

---

## SWALE JOINT TRANSPORTATION BOARD

---

**MINUTES** of the Meeting held in the Council Chamber, Swale House, East Street, Sittingbourne, Kent, ME10 3HT on Monday, 11 September 2017 from 5.35pm - 7.55pm.

**PRESENT:** Councillors Mike Baldock, Cameron Beart, Derek Conway, James Hunt, Ken Ingleton (Chairman), Bryan Mulhern, David Simmons.

Kent County Councillors Andy Booth, Bowles (Vice-Chairman), Sue Gent, Antony Hook, Ken Pugh, Mike Whiting and John Wright.

Kent Association of Local Councils: Parish Councillors Peter MacDonald and Richard Palmer.

**OFFICERS PRESENT:** Alan Blackburn, Philippa Davies, Nikola Floodgate, Ian Grigor and Mike Knowles.

**ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:** Councillors Sarah Aldridge, Mike Henderson, Alan Horton and Roger Truelove.

**APOLOGY:** Parish Councillor Dave Austin.

### 199 **EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE**

The Chairman ensured that those present were aware of the emergency evacuation procedure.

### 200 **MINUTES**

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 26 June 2017 (Minute Nos. 65 – 76) were taken as read, approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

### 201 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor David Simmons declared a Disclosable Non-Pecuniary Interest in item 10, Double Yellow Lines around the Guildhall, Faversham, as he was a stall holder on Faversham Market, quite close to the Guildhall.

### 202 **PUBLIC SESSION**

Mr John Lynch, a Local Resident, presented a petition on behalf of local residents in relation to parking issues at Lavender Court/Fairview Road/Heather Close, Sittingbourne. He outlined the issue of commuter parking and explained that the parking restrictions that had been installed made it difficult for local residents to park there.

The Chairman accepted the petition, which was handed to the Seafront and Engineering Manager, so that a report could be written and submitted to a future meeting of the Board.

Mrs Sarah Drury, South Avenue Primary School, presented a petition on behalf of the school requesting that a survey took place to see how South Avenue could be made into a better and safer stretch of road, and requested that a crossing point be installed. Mrs Drury outlined the safety issues in relation to the children arriving/leaving the school, and explained that the school had tried to mitigate some issues by having 'walk to school days' and a cycle scheme. A pupil from Year 5 explained that she and other pupils did not feel safe when they arrived or left the school. The Chairman accepted the petition which was handed to the District Manager for Swale so that a report could be written and submitted to a future meeting of the Board.

Mr Tim Stonor, a Local Resident, spoke on item 10 of the agenda: Double Yellow Lines around the Guildhall, Faversham. He considered the proposal was contrary to public opinion, and that installation of double yellow lines at this location would not enhance the historic building. Mr Stonor explained that 90% of local traders opposed the proposal as it was ugly and prevented loading/unloading. He further explained that, following public consultation, yellow lines at this location had come bottom of the list, with the option of the installation of planters being more popular. He explained that Faversham Town Council had not considered the planter option as it was too expensive, although no estimates had been carried out. Mr Stonor urged the Board to object to the proposals.

Town Councillor Ted Wilcox, representing Faversham Town Council, spoke in support of double yellow lines around the Guildhall. He explained that the market place had become a car park, and this caused problems when the market was setting up. Councillor Wilcox acknowledged that double yellow lines were not ideal, but were necessary to stop vehicles parking there. He considered the installation of 'no loading' hatched lines might be going too far, but did not want to see lots of signs in this area. Councillor Wilcox explained that some cafes could not put their chairs and tables out because of parked cars. He stated that opening the town centre for evening use was a bonus, but he wanted the Guildhall to be free of cars, and the option of closed roads was not popular with local traders. He further added that traders did not want planters to be installed. Councillor Wilcox supported double yellow lines around the Guildhall so that the historic building could be seen.

Item 10 was considered first by members of the Board.

### **Recommendations for Swale Borough Council's Cabinet**

#### **203 PETITION - UFTON LANE, SITTINGBOURNE - UPDATE REPORT**

This report provided an update to the petition submitted to the Swale Joint Transportation Board in March 2017 by residents of Ufton Lane, Sittingbourne.

A Ward Member spoke in support of the consultations.

**Recommended:**

**(1) That the contents of the report be noted and officers proceed with the previously recommended consultations based on the consultation documents in Annex A of the report.**

**204 SITTINGBOURNE MARKET RE-LOCATION**

This report provided background on the recently advertised Traffic Regulation Order (TRO), in preparation of any formal objections to be tabled at the September 2017 JTB meeting. The Seafront and Engineering Manager reported that no formal objections had been received, so the TRO could progress.

In response to a question, the Seafront and Engineering Manager advised that market traders would need to set up/pack up before 7am and after 5pm. A Member advised that there would be exemption for permit holders, as noted on page 14 of the report.

