

Canterbury City Council

Joint Transportation Board

Minutes of a meeting held on Tuesday 19 March 2024 at 7 pm The Guildhall

Present:

Councillor Alex Ricketts (Chair), Mr Dan Watkins (KCC - Vice-Chair), Mr Neil Baker - KCC, Councillor Mike Bland, Councillor Dane Buckman, Councilor Keith Bothwell, Mr Alister Brady - KCC, Mr Mark Dance - KCC, Ms Mel Dawkins - KCC, Councillor Joe Howes (present as substitute), Councillor Keji Moses, Councillor Naomi Smith, Mr Mike Sole - KCC, Councillor David Thomas and Mr Robert Thomas - KCC.

In attendance:

Mr Alan Atkinson (Parish Council representative)

Officers:

Ruth Goudie - Transportation Team Leader

Richard Jenkins - Senior Transportation Officer

Pippa Tritton - Democratic Services Officer

Jamie Watson - Senior Programme Manager Active Travel (KCC)

JTB 15. Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor J Stockley and Mr Marsh.

JTB 16. Substitute members

Councillor Howes was present as a substitute for Councillor J Stockley.

JTB 17. Declarations of interest by Members or Officers

Mr Baker advised that he was the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport at Kent County Council (KCC) and as such would only comment on any recommendations the Board made and not participate in any vote as he was effectively the decision maker.

Councillor Brady had a disclosable pecuniary interest regarding Annual Parking Review item 650, Roper Road, Canterbury.

JTB 18. Public participation

The Chair advised that there were seven public speakers who would be heard directly before the relevant items.

JTB 19. Minutes of the meeting held on 30 January 2024

The minutes of the meeting held on 30 January 2024 were agreed by general assent as a true record, subject to the addition of Mr Brady in the list of attendees.

JTB 20. Petition - Road Layout Herne Bay New Plaza

(Members of the public, SallyAnn Baxter, Martin Head, Mike Hyland, Joe Marshall, Mr Hutton and Roland Barber spoke prior to the discussion on this item.)

The Senior Programme Manager KCC introduced the report of the Head of Transportation (KCC) and Head of Transportation and Environment (Canterbury City Council) (CCC) which summarised the scheme construction to date and the current situation with regards to ongoing feedback, review and monitoring/evaluation and included a petition received by KCC on the “Road Layout Herne Bay New Plaza”.

He advised that a Working Group had been set up at the request of the KCC Cabinet Member for Highways and Transportation to look into the issues previously raised. The membership and terms of reference for the Working Group would be published on KCC’s website shortly, with results due to be presented to Mr Baker in mid April. Minutes of any meetings held would also be available on the website.

Councillors discussed the report and clarification was provided by the Senior Programme Manager where necessary. Comments included:

- KCC should be commended for getting the Working Group together so quickly.
- The Working Group had the ability to report directly to the Cabinet Member but it was hoped that it would report back to JTB with its findings in the future.
- The Active Travel plan had intended to create something unique for Herne Bay and any findings would need to be considered as part of the Road Safety Audit currently taking place.
- Comments made at this meeting would be considered alongside the recommendations made by the Working Group.
- Residents were positive about some parts of the scheme.
- There were concerns regarding the safety of the Richmond Street cycle path.
- The number of cars parking illegally on the High Street caused difficulties.
- Speeding generally was an issue.
- Western Avenue was particularly dangerous due to the bend in the road and increased usage by large vehicles.
- A councillor had been spoken to by residents in support of the plaza and would like to see how it was used in summer.
- There was concern that other schemes such as the Wincheap gyratory could also go wrong.
- There would be much more traffic in the summer.
- It was not yet clear if money would need to be paid back to Active Travel by KCC if the scheme was amended or scrapped.
- Lessons would be learnt and future consultation would be stronger.
- Councillors still wished to keep the principles of the scheme alive, and by encouraging more people to walk, scoot and cycle, there would be less traffic

- on the road.
- The speakers were thanked for attending the meeting and for highlighting the issues.
 - The police were responsible for enforcement, not KCC. With regards to the 20 miles per hour zones, it was the established policy of Kent police to only support it if it was self enforcing.
 - It was acknowledged that some entry points needed to be reconsidered.
 - It was important for the council to show that it can listen and take action when needed.
 - Any decision made regarding the scheme would be reported back to a future meeting.

