

MAIDSTONE BOROUGH COUNCIL

CABINET

13 June 2012

REPORT OF THE REGENERATION AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Report prepared by Overview and Scrutiny Officer

1. Traffic Congestion Review

1.1 Issue for Decision

1.1.1 To consider the recommendations within 'Traffic Congestion Review' report attached at **Appendix A**.

1.2 Recommendation of the Regeneration and Economic Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee

1.2.1 That the Cabinet Member agrees the following recommendations:

1. That the Council lobbies the Highways Agency for a permanent solution to the crippling effects of operation stack on Maidstone as a matter of urgency;
2. That the public suggestions attached at Appendix A be considered and responded to within the further formulation of the Integrated Transportation Strategy;
3. That a platform be found to enable dialogue between public transport providers and users;
4. That Maidstone Borough Council encourages and supports the use of all methods of transport in and around Maidstone;
5. That the parking permit policy and allocation be reviewed;
6. That car sharing be promoted within the Council using subsidised parking spaces as incentives;
7. That more cycle storage stands be provided at Maidstone House;

8. That a better working relationship between Kent County Council and Maidstone Borough Council be achieved regarding transport;
9. That clarification be sought on the remit of Kent County Council and the Highways Agency as partners involved in Road;
10. That the ambition for a South East Strategic Link route should not be written off entirely as growth was still identified to take place in the south of Maidstone; and
11. That the wider aspects of the relationship between park and ride, parking standards, on-street parking and development control, including the use of contributions from developers towards highways and public transport schemes are considered when addressing congestion and ways to encourage the use of public transport.

1.3 Reasons for Recommendation

- 1.3.1 At its first meeting of the 2011-12 Municipal Year, the Regeneration and Economic Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee agreed to carry out a review of Traffic Congestion. The Committee identified the negative impact congestion issues had on the quality of life of those who live and work in the borough. It was felt the issues needed to be addressed and managed in order to enable economic growth and the growth of the borough.
- 1.3.2 The Committee has carried out formal and informal meetings with internal officers, Kent County Council and the local authorities. As part of its evidence gathering, the Committee visited Godstone Traffic Control Centre, Chelmsford City Council and Medway Council. The Committee made an extensive 'call for evidence' advertising the review to residents on a local bus route and via the local press.
- 1.3.3 Having considered the evidence, the Committee approved a wide range of recommendations that seek to highlight the approach it feels the Council should be taking in addressing Traffic Congestion in Maidstone. The Committee feel that the overwhelming response from residents in relation to this review be given particular consideration. These are attached at Appendix B to this report.

Alternative Action and why not Recommended

- 1.3.4 The Cabinet Member could decide not to endorse any of the recommendations within the "Traffic Congestion Review" report, however the recommendations are based on evidence from a range of sources and support the Council's objectives with regards to Maidstone

having a growing economy with a transport network that supports the local economy, as outlined at 1.4.

1.4 Impact on Corporate Objectives

1.4.1 The Council's Strategic Plan 2011-2015 lists "For Maidstone to have a growing economy" as a key priority. The recommendations within the report contribute to the fulfillment of these objectives.

1.5 Risk Management

1.5.1 The Recommendations contained within the report will need to be risk assessed as part reviewing whether they should be accepted or not.

1.6 Other Implications

1.6.1

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

1.7 Appendices

Appendix A – Regeneration and Economic Development Overview and Committee "Traffic Congestion Review"; and
Appendix B – Regeneration and Economic Development Overview and Committee "Traffic Congestion Review Evidence Pack".

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

N/a