

Maidstone Joint Transportation Board

17 April
2019



Maidstone Integrated Transport Package (MITP)

Decision Making Authority	Kent County Council/Maidstone Borough Council
Lead Director	Simon Jones
Lead Head of Service	Tim Read
Lead Officer and Report Author	Russell Boorman/Lee Burchill
Wards and County Divisions affected	Maidstone Borough including Tonbridge & Malling
Which Member(s) requested this report?	Committee

This report makes the following recommendations:

That the report be noted.

Timetable

Meeting	Date
Maidstone Joint Transportation Board	17 April 2019

Maidstone Integrated Transport Package (MITP)

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

1.1 This report provides an update in respect of the proposed junction improvements contained within the Maidstone Integrated Transport Package (MITP).

2. Business Case Submission:

2.1 A business case was submitted to the South East Local Enterprise Partnership (SELEP) on the 1st February 2019 outlining the requirements of the remaining Local Growth Fund (LGF) in relation to the MITP.

2.2 As previously reported to this board, the initial list of congestion 'Hotspots' identified in 2015 has been amended due to significant challenges faced through the design process and now reflects a more deliverable programme of mitigation measures within the available budget and Local Growth Fund timeframe.

2.3 Table 1 show the amended list of deliverable schemes.

Project	Location	District
1	A20 Coldharbour Roundabout	Tonbridge & Malling
2	a) A229 Loose Road junction with Cripple Street/Boughton Lane	Maidstone
	b) A229 Loose Road junction with Armstrong Road/Park Way	
	c) A229 Loose Road junction with A274 Sutton Road (Wheatsheaf)	
3	A20 Ashford Road junction with Willington Street	Maidstone
4	A20 London Road junction with Hall Road	Tonbridge & Malling

Table 1: Revised congestion 'Hotspots'

2.4 The board must note that the B2246 Hermitage Lane and A26 Tonbridge Road project was removed due to the lack of demonstratable benefits and good value for money but continues to be developed via a Member led working group utilising S106 funding.

2.5 With regards to the A274 Sutton Road Maidstone project, following the announcement of the MBC court proceedings being withdrawn, alternative design options are being considered and a report will be presented to the board in relation to the proposed recommendation at the JTB in January 2018 **"...that the Maidstone Joint Transportation Board recommends this scheme be not accepted as currently proposed and recommends that Kent County Council be asked to amend the scheme to a smaller scale, retaining the grass verges and trees whilst paying more attention to local pinch points. It is inherent that some of the green verges will have to be removed"**. It is anticipated that any scheme delivery will be outside the MITP programme.

2.6 Given the nature and proximity of the schemes, including other externally funded schemes and constraints on the network, and the potential to exacerbate already congested locations during the construction stages, a phased delivery programme, shown in Fig 1, has been produced.

Project	Apr 19	May 19	Jun 19	Jul 19	Aug 19	Sep 19	Oct 19	Dec 19	Jan 20	Feb 20	Mar 20	Apr 20	May 20	Jun 20	Jul 20	Aug 20	Sep 20	Oct 20	Nov 20	Dec 20	Jan 21	Feb 21	Mar 21
1	Detailed Design						Procurement					Construction											
2	Detailed Design							Consultation					Procurement					Construction					
3	Planning Application							Detailed Design					Procurement					Construction					
4	Detailed Design						Procurement					Construction											

Figure 1: Indicative MITP Delivery Programme

2.7 During the business case evaluation period, there is a two 'Stage Gate' review process. This offers the authority the opportunity to submit additional information based on a Red/Amber/Green (RAG) rated system to strengthen the business case. A very positive first Stage Gate review was received from the independent evaluator, and additional requested information returned accordingly.

2.8 A decision regarding the release of the remaining Local Growth Funding provisionally allocated to this programme will be announced at the SELEP Accountability Board on the 12th April 2019. KCC remain positive that the business cases for these schemes in Table 1 will be reviewed by SELEP's Independent Technical Evaluator as presenting high value for money with medium to high certainty of achieving this.

2.9 A funding breakdown including S106 developer contributions secured for each scheme can be seen in **Table 2**.

Scheme	LGF	S106	Total
Coldharbour Roundabout	£2.7m (secured)	£0.816	£3.516m
A20 Ashford Road/Willington Street	£1.672m (required) (this includes the original £1.3m)	£0.128	£1.8m
A229 Loose Road Corridor	£2.528m (required)	£0.822	£3.35m
A20 Hall Road Aylesford	£2m (required)	£1.3m	£3.3m
TOTALS	£8.9m	£3.066m	£11.966m

Table 2: Funding Breakdown

3. Associated Risks:

3.1 Risks remain with the delivery of this programme and are identified below:

3.2 **Project 1:** Land requirement was the biggest risk in the delivery of this scheme. Meetings have been held with the land owner, Secretary of State representative and KCC to discuss a way forward. An 'Agreement in Principal' has been reached and although this remains a risk until heads of terms are signed, this is now a **low risk**.

- 3.3 **Project 2:** Due to its' constrained environment, the need to acquire third party land to deliver this scheme is essential. This also requires 'Traffic Regulation Orders' to alter existing access to side roads. In order to successfully deliver benefits on this corridor, support must be given and gained by Members and the local community. However, based on previous experience in relation to support for a scheme that requires land to be delivered and the need for land acquisition can be an emotive subject, this could result in negative feedback. The need to acquire third party land through Compulsory Purchase (CPO) powers, would mean a protracted process and would significantly impact on the timeframe for delivery. Therefore, this scheme remains a **high risk**.
- 3.4 **Project 3:** In order to deliver this project, vegetation requires removing and an existing 'listed' ragstone wall requires to be taken down and re-sited. A planning application needs to be submitted accordingly, this could generate objections although it must be noted that any vegetation removed can be replanted and the existing ragstone will be used and replaced where necessary. A commission has been issued to develop the feasibility design through to detailed design and this will be completed in July 2019. Early engagement has identified support for this scheme and therefore this is a **medium/low risk**.
- 3.5 **Project 4:** The main risk with this scheme relates to the statutory undertaker apparatus diversionary works. Liaison continues with the relevant undertakers to understand the impact on their apparatus and the estimate for undertaking diversionary works. Land owners have indicated their 'Approval in Principal' to 'gift' the required land. This project will remain a **medium risk** until utility alterations are fully understood.

4. Conclusion

- 4.1 Kent County Council presents this report to Members for information. They must recognise the risks associated with the delivery of this package of works and understand the timing constraint of spending the Local Growth Fund contributions by the end of March 2021.
- 4.2 KCC will keep Members and the board updated at key milestones throughout the next stages.
- 4.3 KCC also recognises the emotive nature of the acquisition of third-party land and will engage with the Local Members and affected parties accordingly. The improvements are aimed to address the current congestion and future growth and benefit all highway users.