



**Gravesham Joint
Transportation Board**

Members of the **Gravesham Joint Transportation Board** of **Gravesham Borough Council** are summoned to attend a virtual meeting to be held on **Wednesday, 8 March 2023 at 7.30 pm** when the business specified in the following agenda is proposed to be transacted.

If you are a member of the public and wish to join this meeting, then please contact Committee Section by 5pm on the day of the meeting to be sent the virtual joining in details.

S Walsh
Service Manager (Communities)

Agenda

Part A

Items likely to be considered in Public

1. Apologies
2. To sign the minutes of the previous meeting (Pages 3 - 6)
3. To declare any interests members may have in the items contained on this agenda. When declaring an interest members should state what their interest is.
4. To consider whether any items in Part A of the agenda should be considered in private or those (if any) in Part B in public
5. Matters Arising from Previous Meetings (Pages 7 - 8)
6. Recommendations for decision by Kent County Council
None.

7. Recommendations for decisions by the Council

None.

8. Reports from Officers

- a) Gravesham Local Cycling & Walking Infrastructure Plan (Pages 9 - 14)
- b) Involvement in the highway aspects of planning applications (Pages 15 - 18)
- c) The Kent County Council (various road, Gravesham) (waiting restrictions and street parking places) (consolidation) (amendment no.11) 2023 (Pages 19 - 24)

9. Issues raised by Councillors with the approval of the Chair

10. Any Other Business which by reason of special circumstances the Chair is of the opinion should be considered as a matter of urgency.

11. Exclusion

To move, if required, that pursuant to Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 that the public be excluded from any items included in Part B of the agenda because it is likely in view of the nature of the business to be transacted that if members of the public are present during those items, there would be disclosure to them of exempt information as defined in Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

Members

County Councillor Conrad Broadley (Chair)

Cllr Tony Rana (Vice-Chair)

Councillors: Brian Francis
Aaron Elliott
Leslie Hills
Nirmal Khabra
Jordan Meade (KCC)
Alan Ridgers (KCC)
Lauren Sullivan (KCC)
Bryan Sweetland (KCC)

Gravesham Joint Transportation Board

Wednesday, 30 November 2022

7.30 pm

Present:

Cllr Tony Rana (Vice-Chair)

Councillors: Brian Francis
 Nirmal Khabra
 Jordan Meade (KCC)
 Alan Ridgers (KCC)
 Lauren Sullivan (KCC)
 Bryan Sweetland (KCC)

Nick May	Parking & Environmental Enforcement Services Manager
Kevin Gore	Dartford & Gravesham District Manager (KCC)
Jenny Lumley	Whitehill Primary School (Business Manager)
Angela Carpenter	Whitehill Primary School (Headteacher)
Ben Clarke	Committee Services Officer
Karen Gingles	Committee Services Officer (minutes)

28. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from County Councillor Conrad Broadley (Chair), Councillors Aaron Elliot and Leslie Hills.

29. To sign the minutes of the previous meeting

The minutes of the meeting of the Board held on Wednesday, 31 August 2022 were signed by the Chair.

30. To declare any interests members may have in the items contained on this agenda. When declaring an interest members should state what their interest is.

Cllr Nirmal Khabra declared an interest as he was a local taxi driver in the Borough of Gravesham.

31. Matters Arising from Previous Meetings

Members were presented with an update on actions that were requested or promised at the previous Gravesham JTB meeting. Kevin Gore (Dartford & Gravesham District Manager for KCC) referred to the previous issue raised by Cllr Hills, which referred to the road works on Lower Higham Road in Chalk. The board were advised that the works had now been

completed, however there would be footway maintenance due to start soon, but this was not thought to cause too much disruption.

The Dartford & Gravesham District Manager (KCC) informed Members that:

- The Gas Board had completed their road works on Lower Higham Road in Chalk and Thong Lane; there were some minor gas works being conducted in the new year but those shouldn't cause any disruption
- The issue relating to speeding on Springhead Road had been resolved
- Reference was also made to the Springhead Parkway rumble strips that had been raised previously by County Councillor Conrad Broadley. The Dartford & Gravesham District Manager (KCC) had invited the developer to the site and was waiting for a date to be scheduled; the board was assured that the rumble strips would be removed by March 2023

The Chair thanked The Dartford & Gravesham District Manager (KCC) for the actions taken.

