

AGENDA

MAIDSTONE JOINT TRANSPORTATION BOARD MEETING



Date: Wednesday 29 July 2009

Time: 5.00 pm

Venue: Town Hall, High Street,
Maidstone

Membership:

Councillors Carter, Chell, Chittenden, Cooke,
Daley, English, Hinder, Hotson,
Marchant, Parr, Mrs Parvin, Robertson,
Ross, Sherreard, Mrs Stockell, Whittle
and J.A. Wilson (Chairman)

Page No.

1. Apologies for Absence
2. Notification of Substitute Members
3. Notification of Visiting Members
4. Disclosures by Members and Officers

Continued Over/:

Issued on 22 July 2009

The reports included in Part I of this agenda can be made available in **alternative formats**. For further information about this service, or to arrange for special facilities to be provided at the meeting, **please contact JANET BARNES on 01622 602242**. To find out more about the work of the Committee, please visit www.digitalmaidstone.co.uk

**David Petford, Chief Executive, Maidstone Borough Council,
Maidstone House, King Street, Maidstone Kent ME15 6JQ**

- | | | |
|-----|--|---------|
| 5. | Disclosures of lobbying | |
| 6. | Minutes of the Meeting held on 15 April 2009 | 1 - 4 |
| 7. | Questions/Statements by members of the public | |
| 8. | Oral Report of the Community Delivery Manager - Clapper Farm Lane | |
| 9. | Report of the Interim Director of Kent Highway Services - Highway Works Programme 2009/10 | 5 - 6 |
| 10. | Report of the Interim Director of Kent Highway Services - Highway Drainage | 7 - 12 |
| 11. | Report of the Head of Transport and Development - Update on Petitions Submitted to Kent Highway Services | 13 - 16 |
| 12. | Report of the Head of Transport and Development - Integrated Transport Programme for Maidstone 2010/11 | 17 - 22 |
| 13. | Report of the Head of Countywide Improvements - Highway Improvement Schemes 2009-10 | 23 - 26 |

Registering for Public Speaking

In order to book a slot to speak at this meeting of the Joint Transportation Board please contact Janet Barnes on 01622 602242 by 3.30pm on the day of the meeting. You will also need to inform us of the topic you wish to speak on. Please note that slots will be allocated on a first come, first served basis up to a maximum of ten speakers.

MAIDSTONE BOROUGH COUNCIL

MAIDSTONE JOINT TRANSPORTATION BOARD

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON **WEDNESDAY 15 APRIL 2009**

PRESENT: **Maidstone Borough Council**

**Councillors Mrs Blackmore, English, Hinder,
Marchant, Parr, Mrs Parvin, Robertson, Ross
and J.A. Wilson**

Kent County Council

**County Councillors Hotson (Chairman), Chell,
Chittenden, Daley and Mrs Stockell**

ALSO PRESENT: **Councillors Gooch and Horne**

58. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Carter and Curwood.

59. NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

There were no substitute members.

60. NOTIFICATION OF VISITING MEMBERS

Councillor Gooch indicated her wish to speak on items 7, 8 and 10 and Councillor Horne indicated his wish to speak on item 8.

61. DISCLOSURES BY MEMBERS AND OFFICERS

There were no disclosures.

62. DISCLOSURES OF LOBBYING

Councillors Hinder, Marchant and Mrs Stockell disclosed that they had been lobbied on Item 10 and Councillor Hotson disclosed that he had been lobbied on Item 9.

63. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 24 FEBRUARY 2009

RESOLVED: That the Minutes of the meeting held on 24 February 2009 be approved as a correct record and signed.

64. QUESTIONS/STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Councillor Bryan Vizzard raised concerns regarding 3 junctions within Heath Ward. He mentioned that the volume of traffic in the Tonbridge Road area has increased significantly due to the rise in local development. The 3 areas of concern were

- 1) Traffic lights at Fountain Lane/Tonbridge Road – drivers accelerating through the changing lights;
- 2) Queens Road/Tonbridge Road – drivers accelerating through the changing lights. Vehicles blocking the access across Tonbridge Road into Fant Lane – suggest yellow hatching at the junction and a camera on the traffic lights; and
- 3) Heath Road/Hermitage Lane/St Andrew’s Road/Fountain Lane Junction. Drivers stopping in the yellow hatched area. No pedestrian phase on the traffic lights makes it difficult for pedestrians to cross the roads. This junction is used by school children and elderly people walking to the Doctor’s surgery.

Councillor Vizzard requested that as these 3 junctions are in close proximity to one another that they are dealt with as one package.

Councillor Vizzard was informed that his concerns were noted and would be passed to Kent County Council.

Councillor Geraldine Brown, Chairman of Yalding Parish Council, asked the Board if a response had been received from Councillor Ferrin regarding the O&D Surveys and English Heritage regarding East Farleigh and Teston bridges. Councillor Mrs Brown informed the Board of further problems with extra wide lorries that had occurred recently and that parents are concerned about children having to cross Town Bridge in Yalding in the dark when travelling to Tonbridge School.

