping Stations	15
Soakaways	8,500

3. Why do KCC need to know where all these assets are?

We continually collect information on all our new, replacement and improved drainage assets. This includes where they are as well as information about the asset itself such as the size of the drain and where it drains to.

We use the information that we collect to plan routine maintenance work, make decisions about where to invest our money and set the levels of service that our customers can expect from us.

The number of drainage assets in Kent is currently increasing each year due to new housing and business developments being built.

4. Why do KCC need to know what condition assets are in?

Once we know what our assets are and where they are located, we need to know what condition they are in. This information helps us to make informed decisions about how often to maintain them and where we need to invest our money to make improvements and keep the drainage system functioning as it should.

We regularly inspect our assets and use information from customers to help assess their condition and understand what needs to be done to keep them functioning correctly in the most cost effective way. This helps us manage our future budget needs and understand what could happen if, for example, the budget we need is not fully available.

5. How often do KCC check what condition assets are in?

There are two types of checks, planned inspections and reactive inspections.

Planned inspections include highway safety inspections and condition checks carried out as part of our cyclical maintenance regime:

- Our team of 12 highway inspectors carry out visual checks to make sure the highway assets are in a safe condition. This includes checking that drain covers are not broken or missing. We carry out this kind of check at least once every 12 months.
- Our drainage cleansing crews look at the condition of the drains on main roads and test each one by filling it with water and checking that it is able to flow away. We carry out these kind of checks at least once every 12 months.

Reactive inspections are carried out in response to enquiries and generate ad hoc and emergency works, for example cleaning blocked drains that are causing the road to flood and repairing collapsed road drains.

6. How do KCC decide how much to spend on each asset?

When we are prioritising drainage works we think about the risk that flooding poses to road users and residents:

- What do we need to do to make sure that the road doesn't flood?
- If the road floods, does it create a hazard to road users?
- If the road floods, does it cause a lot of disruption?
- If the road floods, are people's homes affected?

We use the information we have collected about our drainage assets to help us answer these questions and decide what we need to do to keep the drainage system working and keep road users and people's homes as safe as we can from flooding.

Sometimes the weather can create an increased need demand for maintenance and reactive works such as flood clearance. We ensure that budget is available to respond to these situations.

When we don't have the budget to do everything that is needed, we prioritise works with the budget that we have.

7. Are some assets more important than others and does the type of road affect how much KCC spends on it?

All assets are important and we have a statutory duty to ensure that the highway is safe to use but, we have to work within our overall budget. We decided what work is needed and when it should be done by thinking about where the risk to road users and residents is the highest.

Some of the things we think about include the following:

- The type of road, for example, whether it is a high speed road, a main road, an estate road or a country lane
- The amount of traffic that uses the road, for example is it a main route in and out of a town or is it a minor road only used by a handful of drivers each day
- The impact if the road is closed, for example, the road might only be used by a handful of people but it may also be the only route to get to their homes
- The impact on residential property, for example, when the drains are blocked do homes get flooded

8. How do KCC decide when repairs are needed?

Whilst we know we need to react and fix dangerous situations quickly, this is not a cost effective way of working as we have to send crews specifically to these locations and more time is spent travelling rather than fixing.

We can clearly get more done for our budget if we plan the work that need to be done. By planning ahead and maintaining the assets at the right time, it means we can do more with less and keep the asset at its required condition for longer.

9. How do KCC let customers know what service they can expect?

Our response to emergency or dangerous situations is the same across all our assets – we arrive on site within 2 hours.

For more routine enquiries we normally respond in 28 days

Other more complex requests will take us time to investigate and arrange remediation works.

The levels of service we can deliver is clearly linked to the 'need' of the assets, maintaining safety and the share of the budget it is allocated.

We aim to meet customer expectations wherever possible. We do however welcome support and help from community groups and parishes.

Our aim is to be clear to customers the levels of service they can expect from us for each asset.

10. Where do KCC publish the level of service?

We will publish on the KCC website the work we plan to do during the year so customers can see how drainage assets are looked after, the levels of service you can expect and when work will be carried out.

