

WEST MALLING PARISH COUNCIL

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE HIGHWAYS, TRANSPORTATION & STREETLIGHTING COMMITTEE HELD ON 21 MARCH 2016, 7.30PM AT 9 HIGH STREET, WEST MALLING

Present: **Mr K Bullard (Chairman)**
 Ms H Marlor
 Mr R Selkirk

Minute		Action by	Action taken	Response
16/ 165	<u>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</u> were received from Mrs Dean and Mr Galloway and from co-opted member Borough Cllr Mrs Luck			
16/ 166	<u>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</u> – None other than those routinely declared			
16/ 167	<u>MINUTES</u> of the meeting held on 25 January 2016 were approved and signed			
16/	<u>MATTERS ARISING</u> from the minutes not otherwise on the agenda			
168.1	<p><u>(16/59.3) Entrance to Ryarsh Lane car park</u> – the Clerk reported that the following response had been received from KCC (Mr Paul Brand): “I write in response to your email below to Michael Heath and offer the following comments.</p> <p>In general, there are two things to consider – firstly, what is feasible and secondly, how is any works going to be funded.</p> <p>Looking first at the issue of visibility, I can understand what the concerns are but there are few options to improve this. Given the junctions of King Street and the car park exit and the junction with High Street itself and the space needed for turning vehicles, I cannot see that there is any space to build out any of the footways (without these being continually overrun by vehicles). The only suggestion that I can make is to create some sort of build-out – either a physical restriction with kerbing or a ‘virtual’ restriction with carriageway markings to TSRGD diagram 1040.4 (see attached sketch) – at the exit of the car park. The aim being to encourage drivers to move out away from the substation boundary. This would need to be short enough though so that drivers moved back across so that their vehicle is not straddling the centreline when they reach the junction.</p> <p>As regards improving the crossing point for pedestrians, we could possibly take up some of the small block paving and install tactile slabs, which would be aligned to guide pedestrians across. However, I have concerns about whether the footway southwards (past the village sign and statue) and northwards (past 38 Town Hill) of this point is ideal, notably in terms of width. Looking at this strategically, it may be better to look at crossing pedestrians further north and</p>			

	<p>making use of the wider footway on the east side of Town Hill. For pedestrians coming from Ryarsh Lane car park, they will already be walking in the carriageway, albeit where other traffic is travelling at low speed, and the better route may be to continue south along King Street rather than taking the higher level path.</p> <p>Any scheme of this type would not be suitable for funding from our casualty reduction schemes budget, given there are no personal injury crashes at this location. Similarly, I will not be able to justify time for a site visit. I am also not sure that there is evidence to justify progressing this as a DDA scheme, given that there is not a suitable footway north and south of this point either.</p> <p>I hope that this helps. “</p>			
	The Clerk was to forward this to Mr Galloway as he had raised the initial query.	Clerk	✓	
16/	<u>STREETLIGHTING</u>			
169.1	<p>Emergency Work Mr Bullard reported that Mr Ken Bonner of “Streetlights” was carrying out any emergency work. Two columns deemed by KCC to be dangerous had been necked; Mr Bullard had asked KCC to save the lanterns. One of the columns was on the Village Green opposite the Parish office and the other was in Swan Street.</p> <p>These would need to be replaced; Mr Selkirk also suggested that the column at the High Street entrance to the church and Mr Bullard suggested that the one on St Leonards Street also be replaced.</p>			
169.2	<p>Tenders Mr Bullard reported that on 7 March 2016 he had obtained a tender from Mr Bonner. Mrs Dean had obtained one from KCC. Mr Bullard had drawn up an inventory with the intention of obtaining a quote before the next meeting of this committee.</p>	KB		
169.3	<p>Meeting with Mr David Player of Marwood Electricals Mr Bullard reported that he, Ms Marlor and the Clerk had visited Mr David Player on 21 January 2016. Mr Bullard’s report is appended to these minutes (Appendix 1)</p>			
16/	<u>PARKING CHARGES</u>			
170.1	<p>Mr Bullard reported that WMPC had consistently challenged T&MBC regarding their proposed introduction of charges in the T&MBC car parks. Mr Selkirk had set up an online petition opposing the introduction of parking charges in the car parks; this had attracted about 5,000 signatures. The legal challenge had been refuted by T&MBC. Mr Selkirk agreed to contact Ms Victoria Clothier (KCC Senior Solicitor) who had agreed to represent WMPC .</p> <p>At the time of this meeting WMPC had not seen any legal advice obtained by the Chamber of Commerce.</p>	RS		
	<p>The Leader of T&MBC (Cllr Heslop) had today (21 March 2016) notified WMPC that it would not be possible for a representative of WMPC to address the Cabinet meeting the following day.</p> <p>It was agreed that Mr Selkirk respond to Cllr Heslop and express the disappointment of WMPC’s members, bearing in mind that this was an exceptional circumstance. Members understood the financial background but as the timescale involved had been so short, members would ask that six months be allowed so that T&MBC and WMPC could work together to identify a financial solution.</p>	RS		

