

**MAIDSTONE BOROUGH COUNCIL**

**CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT**

**REPORT OF ASSISTANT DIRECTOR FOR ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES**

**Report prepared by J Kitson**

**Date Issued: 10<sup>th</sup> December 2009**

**1. OBJECTIONS TO TRAFFIC ORDERS**

**1.1 Issue for decision**

**1.1.1** To consider the objections received in relation to the advertising of;

- The Kent County Council (Borough of Maidstone) Waiting Restrictions Order (variation No 3) Order 2009.
- The Kent County Council (Borough of Maidstone) Designated Parking Places Order (variation No 4) Order 2009.

**1.2 Recommendation of the Assistant Director of Environmental Services**

**1.2.1** That the views of the public and the Joint Transportation Board members be considered.

**1.2.2** The recommendations identified in the appendices to the report be agreed and the objectors informed of the outcome.

**1.2.3** That Kent Highway Services be advised that the orders are made and signed as outlined in Appendix A and B.

**1.3 Reasons for recommendation**

**1.3.1** A number of requests have been received by Parking Services for the introduction of parking restrictions at specific locations throughout Maidstone.

**1.3.2** A Public Notice formally advertising the orders was published in Local Press during the week ending Friday July 24<sup>th</sup> 2009.

**1.3.3** Full details were contained in the draft orders which, together with a copy of the Public Notices, site plans and a statement of the Council's reasons for proposing to make the orders, were placed on

deposit at the Highway Information Centre, County Hall and at the Council's Gateway reception desk, Maidstone House.

- 1.3.4 Letters were sent to statutory and non statutory consultees and residents and street notices were posted in the affected roads.
- 1.3.5 All comments received during the formal consultation period were reviewed and considered.
- 1.3.6 The results of the public consultation were formally presented to the Joint Transportation Board on 21 October 2009.
- 1.3.7 The recommendation of the Parking Services Manager for Queen Elizabeth Square was not to proceed with the order due to the lack of support to the proposal. Following the publication of the report to the Joint Transportation Board one objector has withdrawn his objection.
- 1.3.8 The Board reconsidered the traffic order for Queen Elizabeth Square and recommends to the Cabinet Member that it is implemented. It was stated that the residents have suffered from parking problems for the past twenty years and that action needs to be taken to install restrictions to improve the parking situation.
- 1.3.9 Board members were informed that following the implementation of the traffic order in Hampton Road, the parking situation will be closely monitored and, if necessary, further proposals can be made at a later date.
- 1.3.10 The recommendation of the Parking Services Manager for Shaftesbury Drive and Langham Grove was not to proceed with the order due to the lack of support to the proposal.
- 1.3.11 However Board members raised concern about the recommendation not to implement the traffic orders in Shaftesbury Drive and Langham Grove. They felt it was important that these orders were implemented in order to alleviate the problems residents had suffered for many years. They also mentioned that Shaftesbury Drive was a bus route, but this had been withdrawn because the bus could not get round the streets due to poor parking. The bus company has agreed to reinstate the route once the parking problems have been resolved.
- 1.3.12 The Joint Transportation Board resolved;  
That the Cabinet Member for Environment be recommended to agree the recommendations made subject to the following amendment:-

- a) That the Cabinet Member for Environment be recommended to proceed with the proposals for Kingsgate Close, Shaftesbury Drive and Langham Grove and make the Orders.
- b) That officers re-consider the recommendation to the Cabinet Member for Environment regarding Queen Elizabeth Square.
- c) That Kent Highway Services be recommended to implement the Orders subject to the amendments.

1.3.13 Appendix A provides a schedule of all proposals not receiving objections and it is recommended to proceed with each of these proposals and make the Order.

1.3.14 Appendix B provides a schedule of the proposals receiving objection, together with a summary of the objections and the relevant recommendations which were considered by the Joint Transportation Board.

#### 1.4 Alternative actions and why not recommended

1.4.1 To not proceed with the recommendations will result in much needed orders not being implemented, which are intended to regulate parking to reduce current difficulties.

1.4.2 To make the orders as advertised would not take account of comments received by objectors during formal consultation.

#### 1.5 Impact on corporate objectives

1.5.1 The proposals are intended to resolve parking problems and improve traffic flow by reducing localised congestion; this is in accordance with the Council's priority to improve access across the Borough through better roads.