Councillor Mrs Brown was informed that Mr Ferrin had not yet replied to the Chairman’s letter. Kent Highways officers are liaising with the Bridge Management Team about Yalding and East Farleigh and enforcement of the current restrictions on those bridges. They are also looking at short, medium and long term strategies.

Mr Paul Linaker addressed the Board regarding Item 9 of the Agenda – Clapper Farm Lane, Marden. Mr Linaker stated that he represented walkers and equestrians in this area. Mr Linaker fully supported the proposals. Mr Linaker informed the Board that Clapper Farm Lane is a road and dates back from before the 1600s. The road was in regular use, the hedges were maintained by local farmers before it was blocked.

Mr Richard Adam, representing Marden Parish Council and Marden Footpath Group, addressed the Board regarding Item 9 of the Agenda – Clapper Farm Lane, Marden. Mr Adam concurred with Mr Linaker’s

comments about the cause of the effect. Mr Adam fully supported the proposals and asked the Board to approve the report.

65. HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT SCHEMES 2009-10

The Board considered the Report of the Head of Countywide Improvements regarding Highway Improvement Schemes 2009-10.

Members raised a number of queries regarding this report which were addressed by the KCC officer.

Members were informed that the traffic modelling being carried out within the Town Centre is not just based around the bridge gyratory system and therefore £700,000 is being invested in UTMC to improve the traffic flow as much as possible. The traffic modelling is looking at how the existing traffic movements can be improved.

Members again raised their concerns regarding HGVs and it was suggested that some members of the Board met with the KCC Cabinet Member for Highways. It was felt that the specific problems should be listed and detailed and specific suggestions/proposals made.

RESOLVED:

- i) That the Report be noted.
- ii) That the Clerk arrange for a member of each party on the Board to meet with Councillor Ferrin within the next month.

66. CLAPPER FARM LANE, MARDEN

The Board considered the Report of the Director of Kent Highway Services regarding the re-opening of Clapper Farm Lane, Marden.

Members showed full support of this scheme.

RESOLVED: That the implementation of the short term measures and the introduction of the Traffic Regulation Order to enable limited access for walkers, equestrians and horse drawn vehicles be agreed.

67. INTEGRATED TRANSPORT PROGRAMME FOR MAIDSTONE 2009/10 AND BEYOND

The Board considered the Report of the Head of Transport and Development regarding the Integrated Transport Programme for Maidstone 2009/10 and beyond.

The Board were informed that Mr David Hall of KCC had been invited to attend this evening to present to members the new system which is replacing Pipkin. Mr Hall was unable to attend this evening, but was willing to present to members on another date.

The Board were also informed that at the next meeting the Board will be asked to confirm their top 8 bids for priority bonus points.

Members were encouraged to contact Kent Highway Services if they required more information regarding the schemes listed in Appendix C to the Report of the Head of Transport and Development. An addendum to Appendix C was circulated at the meeting.

RESOLVED:

- i) That the report be noted.
- ii) That a date be organised by the Clerk for Mr Hall to present to all members of the Council before the end of this municipal year.
- iii) That if Members of the Board require more information on the schemes in their area, listed in Appendix C of the Report of the Head of Transport and Development and the addendum, to contact Kent Highway Services.
- iv) That KCC officers ask Mr Hall to consider splitting the Integrated Transport Programme into two parts; strategic schemes and local schemes.

68. UPDATE ON PETITIONS SUBMITTED TO KENT HIGHWAY SERVICES

The Board considered the Report of the Head of Transport and Development regarding petitions submitted to Kent Highway Services.

The Board were informed that since the Report was published, one further petition had been received regarding speed restrictions in Goudhurst. An update on this petition will be provided at the next meeting.

Following a request from a Member, Mr Corcoran agreed to provide him with the details of the scheme that proposes weight limits in Bower Place.

RESOLVED: That the Report be noted.

69. DURATION OF MEETING

5.00 pm to 6.40 pm

Highway Works Programme 2009/10

A report by the Interim Director of Kent Highway Services to the Maidstone Joint Transportation Board on 29 July 2009

Introduction

1. This report summarises the identified schemes that have been programmed for construction by Kent Highway Services in 2009/10. Each County Council Directorate is expected to ensure that the cash limits for next year are adhered to. Any within-year Directorate pressures must therefore be met from these cash limits and budgets/work programmes would have to be adjusted accordingly.