32. Reports from Officers

32.1 Highways Forward Works Programme: 2022/23 and 2023/24

The Board was presented with a report that updated them on the identified schemes approved for construction within Gravesham. The Dartford & Gravesham District Manager (KCC) advised this paper was for information only.

The board noted the report.

33. Issues raised by Councillors with the approval of the Chair

The Chair allowed Members to raise various issues which would be submitted to KCC for actioning.

Cllr Rana raised an issue on Whitehill Road. He informed the board that he had visited Whitehill Primary School and met with the Headteacher Angela Carpenter and Business Manager Jenny Lumley to discuss the traffic issues surrounding the school. He advised that there were several dangerous pinch points around the Whitehill Road and Sun Lane areas, plus by the main school entrance in Sun Lane, there was a blind spot which was dangerous and would benefit from a zebra crossing. There was also a lot of traffic congestion along School Road as it headed towards Jellicoe Avenue.

Cllr Rana introduced Jenny Lumley (Whitehill Primary School Business Manager), to the Board who spoke regarding the issues the school had experienced with traffic surrounding the school. She made the following points:

- The school were experiencing severe issues with the traffic especially in Sun Lane, where the school's main entrance was located. The road was very narrow and the school drive headed straight onto Sun Lane.
- There were zig zag and yellow lines but these were mostly ignored.
- Along this road footpaths were also narrow with some parents having to walk in the road at times.

- There was also a bottle neck point in the road, where Sun Lane met Smarts Road.
- The refuse collection truck on Mondays plus the bus route along Sun Lane, added to the congestion.
- The school was very large with 620 children and was one of the only schools in the area that did not have a safe road crossing. Children were rarely able to walk unaccompanied to school and it was not possible for children to use bikes or scooters to get to school, as it was not safe to do so.
- There was an increasing amount of intolerance, aggression and violence witnessed outside school due to the traffic congestion issues.

Cllr Rana informed the board that he had also met with Iona Radalski from Kent Safer Streets who was going to liaise with KCC to see what could be done and would suggest a zebra crossing in Sun Lane and propose methods to slow traffic in School Lane around school drop off/pick up times. Cllr Rana acknowledged this would require funding, so would need the support of both Cllr Meade and Cllr Ridgers. It was also suggested that railings be put in place to widen School Lane and offer protection for the children. Both Cllr Ridgers and Cllr Meade were in support of this suggestion, subject to costs.

County Councillor Bryan Sweetland advised the board that the maximum grant that could be given was £10 000. The cost of the works could be in between £10-15K and may exceed this, depending on whether lighting/power were also required. He advised the board that there was a KCC leaflet which outlined what the grant included, that he would share outside the meeting.

Cllr Jordan Meade addressed Jenny Lumley, stating that he would like to arrange a visit to the school to see the issues for himself. He referred the school to a useful website www.responsibleparking.co.uk where resources such as posters, and mock parking tickets could be printed. He advised that this site worked well for Timberwood School who had experienced similar issues. He suggested that this could also be something the children could get involved with.

The Parking & Environmental Enforcement Services Manager offered the board and school information, on how GBC could assist with the issues. He suggested the following:

- Road markings fell under the remit of Gravesham Borough Council, so if any zig zag or yellow lines needed to be refreshed this could be arranged to make them clearer to parents.
- He would speak with Gravesham's Waste Management team to see if it was possible for the refuse trucks to avoid school drop off/pick up times on a Monday.
- He would ensure parking enforcement officers were as visible as possible but pointed out that due to the number of schools verses enforcement officers, they could not be present all the time.
- If parents parked on footpaths or junctions this would be a police matter. Engagement with Kent Police to work together and provide a joint presence, had been sought, but due to police resources this was not possible
- If the school felt there were areas outside school, that would benefit from further restrictions this could be discussed outside the meeting.

The Dartford & Gravesham District Manager KCC addressed the board regarding the suggestion of installing barriers along School Road. He advised this may prove difficult due to fibre optic cables being in place along the road. Jenny Lumley suggested that maybe

bollards could be a suitable alternative, as these would stop cars from mounting the kerb and potentially harming the children. The Dartford & Gravesham District Manager KCC confirmed that as this would only be a small cost, he would be happy to fund the bollards from his own budget.

Jenny Lumley thanked the board for their assistance on this matter.