#### 1.6 Risk Management

1.6.1 Consideration must be given to objectors' comments and formal letters of support in relation to each proposal. However this must be balanced against the risks involved to road safety, the free flow of traffic, any environmental impact and potential vehicle migration into other roads.

1.7 Impact on Corporate Implications

1. Financial	X
2. Staffing	
3. Legal	X
4. Equality Impact Needs Assessment	
5. Environmental/Sustainable Development	
6. Community Safety	
7. Human Rights Act	
8. Procurement	
9. Asset Management	

1.7.1 Financial  
The costs of the order variation and implementation will be met from within the existing Parking Services budget.

1.7.2 Legal  
Formal orders will need to be made and signed by Kent County Council as the Highway Authority.

1.8 Background Documents  
None

**NO REPORT WILL BE ACCEPTED WITHOUT THIS BOX BEING COMPLETED**

Is this a Key Decision?      Yes      ☐      No      ☒

If yes, when did it appear in the Forward Plan? \_\_\_\_\_

Is this an Urgent Key Decision?      Yes      ☐      No      ☒

Reason for Urgency

**How to Comment**

Should you have any comments on the issue that is being considered please contact either the relevant Officer or the Member of the Executive who will be taking the decision.

Cllr Mark Wooding

Cabinet Member for Environment  
Telephone: 01622 602000  
E-mail: markwooding@maidstone.gov.uk

J Kitson

Parking Services Manager  
Telephone: 01622 602603  
E-mail: jeffkitson@maidstone.gov.uk

## Appendix A

### Schedule of orders receiving no objection.

- The Kent County Council (Borough of Maidstone) Waiting Restrictions Order (variation No 3) Order 2009.
- The Kent County Council (Borough of Maidstone) Designated Parking Places Order (variation No 4) Order 2009.

DYL – means waiting to be prohibited at all times by double yellow lines.

SYL – means no waiting at the times prescribed.

#### **Norman Close;**

Change of operational days from Monday to Saturday to Monday to Friday:

Recommendation: To Proceed with the proposal and make the Order.

-----

#### **Bell Meadow;**

DYL from the junction of Wallis Avenue on both sides for a distance of 65 metres:

Recommendation: To Proceed with the proposal and make the Order.

-----

#### **St Laurence Avenue;**

DYL both sides from its junction with A20 (Coldharbour Roundabout) to its junction with Liphook Way:

Recommendation: To Proceed with the proposal and make the Order.

-----

#### **Gibraltar Lane;**

DYL on the North side from its junction with Chatham Road to its junction with Castle Dene, and from its western junction with Castle Dene for a distance of 15 metres in a westerly direction:

Recommendation: To Proceed with the proposal and make the Order.

-----

#### **Castle Dene;**

DYL on both sides for a distance of 15 metres from its junction with Gibraltar Lane:

Recommendation: To Proceed with the proposal and make the Order.

-----

#### **Leafy Lane;**

DYL on the north side from the access to the industrial estate for a distance of 25 metres, in a north-easterly direction:

Recommendation: To Proceed with the proposal and make the Order.

---

**Tonbridge Road;**

North-west, extend the current DYL on the northwest side for a distance of 39 metres in a northeasterly direction:

Recommendation: To Proceed with the proposal and make the Order.

---

**Florence Road;**

To amend the current single yellow line Mon-Sat 8am – 6.30pm to a DYL from the junction of Bower St for a distance of 19 metres in an easterly direction:

Recommendation: To Proceed with the proposal and make the Order.

---

**Bircholt Road;**

DYL west side from a point 10 metres south of its junction with Coldred Road for a distance of 40 metres in a southerly direction:

Recommendation: To Proceed with the proposal and make the Order.

---

**Chillington Street;**

To amend the current SYL Monday to Saturday 8am-6.30pm restriction to 9am – 5pm Monday – Friday:

Recommendation: To Proceed with the proposal and make the Order.

---

**Buckland Road;**

North-east side SYL Monday-Saturday 8.00am-6.30pm.between bays:

Recommendation: To Proceed with the proposal and make the Order.

---

**Kingsgate Close;**

Both sides to introduce SYL 9.00am-3.30pm Mon-Fri restriction for its entire length: 2 letters commenting on the proposal were received.

The Joint Transportation Board considered that restrictions would help reduce the current parking difficulties in the area.