Highway Maintenance Budget 2009/10

2. The Highways Maintenance Budget for 2009/10 is detailed in Table 1 below.

Table 1 – Highway Maintenance Budget for 2009/10

	(£000s)	
	Revenue	Capital
Total KHS Revenue Budgets (excl. transport & development, network & asset management and business performance)	30,768	
Less Running Costs (including energy costs)	7,732	
Balance available for Highway Revenue Maintenance	23,037	
Balance available for Highway Capital Maintenance (excluding overheads)		39,336

3. There has been a significant increase in the overall Highways maintenance budget for 2009-10. This has been possible through a recasting of the budget, refocusing funding to the frontline, capitalisation of certain items and prudential borrowing. The increases from 2008/09 are as follows:
 - Increase to cover price inflation £2.236m
 - Service strategies and improvements £1.484m
 - Redirection of budgets to front-line services £1.000m
 - Capital maintenance from prudential borrowing £15.900m
 - Street lighting investment from prudential borrowing £2.500m
4. The Highway Operations budget of £62,373M for Technical Services & Community Operations is distributed between the work activities as shown in Table 2:

Table 2 – Highway Operations Budgets

	(£000s)		
	Revenue	Capital	Total
Major Maintenance		4,908	4,908
Jetpatcher		1,100	1,100

PacoPatch		490	490
Minor Surfacing		1,200	1,200
Drainage Repairs		2,367	2,367
Street Lighting	2,935	4,325	7,260
Lines & signs	1,100	891	1,991
Safety Fences		643	643
Structures	1,595	2,500	4,095
Traffic Signals		830	830
Member grants		1,818	1,818
Surface treatments (see table 3 below for breakdown)		18,264	18,264
Routine maintenance Gangs (NOMU and minor patching)	5,969		5,969
Gully Emptying	3310		3310
Soft Landscape & Trees	4,598		4,598
Winter Service	2,525		2,525
Emergency Response / Out of Hours	595		595
Community Operations Traffic Management (High Speed Roads)	410		410
Total (excludes top-sliced ITS - Intelligent Transport Systems)	23,037	39,336	62,373

Conclusion

5. This report is for Members' information

Contact Officers:

Dennis Button	Community Delivery Manager	08458 247800
Gary Peak	Local Transport Schemes Team Leader	08458 247800
Toby Howe	Strengthening & Resurfacing Schemes Manager	08458 247800

Background documents: None

MAIDSTONE JOINT TRANSPORTATION BOARD 29 JULY 2009

Subject:	Highway Drainage
Director/Head of Service:	Acting Director of Kent Highway Services
Decision Issues:	These matters are within the authority of the Kent County Council
Decision:	Non-key
CCC Ward/KCC Division:	All
Summary:	<i>To provide Members with an overview to highway drainage within the County & to advise on the improved current position.</i>
For Information:	This report is for Members' information.
Classification:	THIS REPORT IS OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

Introduction

1. To provide Members with an overview of highway drainage within the county and to advise on the improved current position since the transformation of Kent Highways.

Background

2. The importance of highway drainage has been known since Roman times and a key feature of road construction is the drainage system. Kent County Council as the Highway Authority has a legal obligation under Section 41 of the Highways Act 1980 to maintain highways to set standards and this includes the maintenance of highway drainage systems. The objective is to drain water off the highway, under the highway or prevent discharge onto the highway to avoid flooding.

What is a highway drainage system?

3. The metal grids which can be found in the road to take water off the highway are referred to as gullies. Gullies collect surface water from the highway which then collects in gully pots and these drain away via pipework to either the main sewer network, soakaways, ditches, watercourses, ponds, lagoons and rivers etc. Surface water will also flow through roadside drainage channels, catchpits, manhole chambers and culverts to discharge points.

The Asset and its Condition

4. Kent County Council's drainage system is made up of approximately 256,000 gullies which serve its 8,440 kilometres of road network. The inventory information in relation to the carriageway and footway gullies is relatively good and their locations plotted onto a GIS layer. The information held on the inventory for gullies does not indicate such details as to whether they are brick, concrete or cast iron or their size and direction of the outlet pipes. Information relating to other drainage assets is poor. There are many thousand kilometres of pipework and although the exact number of soakaways is not known as many are buried in farmers' fields it is thought to be in the region of 10,000. Similarly, there are no known figures for the number of manhole chambers, culverts, catchpits, ditches, watercourses, ponds, lagoons etc. The council has very little information to confirm the position, size, depth, gradient or

ownership of these drainage systems. Inventory data collection is an ongoing task. The condition of the visible regularly visited sections of the drainage system i.e. gullies is generally known and in reasonable order, whereas the condition of the remainder of the network, which is largely underground, is less known. There is now a dedicated CCTV team recording such information. The drainage asset continues to grow with the adoption of new roads/footways or carriageway improvements.

Risk from Inadequate Highway Drainage

5. The problems caused by a lack of appropriate maintenance or defective drainage systems are:-

- Aquaplaning
- Skidding on ice
- Swerving to avoid standing water
- Flooding and damage to adjacent property and land
- Erosion and damage to the road structure requiring costly repairs
- Delays and disruption to the movement of people and goods
- Nuisance splashing of pedestrians

Prior to Transformation

6. In the years prior to the Transformation of Kent Highways and when Highway Maintenance Units were operating from District Councils under the Agency Agreement, operational engineers were responsible for all aspects of highway maintenance and as a consequence highway drainage only featured as a small percentage of the workload. Drainage and flooding incidents only accounted for approximately 10% of issues raised by residents. Accordingly the drainage budget reflected this figure. Generally two districts shared a gully emptying machine and additional machines if required were hired in on an ad-hoc basis. Flooding was always attended to but blocked gullies that did not cause a problem and required more work than just a clean may have been ignored in place of other more important highway issues. Similarly drainage repairs were only carried out where flooding was a potential hazard or causing damage to properties or land.