**Recommended:**

**(1) That the report be noted and the Traffic Regulation Order be progressed.**

**205 PETITION - PARKING, SCHOOL ROAD, FAVERSHAM - UPDATE REPORT**

This report provided an update following the petition submitted by residents of School Road, Faversham, for the extension of the current Residents' Parking Scheme onto their road.

**Recommended:**

**(1) That the recent feedback to the consultation with residents of School Road and Plantation Road in Faversham on the proposed Residents' Parking Scheme layout be noted, and that officers proceed with drafting the Traffic Regulation Order for the implementation of the Scheme in School Road, Faversham.**

**206 PETITION AGAINST RESIDENTS' PARKING SCHEME IMPLEMENTATION - PLANTATION ROAD, FAVERSHAM**

This report responded to a petition received from residents of Plantation Road, Faversham objecting to the recently proposed implementation of a Residents' Parking Scheme in their road.

The Seafront and Engineering Manager explained that this was originally included in the School Road scheme, so sat side-by-side with the previous item.

**Recommended:**

**(1) That the petition and report be noted and the proposed implementation of the Residents' Parking Scheme in Plantation Road, Faversham is not progressed.**

**207 DOUBLE YELLOW LINES AROUND THE GUILDHALL, FAVERSHAM - UPDATE REPORT**

This report provided an update to the request from Faversham Town Council for double yellow lines, including a loading ban, to be installed around the Guildhall.

A Ward Member spoke in support of the proposal. He explained that people often parked in a haphazard way, sometimes all day, in the market place. Wide delivery vehicles were forced to mount pavements. He considered it to be dangerous and an accident waiting to happen.

Members raised points which included: accepted that double yellow lines around an historic building were not ideal, but there was an issue of cars parking on both sides of the Guildhall virtually all day; some cars double parked; the cars blocked the view of the Guildhall; double yellow lines were planned originally at this location, but a partial scheme was installed with no double yellow lines around the Guildhall; concerned if the 'no loading' aspect was included as market traders would not be able to unload their vans on market days; and disabled parking would need to be moved to another location.

Councillor David Simmons moved the following motion: that the double yellow lines be installed, but the 'no loading' hatched lines and signage be held in abeyance. This was seconded by Councillor Bryan Mulhern.

Members spoke further on the motion and raised points which included: the setting of this listed building was important, double yellow lines were not appropriate in this setting; 'no parking' signs could be a better option; double yellow lines might be difficult to enforce; did not consider that disabled parking should be re-located; was there any evidence of accidents that made this location a 'dangerous place to park?'; there were better solutions which would enhance the area; concerned about the cost of double yellow lines; planters should be considered as an option; loading restrictions would be damaging to traders; severely disabled people needed to park in the centre, a nearby car park might be too far away; yellow lines on top of cobbled streets would not be a good option; reservations about yellow lines in a conservation area; cost implications of the planter option; the costs outlined in the report could be used to fund the cost of the planters; and yellow lines did not detract from the Guildhall, but cars did.

The Cabinet Member for Safer Families and Communities (whose portfolio included parking), explained that parking restrictions in heritage and conservation areas were not marked out in bright yellow, but with two inch primrose yellow lines instead. He explained that a sign at the entrance had been considered, but with all the parking restriction options, was too large and complicated. The Cabinet Member added that the hatched markings for restricted unloading were not part of the original proposal, but additional to the current proposal.

The Proposer summed up and stated that primrose yellow or double yellow lines were universally understood, and lines could be added quite easily now, and this was not a safety issue. He stated that there was a cost in painting double yellow lines, but this was less than other solutions. He considered planters and benches were not compatible with market use, and suggested that single yellow lines be installed so that disabled vehicle users could still park there.

On being put to the vote, the motion was carried.

***Recommended:***

***(1) That double yellow lines be installed around the Guildhall, Faversham, without the inclusion of No Loading.***

**208 SELLING PRIMARY SCHOOL**

This item was withdrawn from the agenda.

**Recommendations for Kent County Council's Cabinet**

**209 PROPOSED SPEED LIMIT REDUCTION, QUEENBOROUGH AND HALFWAY HOUSES, ISLE OF SHEPPEY**

This report provided details of a proposed reduction in the speed limit from 30mph to 20mph in numerous residential roads in the Queenborough and Halfway Ward, and the results of the statutory consultation.

The Schemes Planning and Delivery Manager reported that there had been seven notifications of objection and 34 in support of the scheme. She clarified that the £50,000 funding noted in paragraph 1.1 of the report was for county-wide schemes.

A Ward Member reported that the majority of residents were in favour of the scheme and residents in other locations had requested similar initiatives. He asked how much funding this particular scheme was receiving. The Ward Member suggested other streets that needed traffic calming; these included Holmside Avenue, Adelaide Gardens and Southdown Road. He considered all of Queenborough should be restricted to 20mph.

