



Steve Clarke  
Senior Planner  
**Maidstone Borough Council**  
Maidstone Planning Department  
King Street  
Maidstone  
Kent  
ME15 6JQ

**Highways and Transportation**

Ashford Highway Depot  
4 Javelin Way  
Ashford  
TN24 8AD

**Tel:** 03000 418181

**Email:** peter.rosevear@kent.gov.uk

**Date:** 5th March 2014

**Application Reference - MA/06/2197**  
**Location - Land at Boughton Lane, Maidstone**  
**Proposal - Erection of 220 residential dwellings together with access, parking, landscaping, and ancillary works on land at Boughton Lane, and provision of new playing fields for New Line Learning Academy**

Dear Steve,

Thank you for your consultation in relation to the above planning application. I have the following comments to make with respect to highway matters :-

The physical layout of the housing site access onto Boughton Lane appears to follow the appropriate design guidance in terms of its visibility, utilising the former construction access for the Academy. A secondary access point is shown further south on Boughton Lane, which also has visibility in compliance with the Manual for Streets. The parking provision appears appropriate, and has been approved by Maidstone Borough Council

This site is on the edge of the urban area. There are education and shopping facilities relatively close, so it is important that the proposal includes a connection for pedestrians to the existing footway at the Academy entrance to the north, and also to the footpaths through the housing area on the western side of Boughton Lane to Norrington Road and out to Loose Road. A cycle route is proposed to connect to the Academy entrance. Cyclists could then follow a route northwards via Pheasant Lane to cross the A274 and head for the town centre on residential roads east of the A229 Loose Road (and north of The Wheatsheaf)

My main concern lies with the assessment of the impact of the additional traffic at the A229 Loose Road/Boughton Lane/Cripple Street junction. The Transport Assessment suggests that the traffic coming and going from the site would be split 73% to the north and 27% to the south. My expectation is that a much higher proportion would be heading to and from the Loose Road junction, as the route to the south towards Boughton Monchelsea is narrow and tortuous. This is particularly relevant to the peak hours flows. In the morning, the majority of the journeys are likely to be work and school related, while in the evening there will be a combination of returning work, leisure, and shopping trips.

The assessment of the A229 junction therefore becomes more critical, as the junction already experiences congestion at busy times for both main road and side road traffic. The traffic

signals were introduced in association with applications for the New Line Academy and redevelopment of part of the Y Centre site in Melrose Close off Cripple Street to manage the competing flows, so that the side road traffic had more chance to pull out onto the A229, This has caused additional delays on the A229, although this is partly offset in the morning peak by the more managed feed of inbound traffic to the A229/A274 junction at The Wheatsheaf.

Further traffic would add to this congestion, and would come on top of that from the permitted primary school at the Academy site. My expectation is that the Transport Assessment, although it looks to encourage walking and cycling (including pedestrian access to the frequent bus services on Loose Road) understates this impact that the Loose Road/Boughton Lane/Cripple Street junction will suffer.

The issue is then whether the additional level of congestion would be acceptable to us as the highway authority, set in the context of our great concern about the difficulty in creating an overall transport strategy for all of Maidstone in the light of long term future development envisaged in the emerging Local Plan.

If we were to regard, as a worst case scenario, all the traffic likely to be generated by the housing development as having to pass through the Loose Road/Boughton Lane/Cripple Street junction, it would amount to approximately 100 vehicles in the morning peak and 120 vehicles in the evening. On an incremental basis, this would be a substantial increase in flows on Boughton Lane - over 30% in the morning (measured against the October 2011 flows in Table 6.2 of the TA) and approaching 50% in the evening. Inevitably this would cause additional delay for drivers coming in and out of Boughton Lane. In practical terms, we would still manage the junction to protect the capacity of the A229 as far as possible, so we are unlikely to consider adding more time to the Boughton Lane arm of the junction.

The scope to make improvements to the junction to increase its capacity has also been the subject of discussions with another developer in association with a potential housing site west of Loose Road on Cripple Street. This has led to a proposal by our consultancy partner Amey that a short commission, to be jointly funded by the two developments, could be carried out to assess how far the exiting capacity could be enhanced. The total cost of such a commission would be some £5,000, so we would seek a contribution from the Boughton Lane development of £2,500.

We recognise that any achievable capacity improvements are likely to be helpful but minor in nature. Should the application be granted, it would cause more delay for existing local residents and parents taking children to and from the Academy and permitted primary school.