Current Cleansing Regime

7. In accordance with the KCC Maintenance Plan, Kent Highways endeavours to clean gully pots on a planned basis with known hot spots being cleaned on a more frequent basis. All works to gullies receiving attention are recorded on worksheets and entered onto a database. During the past year there has been 16 gully emptying machines fully dedicated to either scheduled cyclic cleaning or reactive cleaning. Despite this number, in practice, at various locations, targets are not met due to a mixture of:-

- resource shortfalls
- parked cars
- backlog of blocked gullies
- blocked connections from the gully
- heavily trafficked roads
- narrow roads
- building works or utility companies services works
- flooding sites requiring reactive cleaning

Other factors which affect the service and take longer to carry out the routine cyclic cleaning include gullies being used for fly tipping containing car batteries, vehicle sump oil, garden refuse, hardened concrete and hypodermic needles. Leaf fall in the autumn causes significant problems by blocking gully gratings.

Current Repair Regime

8. In addition to the cleansing of surface water drains there is a programme of works to repair defects highlighted in the drainage systems. These types of works generally involve the excavation of the highway and generally cause disruption to traffic flows. Examples of such repairs or maintenance are:-

- Resetting of gully gratings and frames and other ironwork (manholes) dropped 50mm or more below road level
- Replacing broken gully gratings and frames or other broken ironwork (manholes)
- Replacing stolen gratings
- Replacing cast iron gully pots which have no jetting facility
- Replacing brick gully pots where the brickwork is collapsing
- Replacing gully pots which have been filled with concrete
- Replacing gully pots which are not trapped and emanate smells
- Investigating blockages and repairing collapsed pipework
- Repairing pipework broken by utility companies installing services and recharging costs
- Clearing/excavating and reshaping ditches
- Cleaning soakaways and/or deep boring
- Reshaping of carriageways or footways
- Clearing or cutting of grips

In the first year of formation the drainage team has repaired 861 defects (not including ironwork repairs) across the county. In addition to the above there are major works involving detailed engineering designs to resolve flooding issues.

Criteria for Establishing Priority for Works

9. A list of schemes has been drawn up with the objective of lessening the risk of flooding or damage caused by excessive surface water in order of importance as set out below:-

Level 1

- Sites of known fatalities
- Flooding on high speed roads
- Major flooding to properties (3 or more)

Level 2

- Flooding to properties (1 or 2)
- Flooding to A and B Class roads causing obstruction or potential danger to traffic
- Flooding to unclassified roads causing complete obstruction

Level 3

- Flooding to garages and outhouses
- Flooding to unclassified roads causing minor obstruction
- Damage to buildings caused by water splashing

Level 4

- Flooding of the highway causing splashing to pedestrians

Level 5

- Works to alleviate nuisance (flooding to gardens etc.)

Why Roads will still Flood

10. Problems of flooding will occur despite drainage systems being cleaned and well maintained. Such problems may be caused or exacerbated by a number of factors including:-

- Rainfall of high intensity which is occurring more often and is possibly the consequence of climate change. Large quantities of water arriving on the road, greater than the drainage capacity to take it away.
- Exceptional rainfall washing mud and other debris from nearby fields and quickly blocking gullies which were otherwise clean.
- Long periods of relatively heavy rainfall. This causes land which is normally permeable to become saturated and then acts as if it were impermeable, meaning that any additional rainfall will result in rapidly increasing run-off and overloading of drainage systems and watercourses.
- Soakaways (which are large drainage pits and allow surface water to permeate into the surrounding sub-soil), become ineffective when ground conditions are saturated and/or mud is washed off surrounding fields, silting up the soakaway.
- Highway drainage systems of inadequate capacity, for instance if there are too few road gullies or if drainage pipes, ditches, culverts etc. are too small to take peak flows of surface water run-off.
- The foul sewer network being overloaded, often resulting in water discharging from gullies and manhole covers. This mainly occurs in built-up areas.
- Changes in land drainage patterns. Removal of hedges and woodlands or new springs appearing. Farmers ploughing fields down the fall line instead of across the fall line, allowing water to run off more easily.
- An increasingly common problem is the run-off from front gardens which have been paved for vehicle parking.
- Severe flash floods causing flooding to rivers streams and ditches, preventing highways systems discharging.

The causes of flooding are generally complicated and there are typically a range of contributory factors to any single flooding event

What the Future Holds

11. All the gully emptying machines and the drainage maintenance vehicles are fitted with 'Masternaut' a global positioning system (GPS) for tracking purposes to help manage the inventory and improve efficiency. It is possible in the future to use this innovative technology to record the location and condition of all highway drainage systems and feed the data into the authority's geographical information system (GIS). The benefit of such technology on gully emptying is that the amount of detritus and sediment in gully pots can be ascertained and those gullies in hot spots that silt up quickly can be cleaned on a more regular basis. Similarly, gullies in other locations and lightly trafficked areas may only need a clean once every few years and this information will help produce a more efficient cleaning programme with subsequent cost savings. Another development in the future is the recycling of gully waste. The effects of the Landfill Directive together with the annual increase in Landfill Tax have been to significantly increase the cost of disposal of gully waste (currently at approx. £50 per tonne). It is now possible to process and treat gully waste and to render their constituents safe and suitable for reuse, with the result that less than 5% of drainage waste will go to landfill and so reduce operating costs.