34. Any Other Business which by reason of special circumstances the Chair is of the opinion should be considered as a matter of urgency.

The Chair enquired about the new bus station and the cameras that monitored access through the bus gates. He queried if access was for buses only or whether taxis were also permitted. Nick May (Parking & Environmental Enforcement Services Manager) advised the board that access through the gates was currently for buses only. KCC have made this decision but have stated that they will review this once the bus gate enforcement is in place and they have had the chance to review usage and effectiveness of the cameras. He also informed the board that documentation regarding the bus gates could be viewed within the agenda pack from the previous meeting (31 August 2022).

The Dartford & Gravesham District Manager KCC advised the Chair that he could send him the report if he was unable to access the previous agenda.

Close of meeting

The meeting ended at 8:03pm

MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS

Please note that updates from appropriate officers are set out below the relevant action and any outstanding actions are highlighted in red.

27. Issues raised by Councillors with the approval of the Chair**Traffic Issues raised on White Hill Road**

Cllr Rana raised this issue, and informed the board that he has visited Whitehill Primary School and met with the Headteacher Angela Carpenter and Business Manager Jenny Lumley to discuss the traffic issues surrounding the school. There were several dangerous pinch points and a blind spot by the main school entrance in Sun Lane. There was also a lot of congestion along School Road as it headed toward Jellicoe Avenue.

The Dartford & Gravesham District Manager KCC confirmed he would be happy to fund bollards from his own budget to stop cars from mounting the kerb and posing a risk to the children.

No update was received.

Springhead Parkway Rumble Strips

County Cllr Conrad Broadley (Chair) raised concerns regarding Springhead Parkway rumble strips. It had previously been agreed between the developer, KCC and Ebbsfleet Development Corporation (EDC) that they would be removed but this had not yet been actioned.

The Dartford & Gravesham District Manager (KCC) assured Members that KCC had liaised with the developer and agreed for the rumble strips to be removed. KCC was waiting for a plan to be submitted by the developer. The Dartford & Gravesham District Manager (KCC) advised that he would set up a meeting in order for this to be progressed.

No update was received.

This page is intentionally left blank

Classification: Public

Key Decision: No

Gravesham Borough Council

Report to: Joint Transport Board

Date: 08 March 2023

Reporting officer: Assistant Director (Planning)

Subject: Gravesham Local Cycling & Walking Infrastructure Plan

Purpose and summary of report:

To provide:

- Update on Gravesham's Local Cycling & Walking Infrastructure Plan
- Highlight some of the emerging issues

Recommendations:

1. Members are invited to comment on the plan.

Key Implications:	
Item	Implications
Legal	None
Finance and Value for Money	None
Corporate Plan	Gravesham LCWIP will support a number of the objectives in #People and #Place categories in relation to sustainable travel and health
Climate Change	Encouraging sustainable transport is a key objective of providing cycling and walking networks

1. Introduction

- 1.1 Last year the Borough Council commissioned, from PJA consultants, a Gravesham Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP). This was funded by grants from Department of Transport (via Kent County Council) and National Highways Designated Funds.
- 1.2 The completed report from the consultants can be found at https://democracy.gravesham.gov.uk/documents/s73202/06370%20Gravesham_LCWIP_Report_FINAL_W_Appendices.pdf from when it was reported to Strategic Environment Committee on 22 November 2022.

- 1.3 This report is being made at the request of the Gravesham Cabinet Member for Strategic Environment as walking and cycling is a matter of joint interest for both Authorities.

2. Background

- 2.1 The consultants had to follow the guidance from the Department for Transport (DfT) on producing [Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan \(LCWIP\)](#), together with some tools to help with the process and guidance on design standards.
- 2.2 Local Authorities are expected to produce these plans to set out their priorities for routes for both walking and cycling, and priorities for their implementation. A particular aim is to understand where there are major obstacles to be overcome in the delivery of integrated walking and cycling networks. The objective is to produce a programme of route improvements, that can be funded by a variety of means as and when opportunity arises – for example bids to Government funds, s.106 contributions, Lottery applications etc. Bids for funding to Government (Active Travel England) in the future for walking and cycling infrastructure will expect a relevant LCWIP to exist.
- 2.3 The DfT guidance sets out a 6-stage process, see the table below.