The report was NOTED.

There was a short adjournment to allow members of the public to leave the Council Chamber.

JTB21. Change of order of the agenda

The committee agreed unanimously to take Agenda Item 9, Active Travel Plan as the next item on the agenda.

JTB22. Active Travel Update

The Chair advised that the Active Travel Plan had been covered during the previous item.

In response to a question the Senior Programme Manager advised that an external consultant had been instructed to undertake a road safety audit for Longport and it was hoped that this would be received imminently.

The item was NOTED.

JTB23. Draft Transport Strategy

The Transportation Team Leader introduced the report which set out the draft Canterbury District Transport Strategy, which had recently gone live for consultation alongside the draft Local Plan. This set out a number of sustainable transportation schemes to cater for the additional travel demands of the planned growth in the draft Local Plan.

Councillors debated the draft Transport Strategy and the Transportation Team Leader provided clarification where needed. Points raised included:

- There was concern about the equality impact statement as it appeared to be geared towards bus transportation in the city centre, not in rural areas, where there were little or no bus services even in 2040.
- The impact of increased parking charges would impact those living rurally with no/limited bus services.
- It was acknowledged that the current situation was not adequate but that the

Strategy was a first step and included lots of elements designed to improve accessibility for those in rural areas, including park and ride.

- The strategy was not anti-car, but did encourage alternative forms of transport.
- Some of the ideas seemed unrealistic and could cause gridlock in the city centre if introduced, such as halving capacity on the ring road.
- The bus industry had been heavily hit by Covid.
- Would KCC transport modelling be presented to the JTB?
- In an ideal world the modelling would already have been undertaken, but the Strategy had changed and it was hoped that the modelling would be ready for the next stage.
- Bus Service Improvement Plan (BSIP) money was only guaranteed until 2025.
- All costings were set out in a supplementary document to the Local Plan and nothing relied on BSIP money. However, CCC would like to tap into that funding if it was available.
- Would all the new bus services be run by Stagecoach or would CCC commission any?
- Any major changes, such as to the ring road, would take place gradually.
- It was hoped to have some continuous monitoring of traffic.
- The Bus Strategy proposed there should be a Steering Group. The Local Bus Focus Group had replaced the Quality Bus Partnership. KCC officers and councillors also sat on that group.
- Bus operators had not yet been considered but it would seem sensible if it was an extension to an existing route to use Stagecoach. If it was a completely new route, it would be put out to tender.
- If possible, JTB would see the modelling when ready.
- Human resources did not seem to have been considered as an increased number of buses and drivers would be needed. Stagecoach often cancelled services currently due to lack of available drivers.
- Herne Bay bus depot car park was often empty after 1900 hours which indicated a lack of drivers.
- Drivers of certain smaller sized vehicles would not need a Public Service Vehicle licence which was a concern.
- It was important to have an aspirational Strategy in place.
- The solution to easing congestion was not by building new roads, but by changing habits and this should be acknowledged.
- It was noted that CCC relied heavily on income from car parking charges within the city centre.
- The use of Park and Rides as delivery hubs was interesting and should be considered carefully, including the use of drones for the final mile of the journey.
- It was not reasonable for developers to fund everything that the council should be doing anyway.

Councillors were reminded that the consultation was now live and that they should respond to it.

The report was NOTED.

JTB24. Annual Parking Review

[Regarding Item 650 Roper Road, Canterbury, Councillor Brady abstained from voting as he had a disclosable pecuniary interest (DPI).]

[Mr Neil Baker abstained from general assent and voting on all items due to his role as Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport at Kent County Council.]