	Mr Selkirk was to write to Borough Cllr Brian Luker asking him to read out a pre-prepared statement <u>on behalf of WMPC</u> , whilst <u>NOT</u> asking him to agree with the contents thereof.	RS		
	Mr Selkirk agreed to send to WMPC members the draft of both items to be sent out tomorrow. It was agreed that Mr Selkirk would provide Cllr Luker with a hard copy of the statement shortly before the T&MBC meeting.	RS		
	Ms Marlor commented that there must be a spokesman for the Chamber of Commerce.			
	Mr Selkirk would send to the Clerk individual letters to be sent to the five Cabinet members on behalf of WMPC .	RS/ Clerk	✓	
16/	<u>SPEEDWATCH</u>			
171.1	Sites Mr Bullard reported that Speedwatch sites had been approved: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Four on St Leonards Street • Two on Town Hill • Two on Swan Street 			
171.2	Volunteers Mr Bullard reported that more volunteers were needed. Mr Selkirk agreed to volunteer and to publicise on social media the need for volunteers. Ms Marlor to publicise in Downsmail.	RS HM	✓	
171.3	Equipment The equipment was shared with East Malling & Larkfield PC. It was necessary to negotiate with them about times for use. Mr Bullard explained that the equipment does record speeds accurately and so when data are downloaded can give a very accurate picture of the situation.			
16/ 172	<u>ST LEONARDS STREET</u> Mr Bullard and Mrs Dean had viewed the site with Kent Highways engineers. At the Z-bend the intention was to improve the road markings, road narrowing at Malling Place, signage, hatchings, and location of a SID Speed Indication Display south of Five Bells. Kent Highways mentioned it is possible to utilise a “Movable SID” which would have the benefit of then being relocated around the Parish to monitor other locations on an <i>ad hoc</i> basis. Kent Highways advised that they would re-inspect the bus stop located on the west side of King Hill adjoining the A228 roundabout. WMPC had been previously advised that the bus stop was too close to the roundabout.			
16/ 173	<u>123 BUS ROUTE</u> The following information had been received from KCC (Mr Philip Lightowler): “I can confirm that service 123 is on a list of services to be consulted on in late February, re change to service pattern. This public consultation is due for launch at the end of Feb and affected members will be briefed prior to the consultation launch. In the case of service 123 the proposal is to withdraw the service, on the basis that Liberty have provided section 106 funding to KCC Public Transport for a dedicated bus service linking the Kings Hill development with West Malling Station and then fast direct to Maidstone. Therefore service 123 will be replaced by a new service. The timetable for the new dedicated service, which will be known as X1, is being reviewed as we speak to ensure all journeys presently provided by 123 are covered and the intention is to go to tender on this new service in early March. The vehicles for the service are former Fastrack vehicles, which are presently undergoing a major			