Stage	Name	Description
1	Determining Scope	Establish the geographical extent of the LCWIP, and arrangements for governing and preparing the plan.
2	Gathering Information	Identify existing patterns of walking and cycling and potential new journeys. Review existing conditions and identify barriers to cycling and walking. Review related transport and land use policies and programmes.
3	Network Planning for Cycling	Identify origin and destination points and cycle flows. Convert flows into a network of routes and determine the type of improvements required.
4	Network Planning for Walking	Identify key trip generators, core walking zones and routes, audit existing provision and determine the type of improvements required.
5	Prioritising Improvements	Prioritise improvements to develop a phased programme for future investment.
6	Integration and Application	Integrate outputs into local planning and transport policies, strategies, and delivery plans.

- 2.4 A key objective for the process is to move towards walking and cycling networks which provide a set of safe routes to encourage sustainable transport of all sorts of trip purposes (work, school etc.) as part of addressing net zero carbon. There are also significant health benefits from physical activity and access to the countryside. A key consideration is what is considered a 'safe' route, which will vary significantly for different types of users.
- 2.5 In Gravesham the current key drivers are changes in demand and routes brought about by the development of Ebbsfleet Garden City on the west side of Northfleet and the Lower Thames Crossing on the east side of Gravesend. In the EDC area major development has and is taking place, which is producing a significant shift in demand from new population in or adjacent to the urban area. EDC also has its Green Corridors programme of enhancements which is increasing connectivity in the Northfleet area.

- 2.6 On the east side of the urban area the Development Consent Order application by National Highways for the Lower Thames Crossing results, if granted, in a significant number of rerouted and altered public rights of way. During the construction period a number of footpaths will be closed but a new link provided parallel to Thong Lane to link Riverview area to Shorne Wood Country Park and Shorne. The major operational impact will be the diversion of NCN177 south of the A2 between Marling Cross and Brewers Road, which during construction is on an alignment further south via Jeskyns and Ashenbank Wood. A side effect of the Lower Thames Crossing is the possibility of bidding to National Highways Designated Funds to develop and implement schemes.
- 2.7 The LCWIP process is not about the detailed design of schemes, but it is important to keep in mind that there are both limited resources and physical space (especially in the inner urban areas) to implement an ideal of segregated walking and cycling routes. It is about identifying the key corridors where demand suggests schemes should go and potential routes. The working up of schemes in detail is a separate stage (see further below). Cycling considers the whole Borough, whereas walking is focussed around Gravesend Town Centre.

3. Findings

- 3.1 It is important to emphasise that the Gravesham LCWIP is a dynamic document which will change and evolve as circumstances alter, both through new development (and therefore demand) and from what walking and cycling schemes are delivered on the ground. In particular, the work has not, for timing reasons, been able to take into account the detail of:
- Ebbsfleet Central planning application
 - Northfleet Habourside planning application
 - Lower Thames Crossing DCO application
 - New recent planning permissions, for example the expansion of Meopham school
- 3.2 The aim is to focus on the top priorities for 'now' based on the approach that has to be taken from the national guidance, which is currently being reviewed. It is not attempting to design routes and it is not attempting to produce complete maps of walking and cycling routes in the Borough. It also needs to relate to the sustainable transport, regeneration, design and health objectives amongst others. It is also important to remember that whilst Gravesham is the Planning Authority, Kent County Council is the Transport Authority.
- 3.3 Emerging themes and issues (some of which are of a broader scope than the LCWIP can deal with):
- 3.3.1 The analysis shows strong radial demand in Gravesend, with a particular emphasis in the Northfleet direction in part driven by the new development in the EDC area
- 3.3.2 The rural area comes out weaker simply because there is less population but there are none the less suggested routes
- 3.3.3 The rural areas would benefit from more detailed work at a local level that could be carried out in this commission

- 3.3.4 The combination of topography (both from the point of view of gradient and impact of quarrying on landform in Northfleet) and major transport infrastructure introduces some significant barriers
- 3.3.5 The current Government design guidance (LTN 1/20) is framed in terms of getting segregation for cyclists as far as possible but in many pinch points this is simple impractical
- 3.3.6 There are a range of measures (for example 20 mph zones, dropped kerbs and street scene enhancements) which can improve the environment for walking and cycling which need to be considered in a wider context
- 3.3.7 As a specific example the Gravesend Town Centre one way system is a major barrier to cross or use for both walkers and cyclists
- 3.3.8 Pure leisure routes do not figure greatly (e.g. coastal path) because they are not directly related to population

4. Appendices

- 4.1 There are no appendices.

