

---

## SWALE JOINT TRANSPORTATION BOARD

---

**MINUTES** of the Virtual Meeting Via Skype on Monday, 21 June 2021 from 5.30 pm - 7.31 pm.

**PRESENT:** Councillors Simon Clark, Alastair Gould, Peter Macdonald, Julian Saunders (Chairman), Paul Stephen and Eddie Thomas.

Kent County Councillors: Mike Baldock, Cameron Beart, Andy Booth, Mike Dendor, Antony Hook, Rich Lehmann and John Wright (Vice-Chairman).

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

**OFFICERS PRESENT:** Billy Attaway, Alan Blackburn, Martyn Cassell, Mike Knowles, Kellie MacKenzie, Brett O'Connell, and Jamie Watson.

**ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:** Councillors Steve Davey, Tim Gibson, Ken Ingleton, Carole Jackson, Hannah Perkin, Ken Rowles, Ghlin Whelan, Mike Whiting and Tony Winckless.

**APOLOGIES:** Councillors Benjamin Martin and Bill Tatton.

### **82 MINUTES**

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 1 March 2021 (Minute Nos. 485-498) were taken as read, approved and signed by the Chairman as correct record subject to an amendment to Minute No. 493, that recommendation (1) be amended to read: progressing the scheme to construction.

### **83 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

No interests were declared.

### **84 PUBLIC SESSION**

Members of the public were invited to speak on the items as they were considered.

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

### **85 RESULTS OF INFORMAL CONSULTATIONS - FAVERSHAM & MINSTER AREA**

The Seafront and Engineering Manager introduced the report which provided details of an objection and comments received in relation to the recent informal consultations for the various proposed parking amendments in the Faversham and Minster areas.

Councillor Eddie Thomas proposed that recommendation (1) be abandoned as he considered putting double yellow lines in this location would not help the situation at

Tin Bridge Cottages, Faversham and this was seconded by Councillor Richard Palmer.

Councillor Peter MacDonald raised the issue of parking on the junction of Kings Road and Queens Road, the junction of Princes Avenue and Queens Road and the junction of Imperial Avenue and Queens Road in Minster. He said that parking in these roads and junctions was becoming more of an issue and was very dangerous. He felt that installing double yellow lines would improve safety.

Councillor Peter MacDonald proposed that recommendations (2), (3) and (4) should all be progressed and that recommendation (5) be abandoned and this was seconded by Kent Council Councillor Cameron Beart.

***Recommended:***

***That the results of the recent informal consultations be noted and that:***

- (1) ***The proposed double yellow lines and bus clearways at the entrance to Tin Bridge Cottages, Faversham be abandoned.***
- (2) ***The proposed double yellow lines on the junction of Kings Road and Queens Road, Minster be progressed.***
- (3) ***The proposed double yellow lines on the junction of Princes Avenue and Queens Road, Minster be progressed.***
- (4) ***The proposed double yellow lines on the junction of Imperial Avenue and Queens Road, Minster be progressed.***
- (5) ***The proposed double yellow lines on the junction of Stanley Avenue and Queens Road, Minster be abandoned.***

**86 FORMAL OBJECTIONS TO TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER - SWALE AMENDMENT 24 2021**

The Seafront and Engineering Manager introduced the report which provided details of an objection and comments received in relation to the recently advertised Traffic Regulation Order (TRO), Swale Amendment 24 2021, which proposed various amendments to on-street waiting restrictions in the Swale Area.

The Chairman proposed that recommendations (1) and (2) be progressed and this was seconded by Kent County Councillor Mike Baldock.

Councillor Peter MacDonald spoke on recommendation (3) and acknowledged the objection to the double yellow lines being installed at Clarence Row, Sheerness, but said that currently there was a real issue with emergency vehicles gaining access in that road and double yellow lines could prevent this. He proposed that the double yellow lines in Clarence Row, Sheerness be progressed, but with consideration to installing a nearby disabled persons' parking bay if possible, and this was seconded by Kent County Councillor Cameron Beart.

Councillor Eddie Thomas proposed that recommendation (4) should be abandoned and this was seconded by Kent County Councillor Mike Baldock.