Members raised points which included: supported 20mph on all side roads, but not main roads, as this would make it more expensive; this would help Queenborough residents and improve air quality; suggested a working group for the whole of Swale; 20mph would work well in Queenborough, including the main thoroughfare; this would be difficult to police; was unsure of the reduction in pollution when roads became 20mph zones; this would be more difficult to install in Halfway; not sure if it was appropriate to have 20mph on the A250; zones should be created with entrances to reduce signage costs; not everyone would comply with 20mph; and there was five times less chance of being killed when a 20mph restriction was in place.

In response to questions, the Schemes Planning and Delivery Manager explained that there was £10,000 funding for this scheme. The roads within the scheme were

not chosen at random but were data driven and roads were chosen where the mean speed was already 24mph or less, so signage was reasonably inexpensive. She acknowledged the idea of expanding the zone, but this would mean adding expensive traffic calming measures, and it might not be appropriate to install traffic calming measures in the suggested additional roads. In response to further questions, the Schemes Planning and Delivery Manager advised that the £10,000 was towards the cost of the design, survey, signs and posts, and lines on the roads, including roundels. She agreed to forward information on the traffic speed survey to the Board.

Kent County Councillor Bowles moved the following motion: that 20mph be installed for the whole of Queenborough, as suggested by the Ward Member, and the Halfway part be deferred for further information. This was seconded by Councillor Mike Baldock.

A Ward Member considered that by extending the zone, the signage could be reduced from 11 to three. He suggested the A250 remained as it was, due to parked cars and the unsuitability for installing humps because it was on a bus route. He considered the Halfway option should remain as noted in the report.

The Schemes Planning and Delivery Manager advised that funding for the scheme was available until March 2018. She stated that the roads not included were those where the mean speed was not under 24mph, and it would not be appropriate to run-out 20mph when the current speed was 30mph. She stated that it was possible to see whether there were other roads that could be included in the scheme.

The Schemes Project Manager explained that public perception was that changing a road from 30mph to 20mph automatically made the road safer. There was a need to ensure the reality met the perception, and where mean speeds were above 24 mph traffic calming measures were put in place to force a reduction in speed. On a 20mph road, the behaviour of the user groups changed and sometimes led to drivers taking more risks.

Members made further comments which included: trials needed to be carried out; some documents stated that traffic calming increased pollution; and if we hesitated we might jeopardise the funding; needed to do this now, and consider other roads later.

On being put to the vote, all were in favour of the first proposal for Queenborough, and the Halfway option be as noted in the report, with the addition of St Katherine Road, Danley Road and Filer Road, if possible, with other potential roads to come back to the next meeting of the Board.

***Recommended:***

***(1) That 20mph be installed for the whole of Queenborough, and the Halfway option be as noted in the report, with the addition of St Katherine Road, Danley Road and Filer Road, if possible, with other potential roads to come back to the next meeting of the Board.***

**Items for Noting****210 HIGHWAY WORKS PROGRAMME**

The Board considered the report which provided an update on the identified schemes approved for construction in 2017/18.

**Surface Treatments (page 69)**

The District Manager agreed to provide an update on works to The Street, Oare.

**Street Lighting (page 75)**

An update on work on the LED Conversion Project on The Meads, Sittingbourne would be provided for the Ward Member.

**Developer Funded Works (page 78)**

The Schemes Project Manager explained that work on Love Lane/Graveney Road, Faversham was still with the Development Team, and they would provide a response to Kent County Councillor Bowles and Councillor David Simmons.

**Public Rights of Way (page 82)**

A Member reported that Footpath ZB49 needed to be reviewed as it had been closed for public safety.

**Resolved:**

**(1) That the report be noted.**

**211 PROGRESS UPDATE REPORT**

Members considered the report which gave an update on the progress made regarding various schemes in the Borough.

**Page 85 – 218/09/14**

Parish Councillor Peter Macdonald considered the design of the junction was not right and needed to be moved in a westerly direction to allow HGVs to manoeuvre.

The District Manager for Swale agreed to provide an update on progress at the junction. A Member raised concern with the issue of drivers going south on the road and still making a right hand turn, and stated that something needed to be done to prohibit a right hand turn.

**Page 86 – 869/09/16**

A Member stated that the web page for Swale needed to be updated.

**Page 90 – 1227/03/17**

A Member advised that a speed survey at The Meads, Sittingbourne was going ahead in September 2017.

**Page 90 – 1228/03/17**

The Schemes Project Manager agreed to establish, from Eastchurch Parish Council, where their quote for £7,000 consultation costs came from.

***Resolved:***

***(1) That the report be noted.***

**212 DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

The Chairman confirmed that the next meeting of the Board was at 5.30pm on Monday 18 December 2017.

Chairman

Copies of this document are available on the Council website <http://www.swale.gov.uk/dso/>. If you would like hard copies or alternative versions (i.e. large print, audio, different language) we will do our best to accommodate your request please contact Swale Borough Council at Swale House, East Street, Sittingbourne, Kent, ME10 3HT or telephone the Customer Service Centre 01795 417850.

All Minutes are draft until agreed at the next meeting of the Committee/Panel