5. Background Documents

- 5.1 The following background documents were used:
- 5.2 Department for Transport guidance on LCWIP
https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/908535/cycling-walking-infrastructure-technical-guidance-document.pdf
- 5.3 Gravesham LCWIP
https://democracy.gravesham.gov.uk/documents/s73202/06370%20Gravesham_LCWIP_Report_FINAL_W_Appendices.pdf

Lead Officer: Tony Chadwick

Email: tony.chadwick@gravesham.gov.uk

Secondary Implications	
Risk Assessment	No financial or legal risks
Data Protection Impact Assessment	<i>A data protection impact assessment (DPIA) should be carried out at the start of any major project involving the use of personal data or if you are making a significant change to an existing process.</i>
	<p>a. Does the project/change being recommended through this paper involve the processing of personal data or special category data or criminal offence data?</p> <p>A definition of each type of data can be found on the Information Commissioner's Office website via the above links.</p> <p>No</p>
	<p>b. If yes to question a, have you completed and attached a DPIA including Data Protection Officer advice?</p>
	<p>c. If no to question b, please seek advice from your nominated DPIA assessor or the Information Governance Team at gdpr@medway.gov.uk.</p>
Equality Impact Assessment	<p>a. Does the decision being made or recommended through this paper have potential to cause adverse impact or discriminate against different groups in the community? If yes, please explain answer.</p> <p>No</p>
	<p>b. Does the decision being made or recommended through this paper make a positive contribution to promoting equality? If yes, please explain answer.</p> <p>Yes as the LCWIP will need to consider access to walking and cycling networks for all types of users</p>
	<i>In submitting this report, the Chief Officer doing so is confirming that they have given due regard to the equality impacts of the decision being considered, as noted in the table above</i>
Crime and Disorder	None
Digital and website implications	None
Safeguarding children and vulnerable adults	None

This page is intentionally left blank

To: Members of the Joint Transportation Board.

From: David Brazier, Cabinet Member for Highways & Transport, Kent County Council

Subject: Involvement in the highway aspects of planning applications

Summary: KCC receives many requests from local Members asking to be kept informed and involved in the highways aspects of planning applications. Whilst KCC recognises Members intent is to understand the impacts and mitigations for planning applications to support their local communities, it is not possible for direct involvement for several reasons which are outlined in this report.

Recommendation: The JTB is asked to note the report.

1. Involvement in highways aspects of planning applications advisory note

- 1.1 Any pre-application advice is confidential and cannot be disclosed even under a Freedom Of Information request as it can affect the commercial viability of the site.
- 1.2 Once an application is submitted and KCC Highways are consulted officers have a 21-day turnaround time to submit the statutory response. The level of scrutiny that needs to take place on each application and the number of applications received would make any further consultation within this time period untenable.
- 1.3 Any correspondence on the application **must** be made via the Local Planning Authority (LPA). It is not possible for KCC Highways to have external discussions with developers/members of the public/Members or Parish Council's and other local organisations outside of this process.
- 1.4 KCC Highways, as a statutory consultee, need to give a response to the plans that are submitted before them based on the supporting evidence and **unbiased** technical opinion of the Highway Officer.
- 1.5 It is not the position of the Highway Authority to come up with better ideas, suggest alterations or to attempt to change the mindset of a developer who has presented a workable solution whether or not that solution is popular with local residents and businesses. Our response must be based on fact and cannot take account of assumptions or opinions of the local community.
- 1.6 Our responses cannot be influenced by political persuasion.
- 1.7 Our responses to the applications already set out the key impacts and any mitigation proposed, and this response is uploaded to the LPA website for all to see, in advance of the planning committee meeting.