***Recommended:***

***That the formal objections and comments received to the advertised Traffic Regulation Order be noted and that:***

- (1) The proposed double yellow lines in the Attlee Way Area, Sittingbourne, be progressed.***
- (2) The proposed extension to the double yellow lines in Dark Hill, Faversham be progressed.***
- (3) The proposed double yellow lines in Clarence Row, Sheerness be progressed.***
- (4) The proposed removal of the section of single yellow line in St Catherine's Drive Faversham be abandoned.***

**87 FORMAL OBJECTIONS TO TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER - SWALE AMENDMENT 22 2021**

The Seafront and Engineering Manager introduced the report which provided details of an objection and comments received in relation to the recently advertised TRO, Swale Amendment 22 2021, which proposed various amendments to on-street waiting restrictions in the Swale area.

Councillor Mike Baldock proposed that recommendation (1) be progressed and this was seconded by Councillor Eddie Thomas.

Kent County Councillor Cameron Beart thought that the previous extension of double yellow lines was enough and further extension was not needed. He proposed that recommendation (2) be progressed and this was seconded by Councillor Peter MacDonald.

Some Members spoke on the double yellow lines proposed in Lammas Drive, Sittingbourne and said that vehicles were parking too close to the fence preventing pedestrians from being able to walk on the pavement. They also raised concern with vehicle visibility when using the junction at Lammas Drive and said that vehicles were parking too close to the junction and that double yellow lines would prevent this. The Chairman proposed that recommendation (3) be progressed and this was seconded by Councillor Mike Dendor.

Several Members spoke on recommendation (4) and the following points were made:

- The current lines were 10 metres in distance but this was not the minimum distance set by the highways authority as every junction was different;
- during the day and at night vehicles parked partially on the pavement making it difficult for pedestrians to pass;
- vehicles parked too close to the turning point of the junction preventing other drivers from turning into the junction;
- concerns that if lines were extended this might lead to other crowded parking elsewhere; and
- there was insufficient room for vehicles to turn in the road.

Councillor Simon Clark proposed the extension of the double yellow lines and this was seconded by Councillor Paul Stephen.

The local Ward Member spoke on recommendation (5) and said that emergency services could not access the road because there were too many vehicles parked on the road. He also raised concern with vehicles parking too far onto the pavement preventing buggies and pedestrians from using the pavement.

Kent County Councillor Mike Dendor proposed that double yellow lines in Periwinkle Close be progressed and this was seconded by Councillor Simon Clark.

**Recommended:**

***That the formal objections and comments received to the advertised Traffic Regulation Order be noted and that:***

- (1) The proposed double yellow lines in Hilton Close, Faversham, be progressed and the comments around sightline obstructions by private hedges be forwarded to Kent County Council for consideration.***
- (2) The proposed double yellow lines in Queenborough Road/St Peter's Close Minster, be progressed as advertised.***
- (3) The proposed double yellow lines in Lammas Drive and Cortland Close, Sittingbourne, be progressed.***
- (4) The proposed extension to the double yellow lines in Gore Court Road and Whitehall Road, Sittingbourne be progressed.***
- (5) The proposed double yellow lines in Periwinkle Close be progressed.***

**88 FORMAL OBJECTIONS TO EXTENSION TO SITTINGBOURNE RESIDENTS' PARKING SCHEME - PARK ROAD AND UFTON LANE, SITTINGBOURNE**

The Chairman invited a member of public to speak. They started by thanking the Chairman for the opportunity to speak on this item. They felt that implementing the parking scheme would only increase the parking problems in other roads and residents exceeded the amount of parking permits for vehicles. The local schools in the area did not have any parking available to them and introducing this scheme would result in parents having to drop their children off further away from the school and cross more roads which could make their journey to school dangerous. The most recent consultation that went out to residents showed that out of a total of 131 homes, only 13% were in support of the parking scheme and 41% were opposed to the scheme. The member of public urged members of the JTB to vote against this parking scheme.

The Seafront and Engineering Manager introduced the report which provided details of an objections, indications of support and comments received in relation to the recently advertised TRO, Swale Amendment 25, which covered the proposed extension to the existing Sittingbourne Residents' Parking Scheme to include the full length of Park Road and Ufton Lane

Members made some points which included:

- It was a shame that there was a poor response rate as this did not reflect a true opinion of what the residents wanted in the area;
- the results of the consultation proved that residents no longer wanted the parking scheme;

- some residents thought that timings of the scheme were slightly wrong and would want the timings to change for any future parking schemes;
- there were 3 schools within close proximity to this area;
- the scheme would push parking closer to the schools making it dangerous for local school children;
- some of the objectors were residents that were not local to the area;
- there had been no reported serious accidents; and
- the scheme was not intended to allow for commercial vehicles so commercial vehicles should not be parked in the areas.