Budget

	2009/10
Gully Cleaning and Jetting	£2,700,000
Drainage Repair Works	£3,100,000

Conclusion

12. This report is for information only and has no budget implications. It aims to highlight the improved level of service since the transformation of Kent Highways and the introduction of a dedicated drainage team. Many long outstanding drainage issues are now receiving attention as engineers work through the backlog of problems. Electronic inventory data collection continues and new exciting technology will help in producing an efficient and cost effective service.

Contact Officers

Ken Rawson – Drainage Team Leader

Peter Bridgman – Drainage Asset Manager

This page is intentionally left blank

Update on Petitions submitted to Kent Highway Services

A report by the Head of Transport & Development to the Joint Transportation Board

Summary

1. A report to update the Board on the current status of petitions received by Kent Highway Services and notification of any new petitions received since the last meeting.

Traffic Calming Measures, Heath Road, Coxheath

2. A petition was submitted in April 2008 by some 59 residents, lead by Mr A R Monk of Westerhill Road, Coxheath. It sought action to improve the traffic calming measures installed along Heath Road, Coxheath as the petitioners felt these were dangerous.
3. It was reported at the last meeting that Kent Highway Services (KHS) had agreed to design a third alternative option for traffic calming as neither of the two schemes recently consulted on met with public support. Following two meetings with the Parish Council a new design was produced however, this proposal has received adverse comments from Kent Police and independent safety assessors therefore, KHS have decided not to take this proposal any further.
4. KHS will be making some necessary amendments to the existing scheme to ensure it compiles with current highway standards and will continue to monitor the situation. KHS have written to the Parish Council explaining their decision in more detail.

Safe Crossing for Marden Road, Staplehurst

5. A petition was submitted in May 2008 by Staplehurst Parish Council with over 150 signatures requesting a safer crossing in Marden Road, Staplehurst.
6. Kent Highway Services have investigated this request following a meeting with the Parish Council and have submitted a bid for the provision of a new crossing, pedestrian guard railings, interactive speed sign and bus stop improvements as part of the 2010/11 Integrated Transport Programme for Kent. The details of this bid are included as part of the report on the Integrated Transport Programme for Maidstone.

Request for the Implementation of a Weight Restriction through Yalding

7. A petition was submitted in September 2008 by Yalding Parish Council with over 570 signatures supporting a previous request for a weight restriction through Yalding and that surveys of lorry movements through Yalding and East Farleigh be undertaken.
8. It was agreed at the last meeting of this Board that representatives of the JTB would meet with the Cabinet Member for Environment, Highways & Waste to ask that the previous decision not to carry out lorry movement surveys be reconsidered.
9. At a recent meeting with Nick Chard, the new Cabinet Member for Environment, Highways & Waste and the Chair of this Board it was reaffirmed that Kent Highway Services would not be carrying out local lorry movement surveys in the Yalding area but would target resources at tackling the issue on a countywide basis. The County Council are currently preparing a freight strategy for Kent which outlines a list of actions as to how it proposes to achieve this.

X.1

10. Kent Highways Services have also written to English Heritage as requested by this board in respect to concerns over the damage caused by HGV's to the historic bridges and are awaiting a response.

Closure of Pheasant Lane, Maidstone South

11. A petition was submitted in August 2008 by some 120 residents, lead by Mr David Frais of Osborne House, Loose Road of the Pheasant Lane Action Group which sought the closure of Pheasant Lane to vehicles other than for residential access. The petitioners felt the lane was being used as a rat run, was too narrow for the volume of traffic has too many blind bends with drivers driving too fast and pedestrians are at great risk.
12. Following a public consultation which attracted the support of the majority of local residents Kent Police raised concerns that should the route be stopped up for all vehicular traffic this could potentially increase antisocial crime, fly tipping and effect accessibility and response times for the emergency services.
13. Kent Highway Services have meet with the Police to overcome their concerns and have now passed the Traffic Regulation Order for formal publication and consultation. Following the publication of this order any objections received will be reported back to a future meeting of this Board for a formal decision to be made as to whether to close Pheasant Lane or not.

Fant Traffic Calming Scheme, Maidstone

14. A the last meeting of this board it was reported that a petition was submitted in December 2008 by Maidstone Green Party on behalf of 346 residents of Bower Place, Upper Fant Road, Gatland Land and Glebe Lane, Maidstone requesting measures to slow and reduce the volume of traffic in these roads.
15. It was also reported that a scheme for traffic calming for this area has been approved by the County Council for implementation. It should however, have been made clear that the scheme currently being designed for implementation only covers Gatland Lane, Fant Lane and part of Farliegh Lane. The remaining roads will be subject to further monitoring and bids once the current scheme has been implemented.
16. The draft design for this scheme is complete and the views of the local Councillors have been sought. The full public consultation is due to start in the next few weeks and the results of these consultations will be reported back to the next meeting of this board.