- 1.8 Parish councils and Town councils are consulted at the same time as KCC Highways and all the details are available on the LPA website. Any comments from us can be viewed publicly.
- 1.9 In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework there is a **presumption in favour of development** and it is the duty of KCC Highways to work with the developers to try to ensure that development can proceed.
- 1.10 KCC Highways ensure that development proposals align with both National and KCC Policies and Standards in all highway associated areas.
- 1.11 KCC Highways seek to promote sustainable travel options above that of the private car to offer a mode choice whenever possible.
- 1.12 KCC Highways offer update meetings to KCC Members at least twice per year to discuss the District/Borough Local Plan growth and associated highway infrastructure and any external funding bids.
- 1.13 KCC Highways ensure that any Transport Models used to support a proposal are validated, current and suitable.
- 1.14 KCC Highways will always determine the extent of the area to be covered by a Transport Assessment by scoping out the specific links and junctions on the network that are necessary in order for us to make an informed appraisal.
- 1.15 Mitigation is proposed by the developer for the scrutiny of KCC Highways. The only time a developer might be told what mitigation or contribution **must** be delivered is when the mitigation has been previously agreed as part of a wider District or Borough Transport Strategy and a policy has been attached to an allocated site setting out the infrastructure requirements required for the site to come forward. Such transport strategies and subsequent Infrastructure Delivery Plans will have been previously consulted upon and approved by the District and County Council Members.
- 1.16 KCC Highways Officers are fully aware that most of the allocated sites within a Local Plan, particularly the larger ones, are likely to be unpopular with neighbouring residents, particularly when being built on green space and impacting on views and amenity. Many people hinge their objections on highway impacts because we all use the road network on a daily basis, albeit walking, cycling, driving, by public transport etc. and are familiar with the local junctions and how they operate in peak traffic conditions. What they are often not aware of is that in the vast majority of cases the junctions that they report to be operating above capacity and causing extended queuing are not unusual traffic conditions and these same queues are replicated in exactly the same way in the majority of towns and also some villages across most of Kent and indeed across the country. Most of our network is historic and is constrained by frontage development, conservation and environmental constraints and listed building protection. In view of this it is not always possible to make physical improvements by expanding the road space to create more room to allow cars to travel through junctions more quickly. Often when these improvements are

carried out and the network operates better in a particular area, other traffic then assigns to the improved route and the former scenario quickly resumes.

- 1.17 KCC Highways, where possible, are not now looking to amend the network to accommodate more cars. Instead, they are looking to see how people could travel more sustainably from new development sites and are asking developers to provide the infrastructure to make this happen. This is known as “Vision and validate” or “decide and provide” as opposed to the former use of “predict and provide” which always looked at the worst-case future year scenario and tried to adjust the network to cope with it. The hope is that in the future it will be more inviting and easier to walk and cycle short trips than to use the private car and that public transport will be more accessible with reliable journey times.
- 1.18 KCC Highways officers appreciate that Members are trying hard to support their constituents by trying to change or prevent certain development proposals and its associated network changes but ultimately if a site has been allocated it needs to happen and KCC Highways will always work hard to ensure that the best possible outcome is achieved in terms of minimising highway impacts, promoting sustainability, and creating a sense of place. Inspectors are routinely approving appeals in favour of development. Congestion, journey time reliability and extended queuing are not often being upheld as reasons to refuse development. The only realistic chance of an appeal being upheld on highway grounds is if highway safety is directly compromised and this has to be robustly evidenced.

2. Recommendation

- 2.1 The JTB is asked to note the report.

3. Contract Details

David Brazier
Kent County Council
Cabinet Member, Highways & Transport

This page is intentionally left blank

Gravesham
Borough Council



DOCUMENTS ON DEPOSIT

**These documents should remain
available for public inspection
until 23 February 2023**

In the Borough of Gravesham

**THE KENT COUNTY COUNCIL (VARIOUS ROADS,
GRAVESHAM) (WAITING RESTRICTIONS AND
STREET PARKING PLACES) (CONSOLIDATION)
(AMENDMENT NO.11) 2023**

Please return to:

PARKING SERVICE DEPARTMENT

Gravesham Borough Council

Civic Centre

Windmill Street

Gravesend

Kent

DA12 1AU

PUBLIC NOTICE



**THE KENT COUNTY COUNCIL
(VARIOUS ROADS, GRAVESHAM) (WAITING RESTRICTIONS AND STREET PARKING PLACES)
(CONSOLIDATION) (AMENDMENT NO.11) ORDER 2023**

NOTICE is hereby given that the Kent County Council proposes to make the above-named Order under Sections 1, 2, 4, 5, 32, 35, 36, and 124 and Parts I to IV of Schedule 9 to the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, the effect of which would be to amend the Kent County Council (Various Roads, Gravesham) (Waiting Restrictions and Street Parking Placers) (Consolidation) Order 2021 as follows:

