

**MAIDSTONE BOROUGH COUNCIL**

**MAIDSTONE JOINT TRANSPORTATION BOARD**

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 16 APRIL 2008**

**PRESENT: Maidstone Borough Council**

**Councillors English (Chairman), Mrs Gibson, Horne, Marchant, Parr, Paterson and Robertson**

**Kent County Council**

**County Councillors Chittenden, Curwood, Daley, Hotson and Mrs Stockell**

**KAPC**

**Parish Councillor Wilson**

**Apologies**

**Borough Councillor Mrs Hinder, Parvin  
County Councillors Lord Bruce-Lockhart, Carter**

40. NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

It was noted that Councillor Horne was substituting for Councillor Parvin.

41. NOTIFICATION OF VISITING MEMBERS

There were no Visiting Members.

42. DISCLOSURES BY MEMBERS AND OFFICERS

There were no disclosures.

43. DISCLOSURES OF LOBBYING

Councillors Horne and Marchant stated that they had been lobbied on item 7 on the agenda – Notification of Petition Crossing in Ware Street.

Councillor Mrs Gibson stated that she had been lobbied on item 9 on the agenda – Future Local Transport Plan Bids.

44. EXEMPT ITEMS

RESOLVED: That the items on the agenda be taken in public as proposed.

45. MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 21 January 2008 be approved as a correct record and signed, subject to Minute 35 being

amended to state that it was noted that the proposed HGV surveys should be conducted outside of school holidays.

46. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 7 NOVEMBER 2007

Minute 35 – Heavy Goods Vehicle Management – South and West of Maidstone

It was noted that whilst there was no update on the papers, officers had contacted highways officers in South Wales regarding the experimentation with HGV signing on country lanes. They were happy to carry out another experiment and it was stated that there were a number of parishes who would be interested in taking part, but that they needed to be kept informed.

Minute 36 - A229 Loose Road/Boughton Lane/Cripple Street Junction, Maidstone

The Board were informed that the post for the speed camera at Loose Road had gone in but that the camera was not in place as scheduled for end of March 2008. The works to complete the speed camera would be finished shortly and had been delayed due to a carry over of the previous year's works. A note on the situation would be sent round to all Members of the Board.

47. QUESTIONS/STATEMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Mrs Lloyd of Yalding Parish Council addressed the Committee to raise the issue of weight restrictions on the bridge in Yalding and to follow up on the proposed HGV surveys. The Board were informed by Highways officers that the Kent County Council Cabinet Member responsible for Highways issues had informally given the view that the surveys could not be funded. The Board requested that this be put in writing, via letter, to the Members of the Board for further explanation. As no formal decision had been taken on the matter the Board felt that it was appropriate to formally recommend to the Highways Advisory Board that they take a formal position on the surveys at Yalding. The Board also felt that Members should lobby the appropriate bodies to get a decision taken.

RESOLVED:

- (i) That a letter be circulated to Members explaining the decision taken informally by Councillor Ferrin;
- (ii) That Members of the Board should lobby groups to get a decision taken; and
- (iii) That the Highways Advisory Board be requested to formally consider the matter.

48. NOTIFICATION OF PETITION – CROSSING IN WARE STREET

Councillors Horne and Marchant stated that they had been lobbied on this item.

Mr Willson addressed the Board in order to present his petition in support of a crossing in Ware Street. The Board heard that the road was a busy one with no nearby crossing point and local residents were concerned that an accident would soon occur.

Highways Officers informed the Board that a scheme had been proposed and was currently being put through the PIPKIN evaluation process to see if it could be taken to the next stage. The outcomes of the first stage of the PIPKIN process would be reported to the next meeting of the Board. It was noted that the current stage was to assess the scheme on its merits and in the context of highways policies. Should the scheme make it through the first stage then it would be evaluated for design and costs. The list of successful and unsuccessful schemes would be reported back to the next Board meeting for consideration.