Recommendation: To proceed with the proposal and make the Order

---

**Aldon Close; Bedgebury Close; Bonnington Road; Cooling Close; Emsworth Grove; Farningham Close; Weyhill Close.**

DYL both sides for a distance of 15 metres from the junctions of Hampton Road.

Recommendation: To Proceed with the proposal and make the Order.

---

**Basmere Close**

DYL both sides for a distance of 15 metres from the junction of Hampton Road, SYL Monday to Friday 10.30-11.00am from a point 15 metres from the junction of Hampton Road for the remainder of its length.

**Calehill Close.**

DYL both sides for a distance of 15 metres from the junction of Hampton Road, SYL Monday to Friday 10.30-11.00am from a point 15 metres from the junction of Hampton Road for the remainder of its length

**Crayford Close**

DYL both sides for a distance of 15 metres from the junction of Hampton Road, SYL Monday to Friday 10.30-11.00am from a point 15 metres from the junction of Hampton Road for the remainder of its length.

Recommendation: To Proceed with the proposal and make the Order.

---

**Stockbury : A249 Bimbury Lane;**

DYL both sides from of the access road to Bimbury Lane for a distance of 25 metres in a northerly direction, and around the central island.

Recommendation: To Proceed with the proposal and make the Order.

---

**Coxheath : Stockett Lane**

DYL East side from its junction with Westway for a distance of 15 metres in a southerly direction, West side from a point 100 metres north of its junction with Hanover Road for a distance of 20 metres in a northerly direction.

**Westway:**

Both sides, DYL from its junction with Stockett Lane for a distance of 15 metres in a easterly direction.

Recommendation: To Proceed with the proposal and make the Order.

---

**Marden: Pattenden Lane**

DYL west side from its junction with Sovereigns Way for a distance of 110 metres in a northerly direction.

Recommendation: To Proceed with the proposal and make the Order.

---

**Bearsted: Ashford Road;**

DYL south side from its junction with Cavendish Way for a distance of 12 metres, and outside of Tesco Express/Esso Garage.

Recommendation: To Proceed with the proposal and make the Order.



-----  
Residents parking -

**Upper Stone Street:**

Introduce new Residents Parking Bays Monday to Saturday 8.00am to 6.30 pm on its west side from a point 42 metres from its Northern junction with Old Tovil Road for a distance of 15 metres.

Recommendation: To Proceed with the proposal and make the Order.

-----

**Buckland Road:**

To reduce the residents parking bay outside 96/98 to accommodate one vehicle, to introduce a new residents bay outside of 88/90, Monday to Saturday 6.00am to 6.30pm.

Recommendation: To Proceed with the proposal and make the Order.

-----

Designated free parking places

**Bearsted: Ashford Road;**

To introduce a 1 hour maximum waiting time with No return within 2 hours Monday to Saturday 8.00am to 6.30pm, outside of Yeoman Court on the north side.

On the South side from the existing SYL outside of the boundary of 144/146 for a distance of 9 metres in a westerly direction, from a point 14 metres from the boundary of 144/146 for a distance of 7 metres in a westerly direction, from the boundary of 140b for a distance of 9 metres in a westerly direction, and from a point 19 metres from the boundary of 140b for a distance of 11metres in a westerly direction.

On the south side 12 metres from the junction of Cavendish Way for a distance of 10 metres in a westerly direction and from a point 28 metres from its junction with Cavendish Way for a distance of 22 metres in a westerly direction.

Recommendation: To Proceed with the proposal and make the Order.

-----

Designated disabled parking places

Pope Street, outside of number 4  
Hastings Road, outside of number 23  
Bonnington Road, at the rear of 14  
Allen Street outside of number 53  
Western Road outside of 10  
Charles Street outside of 12

**Staplehurst -** High St outside of United Reform Church

Recommendation: To Proceed with the proposals and make the Order.

## **Appendix B**

### **Schedule of orders receiving objections.**

- The Kent County Council (Borough of Maidstone) Waiting Restrictions Order (variation No 3) Order 2009.
- The Kent County Council (Borough of Maidstone) Designated Parking Places Order (variation No 4) Order 2009.

DYL – means waiting to be prohibited at all times by double yellow lines.

SYL – means no waiting at the times prescribed.

