

---

## SWALE JOINT TRANSPORTATION BOARD

---

**MINUTES** of the Virtual Meeting held via Microsoft Teams on Monday, 28 February 2022 from 5.30 pm - 8.00 pm.

**PRESENT:** Councillors Simon Clark, Alastair Gould, Elliott Jayes, Hannah Perkin (Substitute for Councillor Eddie Thomas) and Julian Saunders (Chairman).

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

**Kent Association of Local Councils:** Parish Councillors John Fassenfelt (Parish Councillor), MacDonald (Parish Councillor) and Jeff Tutt (Parish Councillor).

**OFFICERS PRESENT:** Billy Attaway, Alan Blackburn, Colin Finch, Jay Jenkins, Kellie MacKenzie and Aaron Wilkinson.

**ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:** Councillors Steve Davey, Tim Gibson, James Hunt, Carole Jackson, Richard Palmer, Roger Truelove, Mike Whiting and Tony Winckless.

**APOLOGIES:** Councillors Monique Bonney, Andy Booth, Paul Stephen and Eddie Thomas.

### 630 MINUTES

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 6 December 2021 (Minute Nos. 459 – 472) were taken as read, approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record subject to the following amendment:

Minute No. 465 (Faversham Town Wide 20mph Trial) to read “Councillor Eddie Thomas proposed to retain the full extent of the 20mph limit as per the trial”. The resolution to read “**Resolved: That the full extent of the 20mph limit as per the trial be retained.**”

### 631 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Julian Saunders declared a Disclosable Non-Pecuniary Interest in respect of Item 6, Faversham Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) and left the meeting for this item.

Councillor Alastair Gould declared a Disclosable Non-Pecuniary Interest in respect of Item 6, Faversham Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) and left the meeting for this item.

### 632 PUBLIC SESSION

The Chairman informed the Committee that there was one member of the public who wished to speak on Item 6 Faversham Local Cycling and Walking

Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) and they would be given the opportunity to speak later in the meeting when the item was being considered.

Councillor Tony Winckless, Ward Member for Milton Regis, presented a petition on behalf of residents of Crown Road, Milton Regis asking that Crown Road be made one-way. The petition contained almost 200 signatures. Councillor Winckless explained that motorists were being restricted by the chicaning in Crown Road leading to arguments between drivers about who had the right of way and this caused distress to local residents. Councillor Winckless said that local residents requested that the road be made one-way to allow traffic travelling from Chalkwell Road towards Milton High Street as this was the quickest route for emergency vehicles. The residents of Beechwood Avenue, Milton Regis would still have access options. Councillor Winckless asked that Kent County Council (KCC) carried out a traffic count on the road and that the scheme be progressed further.

Councillor Steve Davey, Ward Member for Milton Regis spoke in support of the petition. He said that if the road was made one-way it would allow for more chicanes and more parking for local residents and was a sensible option. He understood that bus companies would need to be consulted on the scheme to allow buses to pass the chicanes but stated that it was a long-standing bottleneck and also contributed to poor air quality for local residents.

KCC Councillor Mike Dendor, also the KCC member for the area, spoke in support of the petition and said that he would do his best to ensure the studies were carried out properly. He understood that previously the bus companies had objected to the road being one-way. However, there was another route that could be explored but acknowledged it would involve additional work.

The Swale District Manager said that he would pass the petition to KCC's Schemes Delivery Team who would contact the relevant Councillors in due course.

### **633 CHANGE TO THE ORDER OF BUSINESS**

The Chairman agreed to a change to the order of business as minuted.

### **Part A Minute for Recommendation to Swale Borough Council's Cabinet**

### **634 FAVERSHAM RESIDENTS' PARKING SCHEME - PERMIT ELIGIBILITY**

The Seafront and Engineering Manager introduced the report which provided details of the current administration of the Faversham Residents' Parking Scheme and the issuing of permits to residents located within the town centre. He explained that the Council's Parking Manager had requested that the item be considered by the Swale Joint Transportation Board (JTB) as the current Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) for the Faversham Residents' Parking Scheme did not reflect the historic policies for the issuing of permits within the semi-pedestrianised area of Faversham High Street, and agreement was sought for the TRO to be amended to match those policies.

In response to queries from the Chairman, the Seafront and Engineering Manager clarified that Option 1 would require a formal consultation and if objections were

raised to the scheme, then it would come back to the Swale JTB for consideration, but Option 2 did not require a formal consultation and would not therefore be required to come back to the JTB. The Seafront and Engineering Manager explained that the Parking Manager did not anticipate that a significant number of permit holders would be affected.