Kent County Councillor John Wright proposed that the recommendation should be abandoned and this was seconded by Councillor Richard Palmer.

***Recommended:***

- (1) That the formal objections and comments received to the advertised Traffic Regulation Order be noted and the proposed extension to Sittingbourne Residents' Parking Scheme be abandoned.***

**89 RESULTS OF INFORMAL CONSULTATION - GROVEHURST ROAD, SITTINGBOURNE**

The Seafront and Engineering Manager introduced the report which asked Members to note the results of the recent informal consultation with residents in Grovehurst Road, Sittingbourne, on the possible removal of an existing one-hour waiting restriction outside their properties. The request for changes to the parking restrictions were due to residents being inconvenienced by the restrictions which were originally introduced to assist them.

The local Ward Member explained that he had spoken to local residents and that the area in question was the only area within close proximity for them to park. The residents had received fines and abuse when they parked in other areas and it was considered that parking permits would be the best option for this area. He felt that leaving the current one-hour restriction that was in place was not an option. The Seafront and Engineering Manager informed the Member that the Swale Parking Manager would not recommend implementing Parking Permits in this area as it would set a precedent in the Borough.

Kent County Councillor Mike Baldock proposed that the current one-hour parking restriction remained as he could not see an improvement for the residents if this restriction was lifted. This was seconded by Kent County Councillor Cameron Beart.

***Recommended:***

- (1) That the results of the recent informal consultation be noted and the existing one-hour parking restriction between 10am and 11am in Grovehurst Road be left in place.***

**90 PROPOSED PARKING AMENDMENTS - THE STREET, OARE**

The Swale Engineer introduced the report which provided details of a recent informal consultation undertaken on proposals to install parking restrictions and a bus stop clearway at The Street, Oare, following a request from a local resident.

Kent County Councillor Cameron Beart proposed that the proposed restrictions and bus stop clearway be abandoned and this was seconded by the Chairman.

***Recommended:***

- (1) That the contents of the report to noted and the proposed restrictions and bus stop clearway in the Street, Oare be abandoned due to The low response rate and objections received.***

**91 FORMAL OBJECTIONS TO TRAFFIC REGULATIONS ORDER - SWALE AMENDMENT 23 2021**

The Swale Engineer introduced the report which provided details of objections and comments received in relation to the recently advertised TRO, Swale Amendment 23, which covered various amendments to on-street waiting restrictions and parking in Abbey Street and Abbey Place, Faversham.

The Chairman proposed the recommendation and this was seconded by Kent County Councillor Antony Hook.

***Recommended:***

- (1) That the formal objections and comments received to the advertised Traffic Regulation Order be noted and the proposed parking amendments and waiting restrictions in Abbey Street/Abbey Place, Faversham be installed as per the Traffic Regulation Order Amendment 23 2021.***

**Recommendations for Kent County Council Cabinet**

**92 REQUESTS MADE BY COUNCILLORS AND MEMBERS OF JTB**

The Chairman introduced the item and explained that items sent to the Democratic Services Officer had been referred to the appropriate Kent County Council (KCC) officer or Swale Borough Council (SBC) officer.

He had requested that clearer guidance be circulated to all Members for future JTBs to ensure they knew what processes to follow in raising issues with officers and bringing items to the JTB.

The Swale District Manager informed Members that if the appropriate KCC officer had not contacted them yet, the relevant KCC officer would do over the next couple of weeks. He also wanted to let Members know that the policy for new salt bin sites had changed two years ago and that requests for new bin locations had since been funded from the Member Highway Grant. He said that the policy for this winter would be drafted later this summer and would be shared at a JTB meeting before the winter service season 2021/22 began.

***Resolved:***

- (1) That the requested items be noted.***
- (2) That guidance be created for Members before next the JTB meeting in September 2021.***

### **93 HIGHWAYS WORK PROGRAMME**

The Swale District Manager introduced the report which provided an update on identified schemes approved for construction.

***Resolved:***

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

### **94 PROGRESS UPDATE REPORT**

Page 199

235/09/13 – The KCC officer informed the JTB that construction had just finished phase 1 of the project and would be starting phase 2 shortly.

Page 200

442/01/20 – A Member requested an update.

Page 203

308/12/20 – A Member requested clarity on how the consultation process worked.

***Resolved:***

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

### **95 DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting of the Swale JTB would be at 5.30 pm on Monday 6 September 2021.

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