

# Traffic Management Working Party

Wednesday 28<sup>th</sup> February 2018

## MEETING NOTES

Present: Irene Roy (Chairman), Rod Shelton, Howard Leicester, Martin Whitehead, Ian Bell, Graham Bignell, Ted Scott and new member to the group Richard Gullett.

The Chairman welcomed new member Richard Gullett, Managing Director of OBMs, to the group. Following several complaints from members of his staff regarding pedestrian safety incidents Richard decided to join the group to see what could be done.

**Action**

### **1. Parking Review**

All agreed that the parking review had been a thoroughly worthwhile exercise and that the results of the car parking surveys had been surprising. In particular, the results of the village car park were unexpected and demonstrated convincingly that the village car park is far from at capacity with the exception of peak school drop offs and pickups. The results of the Station car park survey also illustrated that there is ample parking space available; even after the first off peak trains.

The results of the staff parking survey showed that we continue to have large numbers of employees seeking long stay parking on the restricted parking roads in the centre of the village and the Bubblestone area. Although long stay parking in our residential areas is not ideal it is currently meeting the needs of this group who are at least contributing to the vitality of the village. (These roads were previously occupied by commuters before the restricted parking was implemented in 2015).

Whilst recording parking requirements for the High Street all of our shops and businesses reported that footfall was down; many went as far as to say that they were just surviving. With three empty shops and one empty pub on the High Street this is a worrying trend. The overwhelming view of the High Street is that the current tariff structure for the village car park is not helping. In their opinion, the 'one hour free' tariff encourages shoppers to rush to avoid paying for parking. In view of the empty premises on the High Street and the possibility that the drop in footfall might have an impact on income from the car park it will be recommended in the final report that Amenities review the current charging structure. The High Street were also unanimous in their support for a 20mph limit through the village which they believe would help to create a quieter, safer and more pleasant place to shop.

IR

Other issues raised during the survey included lack of public toilets and poor lighting in the village car park. A full report on the parking survey together with recommendations will be included in the traffic management report.

IR

### **2. Traffic Management Proposals**

#### 2.1 Revisions & Updates

**High Street.** Lack of a kerb on the opposite side of the road to the Pickmoss step is presenting a number of issues. The speed table planned will not be possible and a build out (extended footway) around the Pickmoss Step will be considered instead to create a pinch point. A query was raised concerning the height of the kerb at the zebra crossing and whether it would be high enough for a speed table. This will be checked by Graham.

GB

A speed survey was carried out in the High Street in 2010 (near no. 33) 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speeds were recorded at: 27.2mph westbound and 26.6mph eastbound. Recorded speeds are too fast for a signed-only scheme and some speed reducing features would be required. New speed tests and pedestrian surveys would be required for any new schemes and pedestrian crossings.

**Shoreham Road.** An additional refuge island at Greenhill Road junction is being considered. GB

**Station Road.** An additional refuge island at Colet's Orchard junction is also being considered. GB  
Periphery hatching south of the refuge island will not be possible due to the narrow width of the road.

A speed survey was carried out on Station Road in 2010 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speeds were recorded at: 35.2mph westbound and 37.2mph eastbound. New speed tests and pedestrian surveys would be required for any new schemes and pedestrian crossings.

**Backup Plans.** If we are unsuccessful in securing agreement for a 20mph limit on the A225 we would need to modify our proposals. In this event, we would consider either increasing the size of the refuge islands or replacing them with new zebra crossings. GB

**Road layout improvements.** We are still waiting for information from Highways. Graham to chase. GB

## 2.2 Costs

A schedule of estimated costs for traffic calming and pedestrian safety measures was put together with the help of Graham, Ian and Highways. The measures were reviewed and a revised version is attached. Proposals have been grouped together by road and the cost for each measure priced separately to include speed surveys, design, consultation, TROs, construction and traffic management where these are applicable. This is to provide complete flexibility to remove or add measures from each scheme to offer a variety of options to Council. Our objective at this stage is to put forward the best solutions available to combat traffic concerns and demonstrate that they are affordable when taken as a group or individually; they could be implemented over a number of years on a priority basis or as finances allow. The High Street and PWW proposals are the most likely schemes to be approved by Highways and with the village primary school located in the centre should be given priority. At this stage, we cannot guarantee that all measures will be approved, but it is the first step in providing a long term plan to resolve current traffic concerns and to protect the village from increases in traffic from planned development in the area.

## 2.3 Funding

As we do not meet Highways fatality criteria for traffic calming we will have to self fund any traffic management improvements; in line with other Parish and Town Councils. The only substantial source of funding we have been able to identify is the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). CIL is a planning charge on new development and was introduced recently by the District Council. Town and Parish Councils receive a 25% share for any development that has taken place within their boundary. CIL must be spent on infrastructure to support or mitigate the effects of development. To date, Otford Parish Council has received £45,259.38 in CIL payments since the scheme began in August 2015 and spent £8,455 leaving £36,804.38 in CIL payments. As development and expansion of existing properties is a certainty this pot will continue to grow over the years.

The District share of CIL is used to fund infrastructure projects across the district. Stakeholders can apply through a bidding system for funding for projects that meet CIL spending criteria; they must demonstrate that they cannot afford to fund the project themselves. Match funding is also possible and might be an option for additional funding, but competition will be fierce.

Traffic issues are an obvious consequence of development and strategic transport infrastructure is at the top of the list for CIL spending. The Parish CIL funds would provide a logical and legitimate source of funding for traffic management for the village; we already have enough funds in the bank to pay for a scheme for the High Street. Our recommendation to Council will be that Parish and District CIL money is used to fund traffic management and that pedestrian safety should be made a top priority for CIL spending. IR

### **3. Highway Advisory Signage**

A review of signage throughout the village was recently undertaken by Rod. This will be updated and any new advisory signage added where necessary.

**RS**

### **4. Public notifications/consultations**

The list of endorsements for a 20mph limit for the village continues to grow. As mentioned above all the High Street shops, businesses, restaurants and pubs would like to see a 20mph limit through the centre of the village and would also support traffic calming measures.

The Primary School, Russell House and St Michael's have also added their names to the list as well as the Otford Village Society, the Village fete committee and several resident associations.

### **5. Date of next meeting**

To be arranged for March 2018.

Cllr Irene Roy  
1<sup>st</sup> March 2018