KCC Councillor Anthony Hook thanked the officers for the clear report. He said that his preference was for Option 2 because it was the cheaper option with no legal costs and no consultation, and it would give the residents affected more freedom to buy a permit.

In response to a question, the Seafront and Engineering Manager confirmed that paragraph 3.8 referred to Option 2.

Councillor Hannah Perkin spoke in support of Option 2.

The Chairman, who was Ward Member for the adjoining Ward, spoke in support of Option 1. He was concerned about displacement of vehicles into Zone B which fell into his Ward if Option 2 was approved.

The Chairman proposed the following motion: That Option 1, Amend TRO, be approved and progressed. This was seconded by Councillor Alastair Gould. On being put to the vote the motion was lost.

The Chairman proposed the following motion: That Option 2, Administer Permits as Detailed in the Current TRO, be approved and progressed. This was seconded by Councillor Hannah Perkin. On being put to the vote the motion was agreed.

***Recommended:***

***(1) That Option 2, Administer Permits as Detailed in the Current TRO be approved and progressed.***

**Part B Minute for Information**

**635 UPDATE ON M2 JUNCTION 5 IMPROVEMENTS - PRESENTATION FROM NATIONAL HIGHWAYS**

The Chairman welcomed Daniel Rollinson (National Highways (NH) Project Manager) and Stevie Collins (Graham Project Manager) to the meeting.

The NH Project Manager and Grahams Project Manager gave a presentation on the M2 Junction 5 Improvements, which centred around the following themes: Current Project Progress; Construction updates; consultation with Parishes; and lookahead.

The Chairman invited KCC Councillor John Wright to speak. Councillor Wright raised points which included:

- The project did not deal with several issues affecting residents of Stockbury such as: loss of bus stop and bus service along the A249; and pedestrians, cyclists and horses not being able to cross the A249;
- Newington Parish Council and Hartlip Parish Council had not been approached by NH despite this being agreed following the public consultation. Both villages were subject to being used as “rat-runs” during construction of the improvements to Junction 5; and
- why was the project ignoring services to Stockbury?;

In response the NH Project Manager said that once the design works were completed bus routes would be reinstated along the Oad Street, Borden link road and NH were in discussions with Arriva and KCC about this. NH were exploring opportunities and funding for a pedestrian crossing over the A249 at Stockbury and improvements to the right of way. The NH Project Manager said that NH were happy to speak to any parish councils and stated that their list of stakeholders was constantly being updated. The NH Project Manager recognised the long-standing issue of rat-runs around the local country lanes and said that it was hoped that the scheme would address this. He said it was inevitable that there would be an impact during construction, but NH were doing everything they could to mitigate the impact on the wider area.

The Chairman invited Members to make comments. These included:

- Communication of the project needed to be improved particularly in respect of any planned road closures. This was an issue and it had an adverse impact on local businesses;
- it was not just Borden and Stockbury parishes that were impacted by the project and other parishes should be consulted;
- would the proposed flyover target all the current planned housing developments or would it cater for any other developments that came forward?;
- congratulated NH on their communication with Borden Parish Council;
- was there an update on when the works to widen the Oad Street/Maidstone Road link would commence?
- could NH influence Kent Police and KCC to reduce speeding traffic along Maidstone Road?;
- that there was a slip road planned from the M2 onto the A249 as there was a sub-standard bend when travelling eastwards down the M2 and then northwards along the A249?;
- a considerable number of commercial vehicles used the road and thought that there was a slip road north from the A249 to Sittingbourne and the Isle of Sheppey but this appeared to have been dropped?;
- would welcome communication with parishes on the Isle of Sheppey;
- disappointed that the mobile communication van had not visited the Isle of Sheppey; and
- suggested that the relevant NH and Grahams contact details be forwarded to Members.

The NH Project Manager explained that they had a list of key stakeholders that were notified of any road closures which included: emergency services; Stockbury

Parish Council; Borden Parish Council; and Elmley nature reserve and asked Members to contact them about anyone else that should be added to the list. The NH Project Manager advised the scheme was modelled on existing developments but was futureproofed for 30 or 50 years and the expected growth of the area and explained that new developments were required to model their impact on the scheme.

The NH Project Manager confirmed that there was a section of Oad Street, Borden that was not the correct width for use as a strategic diversion. He advised that NH were liaising with KCC but as private landowners were involved he was unable to provide timescales for commencement of any work to resolve this. The NH Project Manager said that speeding traffic on Maidstone Road was a long-standing issue and whilst NH were not an enforcement agency they would continue to liaise with Kent Police and KCC and provide whatever speed restriction methods they could. He thanked Members for the positive feedback about their dedicated stakeholder manager. The NH Project Manager said that NH would be happy to hold a consultation and engagement event on the Isle of Sheppey.