New Petitions Received

17. At the time of writing this report Kent Highway Services have received two new petitions since the last meeting of this board.

Resurfacing of Haste Hill Road, Green Lane, Brishing Lane, Church Street, Meadow View Road and Lewis Court Drive

18. Kent Highway Services received a petition regarding the above roads with 432 residents' signatures. The petition was acknowledged by the Community Delivery Team Leader and confirmation was sent to the Lead Petitioners stating that both Haste Hill Road and Green Lane were included in this financial year's surfacing programme. Works are due to be completed before Christmas.

19. The remaining roads listed will be monitored as part of the routine safety inspection regime and any repairs deemed necessary to ensure public safety will be arranged by the Highway Inspector for the area.

Road Safety Measures along Walderslade Woods Road

20. Kent Highway Services have received a petition from Mrs Gillian Tatnell from Walderslade Woods with 212 signatures requesting a reduction in speed limit with traffic islands and hatching. The petition has received the support of Boxley Parish Council although Walderslade Woods Road falls within both Maidstone and Tonbridge and Malling.
21. Kent Highway Services are currently investigating this request and will report the results of our investigations to the next meeting of this Board.

Accountable Officer: Andy Corcoran 01622 798378

This page is intentionally left blank

Integrated Transport Programme for Maidstone 2010/11

A report by the Head of Transport & Development to the Joint Transportation Board

Summary

1. This report reminds members of the schemes currently being bid for as part of the 2010/11 Integrated Transport Programme for Kent and those currently under investigation for future bids.

2010/11 Programme

2. The schemes listed in Appendix A are those that have been assessed for inclusion in the 2010/11 Integrated Transport Programme for Kent using the new Scheme Prioritisation System that has replaced PIPKIN.
3. It was expected that a more detailed report with guidance on the Scheme Prioritisation System would be brought to this meeting requesting Members to agree their top priority schemes and allocate bonus points. However, the new Cabinet Member for Environment, Highways & Waste has decided to review this process with the Chairmen of the Joint Transportation Boards. A meeting will be held shortly with the Chairmen and the Cabinet Member and the outcome of this meeting will be reported back to this Board.

Future Bids

4. Appendix B outlines schemes that due to various reasons such as the complexity of delivery especially those requiring consultation and legal agreements such as land acquisitions or Traffic Regulation Orders could not be bid for in 2010/11 and are being investigated for potential future bids.
 5. Further details of all the schemes listed in the Appendices can be obtained on request from Andrew Corcoran Transportation & Development Manager for Maidstone & Tonbridge & Malling.
-

Accountable Officer: Andrew Corcoran 08458 247 800

APPENDIX A
Schemes assessed for bids in 2010/11

Maidstone Rank	Scheme Title	Ward	Estimated Cost (£k)	Provisional Score
1	A229 Running Horse CRM Roundabout Improvements to lane designation signing and lining	Boxley	50	88.6
2	Bus stop infrastructure improvements - Route 71 & 101	Maidstone	161	70.8
3	Medway Valley Line Train Station Access Improvements to improve integration with other modes of transport and making stations more attractive and safer environments.	Various	70	65
4	Speed reduction signage, improved crossing point at village hall and bus stop improvement Nettlestead	Marden and Yalding	29	56.8
5	A26/South Lane CRM junction improvements to increase visibility on the A26	Barming	35	55.8
6	Pedestrian Crossing Armstrong Road nr Hockey Club, Maidstone	High Street	30	55.7
7	Staplehurst Bus Stop Improvements including pedestrian crossing	Staplehurst	70	54.3
8	A274 Biddenden Road Shenley Corner Bus Stop & Pedestrian Improvements	Headcorn	35	53.3
9	Construction of footway along Brishing Lane including bus stop improvements	Boughton Monchelsea and Chart Sutton	80	53.2
10	Lenham Bus Stop improvements	Harrietsham and Lenham	23	51.9
11	Hermitage Lane/Heath Road, Barming new footway and new pedestrian phase on lights	Heath	92	48.8
12	Marden Pedestrian Safety Improvements including dropped kerbs, warning signs, gateways and mini roundabout	Marden and Yalding	57	48.7
13	Headcorn Road, Sutton Valence footway construction linking South Lane to Heniker Lane	Sutton Valence and Langley	85	48.6
14	Vicarage Lane footway and guard railing improvements outside East Farleigh Primary School.	Coxheath and Hunton	35	48
15	A274 Five Wents CRM Junction improvements realignment, signing & lining	Sutton Valence and Langley	28	47.8