#### **Hampton Road;**

DYL for a distance of 15 meters' at junctions, SYL Monday to Saturday 8.00am to 6.30pm from a point 15 metres south of its junction with Basmere Close to a point 15 metres from its junction with Aldon Close, SYL Mon-Fri 10.30-11.00am on the remainder.

2 objections were received to the proposal, on the grounds that the 24 hour restrictions on the junctions do not cover opposite the junctions, and that the placing of the restrictions will disperse vehicles into other streets where some commuter parking already occurs. This could further increase parking which will impede access, and that as no parking difficulties have been experienced at lower section of Hampton Road, visitors would be inconvenienced by the restriction being proposed.

15 comments and suggestions were received mainly that the placing of restrictions would inconvenience the residents themselves and disperse vehicles into side streets, with some suggesting residents only parking. 6 letters of support were also received.

A proposal was put forward in October 2006, however at the consultation stage a number of issues were raised. This identified that residents wanted some form of residents parking and so it was decided to carry out further surveying and monitoring.

Although it is appreciated that there will inevitably be some inconvenience to the residents and dispersion, the current proposals will mitigate some of the dispersion affect but also allow residents to park.

Recommendation: To proceed with the proposal and make the Order and to conduct monitoring after the Order has been implemented to consider impact on driver behavior.

-----

**Roseholme;**

DYL on the south then east then north sides from the boundary of 37/39 for a distance of 73 metres, then a SYL 8.am to 6.30pm Monday – Saturday restriction on the north side for the remainder of its length:

7 objections were received on the grounds that the placing of the restrictions would not assist with the current lack of parking within Roseholme, which is a highly populated area and a cul-de-sac. The need for parking restrictions on the bend were supported.

20 letters were also received commenting on the proposals. Comments included views that no substantial parking difficulties exist and that most vehicles that park in the street are either residents or visitors to the properties. It was also suggested that if any restrictions need to be put in place they should include residents parking. The consensus was that the restrictions would impede the residents. 4 letters of support were also received.

Recommendation: To not proceed with the proposal.

-----

**Peel Street;**

North-west side, amend the current SYL to a DYL from the junction of Arundal Street to the junction of Caning Street and South-east side from its junction with John Street for a distance of 68 metres in a northerly direction:

5 objections were received on the grounds the current provision of resident bays is already insufficient to meet the needs of residents, therefore those parking on the current restrictions during evenings and weekends are almost invariably the residents themselves, and by taking away the provision would severely impede the residents' already limited parking situation. Local and Kent County Councilors are also against the proposal.

5 letters were received with comments on the proposal where it was expressed that the residents park on the current restrictions out of necessity and the lack of residents bays. If parking on the pavement is causing difficulties this should be dealt with by the Police, also the parking generally occurs outside of normal working hours. The opposite pavement is not obstructed and is always an available alternative.

During a site meeting with Kent Police, Kent County Council and Councillors, the adverse effect of the order on local residents and likely dispersion into other streets was considered.

Recommendation: To not proceed with the proposal.

-----

**Lombardy Drive;**

Both sides SYL 11.00-11.30am Monday-Friday restrictions for its entire length

5 objections were received on the grounds the parking restrictions would have an adverse effect on the residents, as many households do not have sufficient off street parking facilities. These vehicles as well as family and friends would have nowhere else to park and some questioned the need for parking restrictions as they have never seen or experience parking difficulties. It was also suggested that restrictions may have a negative influence on the value and desirability of properties.

4 letters were received which suggested the parking of vehicles on the road resulted in a traffic calming. 10 letters of support for the proposal were received.

Recommendation: To proceed with the proposal and make the Order.

.....

**Bargrove Road;**

To place DYL at the junction of Hampton Road and to introduce a 10.30-11.00am Mon-Fri restrictions for the remainder of its length:

3 objections were received on the grounds the parking restrictions would have an adverse effect on the residents, as many households do not have sufficient off street parking facilities and that the residents from Bargrove Road would have no alternative to park in adjoining streets and thus reducing available space within these roads. Comments suggested that parking at the junction from Bargrove Road to the Woodlands is problematic, however it is felt that it is unnecessary for the rest of the road.

4 letters were received which commented on the introduction of restrictions would inconvenience the residents. It was suggested that that the parking of vehicles on the road resulted in traffic calming. 4 letters of support for the proposal were also received.