(Mr Hammond spoke in relation to 4900 Ridgeway Cliff prior to the discussion.)

The Chair introduced the report which detailed proposals in the Annual Parking Review for changes to parking restrictions and drew attention to the recommendations of the officers. Board members made comments and the officers gave points of clarification where necessary.

During the course of the meeting, those proposals that were debated were put, seconded and then voted upon. All the rest of the proposals, where no debate was needed as all members were in agreement with the officer's recommendation and there were no public speakers registered, were AGREED by general assent.

RECOMMENDED (to the KCC Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport):

a. To action the following proposals as indicated below:

| Parking proposal | Action | Gen assent or vote | Voting record | | |
|---------------------|-----------|--------------------------|---|---------|------------------------|
| | | | For | Against | Abstain |
| Canterbury | | | | | |
| 650 Roper Road Area | No action | Vote | 13 (Bland, Bothwell, Buckman, Dance, Dawkins, Howes, Moses, Ricketts, N Smith, Sole, D Thomas, R Thomas, Watkins) | | 2 (Baker, Brady) |
| 660 Roper Road Area | Implement | Vote | 10 (Bland, Bothwell, | 0 | 5 (Baker, Brady, |

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------|------|--|---|-------------------------------------|
| | | | Dance, Howes, Ricketts, N Smith, Sole, D Thomas, R Thomas, Watkins) | | Buckman, Dawkins, Moses) |
| Herne Bay | | | | | |
| 4900 Ridgeway Cliff | No action | Vote | 12 (Bland, Bothwell, Brady, Buckman, Dance, Dawkins, Howes, Moses, Ricketts, N Smith, Sole, R Thomas) | 1 (D Thomas) | 2 (Baker, Watkins) |
| 3160 Peartree Road | Implement | Vote | 12 (Bland, Bothwell, Brady, Buckman, Dance, Howes, Moses, N Smith, Sole, D Thomas, R Thomas, Watksn) | 1 (Dawkins) | 2 (Baker, Ricketts) |
| 3300 Reculver Road parking bay | Implement | Vote | 7 (Bothwell, Dance, Howes, Sole, D Thomas, R Thomas, Watkins) | 5 (Bland, Buckman, Dawkins, Moses, Smith) | 3 (Baker, Brady, Ricketts) |
| 4580 Dolphin Street | Amend & implement | Vote | 14 (Bland, Bothwell, Brady, | 0 | 1 (Baker) |

| | | | | | |
|---|-----------|-------|---|--|---------------------------|
| | | | Buckman, Dance, Dawkins, Howes, Moses, Ricketts, N Smith, Sole, D Thomas, R Thomas. Watkins) | | |
| Whitstable | | | | | |
| 6400 Borstal Hill | Implement | Vote* | 5 (Dance, Howes, D Thomas, R Thomas, Watkins) | 8 (Bland, Brady, Buckman, Dawkins, Moses, Ricketts, N Smith, Sole) | 2 (Baker, Bothwell) |
| *This vote fell and was then dealt with as one of the remaining proposals by general assent - No action | | | | | |

(b) That the rest of the officers' recommendations on the remaining proposals (not dealt with at (a) above) be accepted.

Reasons for the recommendations: The balance of the representations from supporters and objectors, the officers' comments and councillors' understanding of the local issues.

JTB25. Highway Works Programme

The Chair advised that there was an update report in the agenda. No comments were made and report was NOTED.

JTB26. Monitoring of Previous Decisions

The report was NOTED.

JTB27. Date of the next meeting

7 pm, Tuesday 18 June 2024 (subject to confirmation at the annual Council).

JTB28. Any other urgent business to be dealt with in public

There was no business under this item.

JTB29. Exclusion of the press and public

JTB30. Any other urgent business which falls under the exempt provisions of the Local Government Act 1972 or the Freedom of Information Act 2000 or both

There was no business under this item.

Meeting ended: 21:50