	<p>refurbishment and when introduced into service, will carry a dedicated branding. The section 106 funding is sufficient to enable the new service to establish itself and we would hope, unlike service 123, it becomes commercially sustainable within a three year timeframe.</p> <p>Service 123 will only be withdrawn once service X1 is ready to launch.</p> <p>In addition to the new service X1, the section 106 funding has funded the additional daily return journey to/from Tonbridge from Kings Hill, to provide extra capacity for school travel.</p> <p>I hope the above provides an overview of the situation. "</p>			
	<p>It was noted that the revised route would miss out WM High Street. Comments were invited until May 2016.</p>			
16/174	<p><u>RAIL SERVICES</u></p> <p>Mr Tom Tugendhat MP had been invited to attend the Joint Parish Councils Traffic Consultative Group meeting on 7 April 2016.</p>			
16/175	<p><u>LOWER THAMES CROSSING</u></p> <p>The consultation period ended on 24 March 2016.</p> <p>The Clerk was to liaise with Mr Bullard to produce some comments for submission (see Appendix 2)</p>	KB/ Clerk	✓	
16/176	<p><u>A20 CORRIDOR CONGESTION STATUS</u></p> <p>It was noted that WMPC 's response as formulated by Ms Marlor appeared in the minutes of the previous meeting (minute 16/62 and Appendix 1 of those minutes)</p>			
16/177	<p><u>JUNCTION 4 UPDATE</u></p> <p>Mr Selkirk asked the Clerk to forward to him a copy of the newsletter.</p>	Clerk	✓	
16/178	<p><u>JOINT PARISH COUNCILS TRAFFIC CONSULTATIVE GROUP</u></p> <p>Mr Bullard reported that the agenda had been issued for the next meeting to be held on 7 April 2016; the venue had changed .</p>			
16/179	<p><u>BUDGET STATEMENT</u></p> <p>The statement of Receipts & Payments from 1.4.15 to the date of the meeting had been received.</p>			
16/180	<p><u>QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND COUNCILLORS</u> – None</p> <p>Date of Next Meeting – the next meeting would be held on either Monday 18 April 2016 or Monday 25 April 2016 [subsequently agreed to be the latter]</p>			
	<p>There being no further business, the Chairman thanked members for attending and closed the meeting at 9.05pm</p> <p>Signed.....</p> <p>Date.....</p>			

APPENDIX 1

**FEEDBACK FROM MEETING 21st JANUARY 2016
WITH DAVID PLAYER of MARWOOD ELECTRICAL**

- 1. WMPC & MARWOOD LIGHTING INTRODUCTION.....6
 - 1.1. Marwood’s General Comment.....6
 - 1.2. Marwood Sample Survey6
 - 1.3. David Player Notes on Pricing & Solutions.....6
- 2. TYPE 1- MINI IRIDIUM.....7
 - 2.1. Marwood Recommendation On Type 1 = Leave as is.7
- 3. Type 2- SGS203.....8
 - 3.1. Type 2- Recommendation Replace lantern.8
- 4. Type 3- MBFU Swan neck.....9
 - 4.1. WMPC TType 3 Observations9
 - 4.2. Type 3- Marwood Recommendation Cut Back Replace lantern.9
- 5. TYPE 4- WINDSOR. LANTERN10
 - 5.1. WMPC Type 4 Observations.....10
 - 5.2. Type 4- Marwood Recommendation10
- 6. CONCLUSIONS11

1. WMPC & MARWOOD LIGHTING INTRODUCTION

At the suggestion of Sue Kinsella of Kent Highways, WMPC contacted David Player Regional Sales Manager of Marwood Electrical Company Limited, a major Street Lighting Distributor in the UK, for assistance.

Mr Player undertook a .sample (70%) study of West Mallings Lighting Inventory; which is outlined below. He also conducted Parish Members on a tour of the Marwood Lighting Display in Borough Green to provide an overview of options available to WMPC. His follow up report follows with indications on how to proceed!

1.1. DAVID PLAYER MARWOOD'S GENERAL COMMENT

Matching Lights / Numbers / & Locations proved difficult he was working from an October 2015 Version of Inventory

Inventory has got quite out-dated as Upgrades & Repairs not entered properly for some time. E.G. Church Entrance is now an LED

He advised that it was not always easy to ascertain just visually from below specific Lights Bulbs @ Fittings without recourse to an actual inspection at "Lamp Level"!