Recommendation: To not proceed with the proposal, and to carry out further consultation and monitoring.

-----

**Queens Road;**

Introduce DYL south side from the junction of Speldhurst Court for a distance of 155 metres in a westerly direction and introduce a SYL 9.00am-3.30pm restriction on its north side from its western junction with Shaftesbury Drive to its eastern junction with Shaftesbury Drive. 1 objection was received on the grounds that restricting parking in the vicinity would mean that people visiting will have no place where to park. 2 letters of support were also received.

Recommendation: To proceed with the proposal and make the Order

---

**Shaftesbury Drive;**

To introduce both sides a SYL 9.00am-3.30pm Mon-Fri restriction from a point 15 metres from its western junction with Queens Road to its eastern junction with Queens Road:

8 objections were received on the grounds that, the proposed restriction would create difficulties for local residents, and that the parking problems should be considered to be transient in nature.

17 comments were also made on the proposal which included the college campus finding a solution to their parking problems by supplying sufficient parking on site. Others commented that vehicles would disperse into surrounding streets and create further parking problems. Parking in the vicinity would mean that people visiting will have nowhere where to park. It was also suggested that restrictions may have a negative influence on the value and of the properties. 4 letters of support were received.

The Joint Transportation Board considered that restrictions would help reduce the current parking difficulties in the area.

Recommendation: To consider the views of the Joint Transportation Board in that the Cabinet Member for Environment be recommended to proceed with the proposals for Shaftesbury Drive and make the Order.

---

**Langham Grove;**

Both sides to introduce SYL 9.00am-3.30pm Mon-Fri restriction for its entire length

2 objections were received on the grounds that restricting parking in the vicinity would mean that people visiting will have no place where to park, and that parking was only of a transient nature. 2 letters were received commenting on restriction times.

The Joint Transportation Board considered that restrictions would help reduce the current parking difficulties in the area.

Recommendation: To consider the views of the Joint Transportation Board in that the Cabinet Member for Environment be recommended to proceed with the proposals for Langham Grove and make the Order.

---

**Wheeler Street;**

DYL North-west side from the junction of Well Road to the junction of Grecian Street and south-east side from the junction of Holland Road for a distance of 140 metres in a north-easterly direction:

2 objections were received, one with a petition of 77 signatories, on the grounds that although there is an acceptance that restrictions could be needed for safety reasons, the remainder of the space is essential for many residents who cannot find a space in a residents parking bay.

5 letters were also received one with a petition with 9 signatories commenting on the lack of available parking for residents and a request to provide additional bays.

Two objections were received together with two petitions numbering 86 signatories 5 comments on the proposal; the need for restrictions for safety reasons is accepted. Therefore taking these comments into account it is recommended the proposal be amended.

Recommendation: To amend the order to place 24 hours restrictions on the northwest side from the junction of Well Road to the junction of James Street, at the junctions of James Street, Bluett Street and access to Walsingham House. Southeast side from the junction of Holland Road for a distance of 112 metres in a northeasterly direction, to reflect the views expressed.

-----

**Northdown Close;**

Introduce SYL Monday-Friday 13.00-13.30 restrictions from current DYL both sides for the remainder of its length:

8 objections were received on the grounds the parking restrictions would have an adverse effect on the residents as many households do not have sufficient off street parking facilities and that family and friends would have be inconvenienced the most. Some questioned the need for parking restrictions as the existing situation is a rarely a problem. 7 letters of support were also received with 7 letters commenting on the proposals.

Proposals have previously been put forward to place restrictions and this was not approved following public consultation. However we received a subsequent request to place restrictions and during the informal consultation stage 7 letters of support were received and only 1 objection.

Two objections were received during formal consultation together with two petitions numbering 86 signatories. 5 comments on the proposal were received suggesting the need for restrictions for safety reasons.

Recommendation: To not proceed with the proposal.

---

### **Queen Elizabeth Square;**

Both sides to introduce a 9.00am-5.00pm Monday to Friday restriction SYL from its west/north-west junction with Queen Elizabeth Square DYL on turning heads:

2 objections were received, on the grounds that although the current proposals do not meet the requirement of the residents who want residents parking, and that the proposals would have a adverse impact on residential parking and disperse vehicles into adjoining streets that are currently unregulated.