The Grahams Project Manager confirmed that there was a dedicated left turn and dedicated slip road for eastbound traffic from the M2 to merge onto northbound traffic.

The Chairman thanked the NH Project Manager and Grahams Project Manager for attending the meeting.

**Post Meeting Note:**

Please email [m2j5@nationalhighways.co.uk](mailto:m2j5@nationalhighways.co.uk) to be added to the stakeholder list.

***Resolved: That the presentation be noted.***

**Part A Minute for Recommendation to Kent County Council's Cabinet and Swale Borough Council's Cabinet**

**636 FAVERSHAM LOCAL CYCLING AND WALKING INFRASTRUCTURE PLAN (LCWIP)**

The Vice-Chairman in-the-Chair welcomed the Planner and Adrian Berendt to the meeting.

The Planner introduced the report which outlined the contents of the Faversham Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) and set out how it would be used by SBC and KCC in their decision making.

Adrian Berendt, one of the consultants involved in the Faversham LCWIP gave a presentation on the key elements of the document. He stated that SBC, KCC and Faversham Town Council had been working closely on the project and had followed the Department for Transport's recommended process for developing a LCWIP: scoping the project; gathering information; network planning for cycling; network planning for walking; prioritising improvements; and integration and application and detailed each stage for Members.

The Vice-Chairman in-the-Chair invited Christopher Wright to speak on the item.

Mr Wright said that as a resident of Faversham he walked and cycled every day in the town and said the town was cut into pieces by railway lines and by the A2 and M2 and this affected the way people could move around. He welcomed the Faversham LCWIP which he considered would help people to move around the town more easily and in ways more friendly to the environment. Mr Wright said that as a traffic researcher he was conscious of the need to reduce vehicle mileage by a considerable margin to: accommodate the population growth; deliver the carbon reductions needed to combat climate change; and to prepare for driverless cars which could have the effect of increased demand for road travel by a margin that no one can yet foresee. The Faversham LCWIP was an important first step in raising public awareness for the need for change and influencing the way we got about. He added that it would be a star feature at the forthcoming visit in April 2022 of Chartered Institute of Highways and Transportation delegates.

The Vice-Chairman in-the-Chair opened the debate to Members and comments made included:

- The plan area seemed to cover parts of neighbouring parishes;
- some of the maps were difficult to read;
- some figures in tables did not match what was in the text;
- improvements at Brenley Corner to make it safer to cycle and walk had not been successful; and
- the current KCC review of buses needed to be referenced.

In response Mr Berendt said that this was solely about the Faversham town Council border but did include part of Oare. In response to a concern from Parish Councillor Jeff Tutt, the Planner agreed to confirm how much of the project area was in the parishes of Boughton and Selling and check for any other errors within the document.

***Recommended:***

- (1) That the contents of the document be noted.***
- (2) That the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) be used as evidence base in SBC and KCC decisions, especially in KCC Highways Strategies and Plans, KCC and SBC planning applications and their associated Section 106s and to inform the SBC Local Plan Review.***
- (3) That the LCWIP be used by both SBC and KCC to assist in applying for funding for active/sustainable travel initiatives.***

**Part A Minute for recommendation to Kent County Council's Cabinet**

**637 THE CRESCENT, HALFWAY - TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER**

On behalf of the developer, the Principal Transport & Development Planner introduced the report which responded to the TRO objections raised against the proposed signal junction and carriageway improvements at the junction where Halfway Road, Minster Road, The Crescent and Queenborough Road met. The improvements were proposed to improve capacity at the junction as a result of the

new residential development at Belgrave Road, Halfway and in accordance with works requested as part of the planning conditions for that development.

Parish Councillor Peter MacDonald was invited to speak. He considered the person who had carried out the study had no knowledge of the difficulties of driving in a northerly direction along Holmside and Southdown Road and that the traffic queuing was not just during peak hours. Parish Councillor MacDonald said that investment should have been put into improving the blind corner near the junction of Belgrave Road and the A250 for vehicles travelling from Halfway towards Queenborough as it was difficult to see traffic exiting the junction of Belgrave Road. He said the whole scheme was a “nonsense” and needed to be looked at again as there were strong objections from local residents.

KCC Councillor Cameron Beart was invited to speak. He said that he was not against the scheme but sceptical. He asked how many extra movements of vehicle would the change generate? KCC Councillor Beart said it would have been helpful if consultation responses were included within the report and asked whether the officer had responded to any of the comments raised and recognised and accepted that some of the responses were based on assumptions. KCC Councillor Beart said that the rat-run issue needed to be resolved and was concerned that the scheme could potentially make it worse. He stated that it was not a parished area despite the report claiming that the Parish Council supported it. He confirmed that the site was in the village of Halfway despite the report stating that it was in Minster and documents on deposit stated that it was in Queenborough.