16	Boxley Road Pedestrian Crossing & associated speed limit	Boxley	35	47.4
17	Speed reduction measures, warning signage and footway by Gidds Pond Cottages, Bearsted Road	Boxley	28	44.7
18	Bus Stop Improvements, Sutton Valence	Sutton Valence and Langley	15	43.2
19	Warmlake Crossroads CRM, Sutton Valence junction improvements and advanced warning signage	Sutton Valence and Langley	18	37.1
20	Construction of new footway, Impton Lane, Walderslade	Boxley	85	33.9
21	SRTS Egremount Road, Madginford Installation of pedestrian guard railing and Zebra crossing facility	Bearsted	35	33.7
22	Hunton Gateway Improvements to reduce traffic speeds in the Village and improve road safety	Coxheath and Hunton	8	32.9
23	Pedestrian Crossing Provender Way, Grove Green	Boxley	35	31
24	Junction improvements by increasing visibility, protecting the footway and verge Upper Fant Rd j/w Lower Fant Rd	Fant	17	17.6
25	Re-aligning of Lees Road / Hampsted Lane junction, Yalding to improve road safety	Marden and Yalding	43	17.2
26	Beresford Hill Junction Improvements to protect structure and improve road safety	Boughton Monchelsea and Chart Sutton	23	16.3
27	Dean Street East Farleigh junction improvements re-alignment, signing and lining refresh	Coxheath and Hunton	23	16.2

APPENDIX B
Schemes being investigated for potential future bids

Location	Description	Status
A249 Roundabouts	Roundabout Construction along A249 reducing vehicle speeds	Scheme not deliverable in 10/11 therefore, further investigation required before a potential bid in 11/12
A249 Side road improvements	Accessibility improvements off of the A249	Scheme not deliverable in 10/11 therefore, further investigation required before a potential bid in 11/12
A274 Station to Dairy - Headcorn	Construction of new footway	Further investigations required for a potential in 11/12 bid
Bearstead Footway	Footway at the junction of Roseacre Lane & Windmill Heights & hard standing by The Green bus stop	Further investigations required for a potential in 11/12 bid
East Farleigh Bridge Signalisation	Traffic Lights at either end of East Farleigh Bridge balancing traffic flows	Scheme not deliverable in 10/11 therefore, further investigation required before a potential bid in 11/12
Heath Road, Barming 20Mph Zone	Traffic Calming in vicinity of Barming Primary School	Scheme not deliverable in 10/11 therefore, further investigation required before a potential bid in 11/12
Hildenborough Crescent	Request for speed management measures	Scheme requires further investigation for a potential bid in 11/12
Hockers Lane, Detling	Hockers Lane/The Street junction improvements and Hockers Lane Traffic Calming	Scheme to be worked up in conjunction with Parish design group for potential bid in 11/12
Hunton Crossroads	Roundabout at the Hunton Crossroads at the intersection of Dean Street, Heath Road and Upper Hunton Hill for improving road safety	Scheme not deliverable in 10/11 therefore, further investigation required before a potential bid in 11/12
Langley Footway Improvements	Footway on A274 from Horseshoe Lane to Church	Further investigations required for a potential in 11/12 bid
Linton Crossroads	CRM - Junction Improvements	Due to deliverability issues to be rebid in 2011/12
London Road j/w Castle Rd	improved pedestrian facilities at junction - pedestrian push buttons	Further investigations required for a potential in 11/12 bid
Loose Road jct. with Armstrong Road – South Ward	Junction improvements to improve safety & reduce congestion	Further investigations required for a potential in 11/12 bid
Pilgrims Way Traffic Calming	Quiet Lanes Project for Pilgrims Way between Detling and Hollingbourne	Awaiting further information from Project Group for future potential bid

Sutton Valence Pedestrian Crossing	Crossing Facility on the A274	To be reassessed following relocation of School Crossing Patrol
UTMC	Maidstone Town Centre future upgrades	UTMC in Maidstone being reviewed for a potential bid for improvements in 11/12
Yeoman Lane, Bearsted	Speed Reduction measures and Pedestrian Facilities	Further investigations required for a potential in 11/12 bid

This page is intentionally left blank

MAIDSTONE BOROUGH COUNCIL

JOINT TRANSPORTATION BOARD

29 JULY 2009

REPORT OF HEAD OF COUNTYWIDE IMPROVEMENTS

Report prepared by Andrew Burton, KCC Highway Schemes Manager

HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT SCHEMES 2009-10

1.1 For Information

1.1.1 Appendix A to this report updates Members on the integrated transport improvement schemes that form part of this year's capital programme for Kent County Council.

1.2 Background Documents

1.2.1 Item 11, Kent County Council Highways Advisory Board, 8 May 2008, "Transportation and Safety Package Programme 2008-09"

1.2.2 Item 7, Kent County Council Highways Advisory Board, 3 March 2009, "Transportation and Safety Package Programme 2009-10"

1.2.3 Item 8, Maidstone Joint Transportation Board, 28 January 2009, "Integrated Transport Plan for Maidstone 2009-10 and Beyond"

2 Discussion

2.1 Appendix A to this report details the progress of each scheme, including previous years' schemes that were not completed by April 2009. Progress to date is summarised and anticipated progress prior to the next Joint Board is detailed. New schemes that are being funded as part of the 2009-10 capital programme are also described. Due to space restrictions, certain schemes are reported in more detail as follows:

2.2 **Traffic calming Coxheath** (Scheme Ref MG7410 ML) – it was reported to the last meeting of this Board that whilst the original scheme was completed in May 2008, public dissatisfaction with its performance has necessitated a scheme review. Unforeseen delays have meant that this review is not yet complete and it will therefore not be possible to report the outcome until the next meeting of the Board. A budget of £50,000 in this financial year has been allocated to implementing the findings of this review.

