

dear mr. Burr

i would like to raise my objections to the outcome of the recent swale JTB where they recommended that the order for yellow lines outside the school be rescinded, it was my view that this was not a matter for the JTB to act on and certainly not overturn a plan that is supported by the parish council ( of which i am member for the record but i write this compliant as a private resident of tunstall) the lines were also supported by a public consultation. the need for lines outside the school is to improve the safety of the road, the need for lines should not be lumped in with the recent planning application for a new school car park either they are very separate issues. i would appreciate any further advice or clarification on this matter.

---

I would like to confirm that the recent Swale Joint Transportation Board did not rescind the proposals to implement yellow lines outside Tunstall School but just recommended that a final decision be deferred until the recently submitted planning application for off street parking is decided. This is compatible with the previous recommendations made by the Joint Transportation Board and I feel it's only reasonable to await the decision on the planning application before making a final decision on the waiting restrictions. My officers are in discussions with the planning department on times scales for a decision on the planning application and I would like to reassure you that all views will be taken in to account when the final decision is made.

---

The reason why the above is so important is because it appears that the JTB have taken the views of just **one** "resident" who is the Chair of Governors to Tunstall School, over and above the views of the majority of residents as indicated by the overwhelming response following the consultation process and also the views of Tunstall Parish Council (who represent the Parishioners). The JTB's views may have been very different had we been made aware that we were allowed to speak at this meeting to present our reasons for supporting the scheme.

Also, I am still confused by the "new" process as I understood that if there were less than 5 or 7 objections (I can't remember which) this process would simply be determined by Mr John Burr but I understand he has now taken the view of the Swale JTB to defer the traffic restrictions. Please can Cllr Whiting explain this?

Therefore, please can you explain to me what this deferral means as it is not clear in the minutes only that, "**a decision on waiting restrictions in Tunstall Road be deferred until KCC had considered the planning application**". What does this mean?

Does this mean:

1. If the School car-park is granted planning permission will the restrictions be scrapped?
2. If the restrictions are scrapped, what happens if cars continue to park outside the front of the school on the road – do we have to go through the whole consultation process again and waste more public money?
3. What happens if the School is not granted planning permission for the car park – will the scheme then proceed and how long will this take?

Also, why did the Members vote for the double yellow & zig-zag lines to be proceeded at the last JTB meeting (knowing full well what this scheme would have meant) and then make comments to the contrary at this meeting such as:

- “double yellow lines would be detrimental to residents and may encourage speeding as there would be no parked cars along the road” - Cllr Alan Willicombe
- “the alternative parking arrangements were nearly in place and no action should be taken until this had been decided” Cllr Alan Willicombe
- “were residents advised about the planning application for alternative parking as part of the consultation process, as it may have affected the responses” Cllr Harrison
- “zig-zag lines do not work and are ignored unless policed.” Cllr Prescott

As these comments were minuted, I would like to know which Members made these comments and in particular the comment, **“the alternative parking arrangements were nearly in place and no action should be taken until this had been decided”**

As this implies the planning decision has already been predetermined by the KCC Planning Committee and that it will go ahead. Please can Cllr Whiting explain this and why these are not being treated separately as one is about staff convenience and need and one is about child and pedestrian safety?

In response to some of the other comments, many residents have known months’ ago about the proposed planning application for alternative parking or were aware that this was being considered – certainly the public “resident” speaker, Mrs Doreen Hunter, would have been fully aware of the School’s intentions months’ ago as she is the Chair of Governors to Tunstall School and would have been in contact with the landowner (who is also a nearby resident) as the plans in the School’s Strategy report are dated March 2012. The School was also in discussion with the nearby residents who were affected by their application (also stated in the School’s Strategy Report) for their views before the application was made. Furthermore, our County Councillor and Ward Councillors have known about the School’s intentions months’ ago (as minuted in the Parish Council minutes which are in the public domain). Please can Cllr Whiting explain this?

With regard to the statement having no parked cars along the road would encourage speeding – firstly, does the JTB consider parked cars to be a permanent traffic calming measure outside a School? Secondly, if speeding was an issue here, why are there not “proper” permanent traffic calming measures outside the School when there are traffic calming measures in place along other parts of this road in the village? Finally, with regard to the comment about zig-zag lines, why are these outside every other school if they do not work? If they have the correct Traffic Regulation Order, then there is no reason why they cannot be policed and enforced.” Please can Cllr Whiting explain this?

Thank you and I’ll await Cllr Whiting’s full reply.

---

I refer to your email dated 15<sup>th</sup> January 2013 concerning the proposed parking restrictions outside Tunstall Primary School which has been passed to me to respond to on behalf of the County Council.

At the meeting of the Swale JTB held on the 12th December 2011 (minutes amended and approved at the 12th March JTB) it was agreed for the County Council to carry out a consultation with local residents to look at options for parking restrictions outside the school so that options were available to take forward when a decision had been made by the school on any additional land that was available for parking. This original recommendation that the options should not be taken forward until a decision has been made on the school providing additional off street parking has been recently reaffirmed by the Joint Transportation at their meeting dated 10<sup>th</sup> December 2012.

At the time the consultation results were clearly intended for use only once a decision had been made on any potential provision of off street parking and therefore, in my opinion it is

only correct that any subsequent decision informed by the results of the original consultation is deferred until a decision has been made on the off street parking. This position is supported by your local County Councillor, Mike Whiting and Alan Willicombe. Mr Whiting generously promoted this consultation with funds from his Member Highway Fund.

The new County Council's procedures for making decisions on Traffic Regulation Orders when five or fewer objections has been received states that the local County Councillor has to be in full support to proceed before a delegated decision is made. As the County Councillor supports waiting until a decision on the off street parking has been made no decision can be made by the Director under delegated authority. Both the County Councillor and /or the Director can also refer the matter back to the Joint Transportation Board if they feel this is appropriate.

As to what the final decision will be once the planning application for the schools off street parking has been made is pure conjecture at this moment in time. Members of the Joint Transportation Board are perfectly at liberty to make whatever comments they feel appropriate and change their minds on any issue if they so wish to. I can confirm that the decision on the off street parking planning application will be taken separately from the waiting restrictions and will have to follow the County Councils formal procedures.

It is true that in certain circumstances and schemes highway authorities do use the fact cars are parked on a road as a natural form of traffic calming. In Kent road safety outside schools is generally very good and it is rare to have many road traffic crashes that result in injury. One of the reasons for this is attributed to the congestion outside schools at dropping off and picking up times keeping vehicle speeds low. The County Council do not have any records of any personal injury crashes outside Tunstall School since our records began in 1994. Therefore there are no grounds for the installation of traffic calming measures and it should be noted that as there have been no recorded personal injury crashes, the removal of the parking, may statistically make the crash record worse in the future.

The comment regarding zig-zags infers that they only work when enforced. Obviously the more enforcement the more effective they are in preventing parking but as local government resources under increasing pressure it must be assumed that the zig-zags will only received limited enforcement.

While the above may not be the answers you were hoping for I trust I have responded to all the issues you raised.

Kind regards,

Andy Corcoran  
Traffic Schemes & Member Highway Fund Manager