The Chairman opened the debate up to Members, and points raised included:

- Angry that the developer had claimed the Parish Council supported when it was an unparished area; and
- there was overwhelming public opposition.

The Principal Transport & Development Manager stated that KCC’s Traffic Signal Team had indicated that approximately 300 additional vehicles would be going through that junction per hour because there would be a time saving on the cycle and a significant time saving from when the lights changed from red to green. The scheme had been requested by KCC and SBC via Planning Committee for the Belgrave Road application. Through an appeal SBC had employed their own transport consultant to review the performance of the network and they had concluded that the junction improvement was required to mitigate the effects of the new development. The Principal Transport & Development Manager advised that there was currently an incentive to use the traffic lights at The Crescent as a rat-run and it was hoped that by removing that incentive it would dissuade people from doing that.

KCC Councillor Mike Baldock moved the following motion: That the TRO be rejected following the public consultation which showed that local residents were demonstrably opposed to the scheme. This was seconded by Parish Councillor Peter MacDonald.

There was some discussion about amending the motion and a request that the developer provide a better solution. The Principal Transport & Development

Manager explained that the mitigation had been proposed and accepted by SBC's Planning Committee, therefore it could not be changed. He added that the JTB could reject the TRO but if they did the proposed mitigation for this junction would not happen.

The following points were made:

- Concerned that with the housing developments there would be extra traffic and if the TRO was rejected things would only get worse for residents;
- if the TRO was rejected could the developers appeal?;
- was the Belgrave Road application approved on appeal?;
- Belgrave Road application had not gone to appeal; and
- considered the junction was already over-capacity so had to support the TRO.

On being put to the vote the motion to reject the TRO was agreed.

***Recommended:***

***(1) That the TRO be rejected following the public consultation which showed that local residents were demonstrably opposed to the scheme.***

**Part B Minutes for Information**

**638 HIGHWAYS WORK PROGRAMME**

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

The following comments were raised:

- Page 117 – Machine Resurfacing for High Street, Sittingbourne the extent of works should refer to “Park **Road** to Central Avenue”, not Park Avenue and also “High Street to **West Street**”;
- Page 136 – SW/003453 Chestnut Street, Sittingbourne – “Technical Vetting underway”. Borden Parish Council were very concerned about the roundabout and in particular the fourth arm and slip road and had discussed with KCC Highways in October 2021. KCC Highways had promised that when a technical note was agreed by NH the Parish Council would be given a copy. Was there any update and could assurances be made that Borden Parish Council would have a copy of the technical note? ;
- Page 117 – Boughton Hill was in Dunkirk not Boughton-under-Blean;
- welcomed the works in Whitstable Road and Tanner Street, Faversham to reduce flood risk;
- Page 137 – any further discussion on what the works to Lady Dane Footbridge, Faversham would look like?; and
- Page 119 – B2231 Sheppey Way. Who was responsible for work to the bridge as it was in a “shocking” state?.

The Swale District Manager noted the typographical errors in the report as outlined by Members. With regard to SW/003453 Chestnut Street, Sittingbourne he advised that the Development Officer would contact the Member about this. The Swale District Manager advised that Network Rail were responsible for the bridge and KCC Highways and Transportation were actively working to resolve some technical issues with Network Rail so that it could be resurfaced.

**Resolved:** *That the report be noted.*

**639 PROGRESS UPDATE REPORT**

The Chairman introduced the paper and invited Members to make comments.

There were no comments.

**Resolved:** *That the report be noted.*

**640 REQUESTS MADE BY COUNCILLORS AND MEMBERS OF THE SWALE JOINT TRANSPORTATION BOARD**

The Chairman introduced the paper and invited Members to make comments.

A Member raised concern that the Transport Strategy had not been included on the agenda.

The Chairman explained that he had refused this as an item. He drew attention to paragraph 5.2 of the JTB Terms of Reference (ToR) where it stated that the board should *“Be a forum for consultation between KCC and the district council on policies, plans and strategies related to highways, road traffic and public transport”*. The Chairman stated that following advice his view was that the transport modelling evidence was neither a policy, a plan or a strategy, and because it had been developed in partnership with KCC there was no need for consultation with them on it.

The Chairman stated that the ToR of the JTB also stated at paragraph 5.5 that the JTB will *“Receive reports on highways and transportation needs within the district”* but the report in question was an evidence base for the Local Plan not a report on transport needs.

**641 DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting of the Swale JTB would be at 5.30 pm on Monday 20 June 2022 (subject to confirmation).

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