Some of the older Lighting Columns look to be in need of repair

1.2. MARWOOD SAMPLE SURVEY

Report Type	Description	Marwick Total Observed
Type 1	MINI IRIDIUM	10
Type 2	SGS 203	14
Type 3	MFBU Swan Neck	22
Type 4	WINDSOR LANTERN	31
Not Surveyed		50
TOTALS		125

As discussed this table is based on the Inventory list available at the time, as noted I did find some additional roads as follows which I did not record so there will be additional numbers to include in your forecasts; E.G. Stratford Road; Offham Road (Thought to be Type 4 lanterns, possibly around 14 in number); Ryarsh Lane (Thought to be mainly type 3 lanterns) and Swan Street!

1.3. DAVID PLAYER NOTES ON PRICING & SOLUTIONS

As a refresher, my recommendations for optional solutions include but are not limited to suggestions made!

All prices would be subject to VAT and are only a guide, once numbers are confirmed then formal quote can be raised.

2. TYPE 1- MINI IRIDIUM.



These are fairly modern fittings, and I predict they will be either SON light source or Cosmo already, both light sources are still readily available for lamp and gear replacements. The lantern is also made from a robust aluminium so will have a number of years left of use, the body of these lanterns is expected to last in excess of 15 years (Subject to not being vandalised).

2.1. MARWOOD RECOMMENDATION ON TYPE 1 = LEAVE AS IS.

3. TYPE 2- SGS203.



This is likely to be a SON light source so no immediate problems, but this type of lantern is made from a plastic/poly type body which will have been subject to UV degradation so will at some point need to be replaced. I would not say this is an urgent problem, but may be looked at on a point for point replacement.

3.1. TYPE 2- RECOMMENDATION REPLACE LANTERN.

Two options possible;

- a) Replace with a new LED Lantern- This will be a more directional light source with a very defined cut off of light- Cost in the region of £200-£250
- b) Replace with a new Cosmo lantern- More traditional output in the sense that it will not be a harsh cut off (It is a lamp source), with the benefit of having white light (Better perception to the public of amount of light due to the way the eye sees white light compared to Son light source)- Cost in region of £250.

4. TYPE 3- MBFU SWAN NECK

4.1. WMPC TYPE 3 OBSERVATIONS

These lanterns are believed to be of the oldest types in the WMPC Inventory and are not conducive to easy Modification!

Marwood Electrical Company identified "22 Swan Neck Mercury Lights". Providing the 22 are structurally sound they can be "Truncated" and retro-fitted with LEDs!

Cost of suitable LED around £200 (some LDs as low as 150) Mark. But cost of retro-fitting work has also to be considered

WMPC might consider undertake "Structural Checks" on all "Swan Necked / Mercury" note WMPC records indicate there are many more than 22

Carry out the Retrofits on "Structurally Sound" lights rather than doing a separate "Electrical Check" This Approach meets Mercury Light strategy at lower cost!

4.2. TYPE 3- MARWOOD RECOMMENDATION CUT BACK REPLACE LANTERN.

Solutions as per Type 2- most fitting are on a swan neck bracket which would need to be removed or cut back at the discretion of the contractor to fit a new lantern.



5. TYPE 4- WINDSOR. LANTERN



5.1. WMPC TYPE 4 OBSERVATIONS

WMPC believes there are 40 Lantern Style Lights. The INVENTORY comes in a wide range of Styles and Sizes. At least around 18 are believed to be Wall Mounted rather than Lampost!