2.3 **Quality Bus Partnership – Shepway Estate** (Scheme Ref MY 06 04TD) – This scheme was deferred from 2008/09 to allow negotiations with the bus operator to be concluded. Arriva are concerned that the existing traffic calming in Shepway Estate is unsuitable for a bus route and have strongly urged KCC to replace the speed-reducing features with measures that have less deleterious effects on buses, bus drivers and passengers. It is the case, however, that

officers and Members of both Councils are committed to retaining a low-speed environment in the estate and that significant speed reducing features are required to maintain a reasonable environment for road users. Because it has not been possible to agree a compromise using conventional traffic calming features, KCC will trial two new road humps designed to affect buses less than cars. These will be installed in August and their effects on road users measured over the following three months. If they prove successful, they will replace existing road humps along the bus route through the estate.

- 2.4 **South East Maidstone Strategic Link (SEMSL)**. As reported to the last meeting of this Board, there remains a longer-term desire to bypass the B2163 through Leeds and Langley. Because this is mainly an environmental improvement, it is unlikely to get Government funding. However, the Local Development Framework (LDF) that Maidstone Borough Council is producing, includes the potential for new development in the south east quadrant of the town. This might see the need for a more direct route between the A274, and the commercial area around Parkwood that might also serve the new residential development at the A20/M20 Junction 8. The LDF process has not defined the new housing areas or new commercial development areas yet so it is not possible to advise what route SEMSL may take. Maidstone Borough Council is currently assessing traffic flows and preparing a transport strategy to manage future development. This strategy is expected to include SEMSL. Provided that it is a defined transport need, publication of the Core Strategy for the LDF, possibly in autumn 2009, will see outline designs of a SEMSL published.
- 2.5 **A229 /A26 Maidstone Bridge Gyratory** This proposal identified a new road layout and conversion to two-way traffic at the junction of Fairmeadow / High Street / Bishops Way / Tonbridge Road and St Peter's Street. Extensive design work was undertaken but, as reported to the last meeting of this Board, the forecast cost has now escalated to £3.5-£4million. Compared to other funding priorities for Kent County Council, this cost is currently disproportionate to the benefits the scheme would achieve. Accordingly, public funding of this specific proposal is unlikely as a stand-alone scheme in the foreseeable future. In the meantime, detailed assessment of traffic flows is being carried out to more precisely quantify the traffic benefits of the scheme. This is using output from Maidstone Borough Council's traffic model, developed for the Local Development Framework.

MAIDSTONE JOINT TRANSPORTATION BOARD – 29 JULY 2009

APPENDIX A. Integrated Transport Improvement Schemes for Maidstone Borough

KHS Ref	Location	Description of Works	Current Progress	Anticipated Actions for next 3 months (Prior to next JTB)	Budget 2009 - 10	Forecast Out-turn 2008-09	Kent Highway Services Contact 08458 247800
MG7410 ML	Traffic calming Coxheath -	06/07 scheme: Speed management measures including physical measures to slow vehicular traffic	Original scheme completed, but review underway following public dissatisfaction with scheme's performance.	See main body of report	£50K	£50K	Andrew Burton
MY96 05/2 TD	New Cut Rd – Maidstone	2008-09 Scheme: Upgrading of existing pelican crossing to Toucan crossing	Scheme review has revealed technical issue delaying its delivery until Autumn 2009	Review to be completed and reported to next meeting of this Board	£8K	£1K	Julian Cook
MY 06 07TD	Ware Street, Bearstead	Zebra crossing west of railway bridge	Statutory consultation on outline design commenced June 2009	Public consultation to be carried out August 2009	£25K	£28K	Ben Hilden
MY 06 06TD	Fant	Traffic calming	Public consultation on outline design carried out June 2009	Scheme to be refined to incorporate views of consultees.	£85K	£20K	Ben Hilden
MY 06 02TD	Town Centre Maidstone	Cycle Improvements	Statutory consultation on proposed contra-flow cycle lane in spur of Station Road (beside KFC) commenced June 2009	Scheme to be refined to incorporate views of consultees	£30K	\$16K	Helen Cobby
MY 06 04TD	Quality Bus Partnership - Maidstone	Scheme deferred from 2008/09: Upgrade existing bus corridors in Shepway estate	Detailed design complete	See main body of report	£100K	£20K	Andy Padgham
S106	A229 Loose Rd/ Cripple Street, Loose	New traffic signals at junction	Developer-funded scheme required as planning condition	Details awaited	tba	tba	Andy Corcoran

This page is intentionally left blank