It was noted that there were new developments in the area of the proposed crossing and section 106 monies had been agreed for a speed indicator along the road. Highways officers were monitoring the situation with regard to the section 106 agreement.

RESOLVED:

- i. That the petition be given the support of the Board; and
- ii. That a full list of the schemes put through the PIPKIN process and the outcomes of the first stage be reported back to the next meeting of the Board; so that action can be taken on those schemes that fail to make the next stage.

49. QUIET LANES

The Board considered the reference from the Mid Kent Downs Steering Group on the issue of introducing quiet lanes in the North Downs. A report by the Mid Kent Downs Steering Group was circulated at the meeting. It was noted that a scheme was due to be assessed through PIPKIN for Pilgrims Way traffic calming that aimed to get a quiet lanes scheme in place. However, previous experience had shown that quiet lanes schemes did not receive high priority. The Board stated there support for quiet lanes and for the Pilgrims Way scheme.

The Board were informed that there was no formal legal designation of quiet lanes. However, two experiments been carried out, one in Kent and another in Norfolk. The experiments had had a high cost with little impact. However, alternatives were possible such as adopting rural traffic calming in the form of edging lanes and using artificial gateways.

RESOLVED: That the Board support the Quiet Lanes Scheme.

50. FUTURE LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN BIDS

The Board considered the report of the Transportation and Development Manager on the proposed schemes for 2009/10. The listed schemes would need to be put through the PIPKIN process. This first stage of assessment was based on how schemes met the central government and highways

authority policies and objectives. If successful the schemes would then have design work and costing carried out for further prioritisation.

The Board raised the issue of whether too much emphasis was being placed on urban rather than rural schemes. A large number of schemes came forward from Parish Councils, who invested a lot of time and effort into them, and they failed to make the next stage of PIPKIN. The Urban Traffic Management and Control Scheme required a substantial amount of funding. However, its impact would not just be in the urban area but also felt on rural areas as well, as the traffic flow through the town centre improved.

The Board stressed the need for those people who submitted schemes to be kept informed of when they failed to get through to the next stage. This would then allow alternative methods of funding, such as Parishes raising precepts, to be investigated. The report on the next stage of the PIPKIN process, including those schemes that were unsuccessful, would be reported back to the next meeting of the Board. This report would include the costings of the schemes.

Officers and the teams involved were congratulated on the good work that had been carried out on Bluebell Hill. A request was made that the contact details of Maidstone's Highways Liaison officer be circulated to the Members of the Board.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

51. UPDATE ON CAPITAL WORKS PROGRAMME

The Board were informed that a full report on the Capital Works Programme would be presented to the next meeting. Officers were asked to provide information on the 25 camera sites around the Borough, in particular, how the system was financed, how it would be serviced and how it would integrate with the police, the highways authority and the UTMC.

The statistics for accidents resulting in fatal or slight injuries had been released and showed Maidstone as being higher on the list than anywhere else in Kent. The Board stated that it hoped that Kent County Council and the Highways Advisory Board would be challenging those figures. More detailed information would be made available to allow a more in depth look at this issue at the next Board meeting.

The issue of reviewing the role of the Joint Transportation board was raised. It was noted that a joint Overview and Scrutiny report, by Tunbridge Wells and Maidstone into highways services communication had been produced and would be available at the next Board meeting. The report made recommendations for the Board. A report on the funding of KCC highways was broken down, particularly Capital Maintenance, was also requested and officers agreed to produce this.

RESOLVED:

- (i) That a report on Capital Maintenance funding be submitted to the next meeting;

- (ii) That the Overview and Scrutiny Report into Kent Highways Services Communication with District Councils be submitted to the next meeting;
- (iii) That a full Capital Works Programme Report be submitted to the next meeting; and
- (iv) That a report containing more detailed figures on the fatal and slight injuries in Maidstone be submitted to the next Board.

52. DURATION OF MEETING

5.00 p.m. to 6.46 p.m.