Marwood advise :-

THERE IS NO SIMPLE LED CONVERSION SOLUTION. It is unlikely WMPC will be able to get any "Off Shelf LED" solution

Could consider converting any of these lights that need repair or upgrade to a COSMO Fitting ! Could be done by adapting existing Lantern Sockets

So these are a Low Priority for replacement unless "Structural & Electrical Tests" show Lanterns to be unsafe

5.2. TYPE 4- MARWOOD RECOMMENDATION

- c) Replace for new- Cosmo lantern approx. £500, LED would cost even more.
- d) Retrofit for Cosmo lamp- Approx cost for lamp and gear £70-80

6. CONCLUSIONS

- a) WMPC needs in short term to have services of Local Contractor for Emergency Work (Steve Bonner of Streetlights Co appointed)
- b) A "Swift Visual Inspection" is needed to identify seriously "Badly Rotten" Columns E.G. Church Yard / High St; and 110 Swan St and FIX
- c) Decide whether Ken Bonner & Streetlights Co or Kent Highways can undertake Electrical & Structural Surveys dealing with New Lamps / Lanterns as Needed
- d) Create an overall 2 Year Plan to refurbish and Upgrade Lights under a "New Service Contract"
- e) Look at a Strategic Plan to move some of MPC ordinary Stock & Locations under KCC's LED Program!

APPENDIX 2

Response ID ANON-F39M-AUWF-J

Submitted to Lower Thames Crossing Consultation

Submitted on 2016-03-24 14:57:46

About you

1 Name

Name:

West Malling Parish Council

2 Postcode

Postcode:

ME19 6QH

3 Email address

Email:

clerk@westmallingspc.kentparishes.gov.uk

4 Are you responding on your own behalf or on behalf of an organisation or group?

Providing a response on behalf of an organisation or group

Crossing location

5 On balance, do you agree or disagree with our proposal for the location of a crossing, at Location C?

Tend to agree

Please provide the reasons for your response:

the members of West Malling Parish Council would prefer the Western Southern Crossing and then Route 4.

their main concern is that the existing routes between M20 and A2/M2, which will have to take traffic coming from Channel Tunnel including HGVs namely A249,

A229, A228 need to be significantly upgraded if the original link at Bluebell Hill is not now to be developed.

these routes are already congested - in some cases these are not completely dual carriageway - and will become significant bottlenecks

Routes north of the river

6 There are three route options north of the river in Essex – Routes 2, 3 and 4. Where do you think the route should be located north of the river?

Route 4

Please provide the reasons for your response:

7 Thinking about the three route options north of the river, on balance do you agree or disagree with our proposal for each of these?

Q7 - Route 2:

Q7 - Route 3:

Q7 - Route 4:

Tend to agree

Routes south of the river

8 There are two route options south of the river in Kent – the Western Southern Link and the Eastern Southern Link. Where do you think the route should be located south of the river?

Western Southern Link

Please provide the reasons for your response:

9 Thinking about the two route options south of the river, on balance do you agree or disagree with our proposal for each of these?

Q9 - Eastern Southern Link:

Q9 - Western Southern Link:

Strongly agree

The proposed scheme

10 Having evaluated the options, our proposed scheme is a new bored tunnel road crossing at Location C, following Route 3 north of the river and the Eastern Southern Link south of the river. On balance, do you agree or disagree with our proposed scheme?

Tend to disagree

Please provide the reasons for your response:

Junctions

11 We would welcome any comments you may have on our proposals for junctions.

Feedback on additional junctions:

Any other comments

12 We would welcome any other comments you may have on our proposals

Text box for additional comments on proposals:

Feedback on Consultation

13 How did you hear about the consultation? (Please select all that apply)

Received an email

Other:

14 Do you have any feedback on this consultation – events, information provided, advertising, etc.?

Text box for further comments:

More about you

15 If you represent an organisation please complete all questions in this section.

Position in the organisation:

Clerk to the Parish Council

Name of the organisation of group:

West Malling Parish Council

Please use the space below to provide further detail about your role or organisation:

16 What category of organisation or group are you representing?

Local government

Other:

More about you

17 How often, if at all, do you do personally you use the Dartford Crossing, either by driving or being driven?

About once every six months

Equality and Diversity

18 What is your gender?

Female

19 Do you consider yourself as a person with a disability?

No

20 Please describe your ethnic background

White

21 Age

Over