- 1. Introduce “Limited Waiting Mon-Fri 7am-7pm 4hrs No Return Within 2hrs” in Gordon Promenade East in the following locations:**
 - a. On the western side, from a point 31m north of the junction with Canal Road, for 30m, replacing existing ‘No Waiting Mon-Sat 8am-6:30pm’ single yellow line (SYL) restriction.
 - b. On the southern side between existing disabled bays and buildouts for a total of 95m.
- 2. Introduce “No Waiting at any time” double yellow line (DYL) restriction in the following roads:**
 - a. Admirals Way, on both sides at the junction with Canal Road
 - b. Gordon Promenade East, across the buildout and opposite the Gravesend Sailing Club, on the southern side and across the swing bridge entrance, to meet existing DYL on the northern side.
 - c. Ordnance Road, on the northwest side opposite the junction with Albion Terrace
 - d. Prospect Grove, on the northern side from the junction with Canal Road to the central reservation.
- 3. Replace existing “No Waiting Mon-Sat 8am-6:30pm” single yellow line (SYL) restriction with “No Waiting at any time” double yellow line (DYL) restriction in the following roads:**
 - a. Canal Road, for its entirety.
 - b. Gordon Promenade East, for its entirety, with the exception of the above ‘Limited Waiting’ restriction.
 - c. Norfolk Road, from its junction with Prospect Grove and Canal Road, for a distance of 45m on both sides.
 - d. Russell Road, at its junction with Canal Road, for a distance of 7m on both sides.

Copies of the draft Order, the statement of the Council’s reasons for making the proposed Order, and a copy of any other Orders which will be amended by the proposed Order may be viewed in person, Monday to Friday from 9am to 5pm at Gravesham Borough Council, Civic Centre, Windmill Street, Gravesend, DA12 1AU.

Representations supporting or objecting to the proposed Order can be made by writing to the Parking Services Manager, Gravesham Borough Council, Parking Services Department, Civic Centre, Windmill Street, Gravesend, DA12 1AU or by email to parking.consultation@gravesham.gov.uk; by noon on 23 February 2023.

Nicholas May
Parking Services Manager
Gravesham Borough Council
02 February 2023

THE KENT COUNTY COUNCIL (VARIOUS ROADS, GRAVESHAM) (WAITING RESTRICTIONS AND STREET PARKING PLACES) (CONSOLIDATION) (AMENDMENT NO.11) ORDER 2023

STATEMENT OF REASONS

Location	Proposals	Reason
Admirals Way	To introduce no waiting at any time restrictions.	To avoid danger to persons and other traffic by maintaining sight lines at junctions and preventing parking in locations where considered unsafe to do so.
Canal Road	To replace existing no waiting Mon-Sat 8am-6:30pm restriction with no waiting at any time restrictions.	To avoid danger to persons and other traffic by maintaining sight lines at junctions and preventing parking in locations where considered unsafe to do so.
Gordon Promenade East	To introduce Limited Waiting Mon-Fri 7am-7pm 4hrs No Return Within 2hrs restrictions.	To better manage parking available on this road.
Gordon Promenade East	To introduce no waiting at any time restrictions.	To avoid danger to persons and other traffic by maintaining sight lines at junctions and preventing parking in locations where considered unsafe to do so.
Gordon Promenade East	To replace existing no waiting Mon-Sat 8am-6:30pm restriction with no waiting at any time restrictions.	To avoid danger to persons and other traffic by maintaining sight lines at junctions and preventing parking in locations where considered unsafe to do so.
Norfolk Road	To replace existing no waiting Mon-Sat 8am-6:30pm restriction with no waiting at any time restrictions.	To avoid danger to persons and other traffic by maintaining sight lines at junctions and preventing parking in locations where considered unsafe to do so.
Ordnance Road	To introduce no waiting at any time restrictions.	To avoid danger to persons and other traffic by maintaining sight lines at junctions and preventing parking in locations where considered unsafe to do so.
Prospect Grove	To introduce no waiting at any time restrictions.	To avoid danger to persons and other traffic by maintaining sight lines at junctions and preventing parking in locations where considered unsafe to do so.
Russell Road	To replace existing no waiting Mon-Sat 8am-6:30pm restriction with no waiting at any time restrictions.	To avoid danger to persons and other traffic by maintaining sight lines at junctions and preventing parking in locations where considered unsafe to do so.

This page is intentionally left blank