11. How can customers contact KCC to help look after assets?

If you see a drain that is causing a problem please report it to us using our online web form or if you are concerned about dangerous flooding call our contact centre which is available 24/7 on 03000 41 81 81. We have also put information on the website entitled "how you can help" if you want to look drains near you. We encourage local communities to help enhance the level of service we deliver

and we have produced guidance which is also published on the KCC website.

It is helpful if you can give us as much information as possible when reporting a problem. We need:

- The number or name of the house the problem is outside or another landmark to help us locate it.
- The name of the road
- The name of the town or village
- What is wrong, for example " the drain is blocked and causing flooding across half the width of the road"

The more information we have when the fault is reported, the quicker we can deal with it.

12. How do KCC let customers know what has been done each year?

Each year we will report and publish on the main KCC information about how we have spent our budget. We want to be open, honest and clear about how we look after our assets in Kent, where we spend our budget and what levels of service customers can expect.

Report To: Joint Transportation Board

Date: 10th March 2015

Report Title: Future Roles & Responsibilities

Report Author: Jo Fox, ABC Health, Parking & Community Safety Manager
Lisa Holder, KCC Ashford District Manager

Summary: Report outlining arrangements for reporting highway faults and links to JTB.
--

Background

1. The recent restructure within Ashford Borough Council has aligned the Engineering Services function with the Parking Service in order to provide a more streamlined approach. This was therefore a good opportunity for us to consider the background and functions of the Joint Transportation Board (JTB) alongside the day to day working arrangements between officers from both ABC and KCC.
2. ABC and KCC Officers are working together to ensure there is a focused and efficient delivery on agreed joint projects. ABC Officers are now meeting on a bi-monthly basis with representatives from all areas covered within the KCC Highway works programme. This is proving a valuable opportunity for progressing reports and information sharing.
3. As well as these changes the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the JTB and have discussed how they would like highway fault items to be addressed in the future and how this links to discussions at JTB meetings.

Arrangement for reporting highway faults

4. It is recommended that all items relating to highway faults such as potholes, drainage, faulty street lights, broken signs etc. must be reported to Kent County Council via telephone on 03000 418181 or online at www.kent.gov.uk/highwayfaults.
5. From this site it is possible to see all known issues, view any planned works, report multiple issues, upload photos as well as track any existing enquiries.
6. Most problems can then be placed into one of the following categories and the fault can be tracked using its reference number:

- Emergencies - to be responded to within 2 hours. Following assessment of the situation, if an emergency repair is required this is carried out within a further 2 hours
 - Urgent items - to be fully resolved within 24 hours
 - Less urgent items - to be fully resolved within 7 days or 28 days dependent upon the safety critical element
 - Planned / Programme works
7. When Board Members wait until a Joint Transportation Board meeting to report these issues, delay is caused and can take up officers' time unnecessarily deflecting them from their programmed work.
 8. Items that are appropriate for reporting to Kent County Council via Contact Centre should not need to be addressed at JTB meetings.
 9. If a Board Member would like to receive an update from Officers on a previously reported item to the Contact Centre, they are recommended to email the reference to the Ashford District Manager prior to the meeting so that an update can be prepared.
 10. By adopting this process it will ensure that resources are focused on supporting deliverable projects and allowing for a joint approach and reporting process for the JTB.

Board Members' Enquiries

11. For future JTB agenda it is proposed that there will be an item entitled 'Members' Enquiry Items'. Under this item Board Members will be able to raise for example the following:
 - Questions in relation to capital and revenue funded works programmes
 - Suggestions for future traffic regulation orders or street management proposals
 - Questions on policies, plans and strategies related to highways, road traffic and public transport.
 - Suggestion of future agenda items (subject to the Chairman's approval).

Conclusion

12. Hopefully by adopting these processes we will further strengthen our handling of JTB issues.

Contact: Jo Fox & Lisa Holder

Email: jo.fox@ashford.gov.uk & lisa.holder@kent.gov.uk