One objector withdrew his objection and suggested a review of the restricted times from 09:00am to 3.30pm Mon-Fri.

The Joint Transportation Board considered that restrictions would help reduce the current parking difficulties in the area.

Recommendation: To consider the views of the Joint Transportation Board and proceed with the proposal and make the Order amending the restricted time to 09:00am to 3.30pm Monday to Friday.

---

### **Faraday Road;**

Both sides from its junction Penenden Heath Road in a southerly direction extend the current 15 metres DYL to 30 metres.

1 objection was received, on the grounds that there is no requirement for the lines to be extended and that the restrictions would disperse vehicles further into the road which could cause problems. 1 letter of support was received.

The proposal is also supported by Kent County Council due to safety concerns.

Recommendation: To proceed with the proposal and make the Order.

---

### **Thurnham: Thurnham Lane**

Both sides, to introduce SYL restriction from 12.30 – 1.00pm Monday to Friday from the existing double yellow lines to the motorway bridge.

1 objection was received, on the grounds that the restriction is extreme and that as the government is attempting to get the public to use public transport. The road offers the opportunity of free parking for rail users, and that most of the vehicles park in a considerate manner. 5 letters were received supporting the proposal and 1 letter commenting on the restriction times.

The original proposal was put forward in October 2006, however at the consultation stage a number of issues were raised. This identified that

residents wanted to extend the restrictions to cover the whole road and reduce the restriction times to allow for flexibility of parking.

Recommendation: To proceed with the proposal and make the Order.

-----

#### Residents parking -

##### **Hampton Road;**

Introduce residents parking bays Monday –Friday 10.30-11.00am on its (North-east side from a point 15 metres from its junction with Sittingbourne Road for a distance of 58 metres), (East side from a point 15 metres from its junction with Bonnington Road for a distance of 67 metres), (South side from a point 15 metres from its junction with Guston Road for a distance of 56 metres), (West side from a point 49.5 metres from its junction with Aldon Close for a distance of 22.5 metres), (North-west side from a point 30 metres from its junction with Farningham Close for a distance of 50 metres):

2 objections were received to the proposal on the grounds that the 24 hour restrictions on the junctions do not cover opposite the junctions, and that the placing of the restrictions will disperse vehicles into other streets where some commuter parking occurs. This may further increase parking difficulties which may restrict access. Some identified that no parking difficulties have been experienced at lower section of Hampton Road and visitors would be inconvenienced by any restriction.

15 comments and suggestions were received mainly stating that the placing of restrictions would inconvenience the residents themselves and disperse vehicles into side streets. Some suggested residents parking only. 6 letters of support were received.

A proposal was put forward in 2006, however at the consultation stage a number of issues were raised, this identified that residents wanted some form of residents parking, and it was decided to carry out further surveying and monitoring.

Although it is appreciated that there will inevitably be some inconvenience to the residents and dispersion, the current proposals will mitigate some of the dispersion affect but also allow residents to park.

Recommendation: To proceed with the proposal and make the Order and to conduct monitoring after the Order has been implemented to consider impact on driver behavior and, if necessary, further proposals can be made at a later date.



---

Designated disabled parking places

**St Anne Court;** outside of number 38;

1 letter of objection and 1 letter received which raised objections and concerns to an additional Disabled bay. The proposal is not to increase the current amount of disabled bays but to formulate the existing bay which was placed as an interim bay whilst the order was processed.

Recommendation: To proceed with the proposal and make the Order.

---

**Florence Road;** outside of number 52;

2 objections were received to the proposal on the grounds that the bay is not being used as the recipient has passed away, and that another bay is located within the vicinity.

Recommendation: To not to proceed with the proposal and to carry out further consultation to verify bay use.

---

**Hardy Street;** outside of 4;

1 objection and 1 letter commenting on the proposal were received. The objector had originally objected at the informal consultation stage on the same grounds that the bay is not being fully used and that parking facilities already exist at the rear of the premises.

Recommendation: To not proceed with the proposal and to carry out further consultation to verify bay use.

---

**Perryfield Street;** outside 16/18;

1 letter was received which raised objections to an additional Disabled bay as this will reduce their ability to park outside of their property. The proposal is not to increase the current amount of disabled bays, but to formulate the existing bay which was placed as an interim bay whilst the order was processed.

Recommendation: To proceed with the proposal and make the Order.

---