KCC Highways & Transportation recognises that there will be a cumulative impact of any additional traffic in an already congested area. We would wish to maintain a consistent position at this stage, prior to the adoption of the Borough Council's Local Plan and the eventual emergence of an agreed Integrated Transport Strategy, with our views on other applications on the A229/A274 corridor south of the town centre. In particular, we have sought contributions of £3,000 per dwelling from the housing sites on Sutton Road towards strategic transport improvements, and would make the same request from this development.

**I would therefore like to make no objection to the application, subject to the following financial issues :-**

1)A S106 contribution of £3,000 per dwelling is sought towards future strategic transport improvements.

2)A £2,500 contribution is sought towards a commission to assess options for capacity

improvements at the A229/Boughton Lane/Cripple Street junction.

3)A sum of £3,000 is paid to KCC to pursue the extension of the 30 mph on Boughton Lane south to cover to site access

**and that the following conditions are attached to permission, if granted :-**

a)A shared use pedestrian cycle route, as described in the Transport Assessment, is constructed from the site access north to the Academy site entrance

b)Pedestrian links are made from the site to existing public footpaths

c)Appropriate wheel washing facilities are used during construction to prevent mud and debris being deposited on the highway

d)A Travel Pan for the site is implemented and monitored according to the proposed Framework

Could you also please add the KCC Transportation & Development Standard INFORMATIVE: It is the responsibility of the applicant to ensure , before the development hereby approved is commenced, that all necessary highway approvals and consents where required are obtained and that the limits of highway boundary are clearly established in order to avoid any enforcement action being taken by the Highway Authority. The applicant must also ensure that the details shown on the approved plans agree in every aspect with those approved under legislation and common law. It is therefore important for the applicant to contact KCC Highways and Transportation to progress this aspect of the works prior to commencement on site.)

Yours sincerely,

**Peter Rosevear**  
Strategic Transport & Development Planner

David Brazier  
Cabinet Member for Environment & Transport



Cllr Annabelle Blackmore  
Leader of Maidstone Borough Council  
Maidstone House  
King Street  
Maidstone  
Kent  
ME15 6JQ

Members' Suite  
Sessions House  
County Hall  
Maidstone  
Kent  
ME14 1XQ  
Tel: 01622 694434  
Fax: 01622 694212  
E-mail: [members\\_desk@kent.gov.uk](mailto:members_desk@kent.gov.uk)

Date: 10<sup>th</sup> September 2014

Dear Annabelle,

I write to clarify any uncertainty about the Highway Authorities' position on the A274 Sutton Road in so far as it relates to the three recently granted planning consents and the Transport Strategy.

I am sure you are aware that the scale and location of development proposed by the Borough Council through the emerging Local Plan has changed dramatically in the last two years. Furthermore, two separate Joint Transportation Board meetings on the 24<sup>th</sup> October 2012 and 3<sup>rd</sup> September 2014 have clearly expressed nearly unanimous opposition to the concept of widening Sutton Road for a bus lane. Indeed, the JTB comprehensively rejected the whole Transport Strategy itself in October 2012. Please therefore be in no doubt that Kent County Council as Local Highway Authority will neither support nor permit either the widening of the carriageway itself for traffic use, nor the prioritisation for public transport on this corridor. To do so would be a waste of significant developer contributions which may be put to better use in the area once the Transport Strategy is agreed. In particular I believe we should keep the option open to us of using as much private sector funding as possible for a relief/upgraded road near Leeds and Kingswood which I hope we can begin to discuss in more detail as we work together through the JTB to develop the Transport Strategy.

Yours sincerely

David Brazier

**MAIDSTONE BOROUGH COUNCIL**

**MAIDSTONE JOINT TRANSPORTATION BOARD**

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON MONDAY 22 FEBRUARY  
2016**

**Present:** Councillor Burton (Chairman), and  
Councillors Ash, Bird, Mrs Blackmore, Brown, Carter,  
Chittenden, Clark, Cooke, Cuming, Daley, English,  
Hotson, T Sams, Vizzard, Willis and J.A. Wilson

**Also Present:** Councillors Mrs Gooch, Mrs Ring, Springett  
and Mrs Wilson

135. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

It was noted that apologies for absence had been received from Councillors Fort and Stockell.

136. NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

It was noted that Councillor Blackmore substituted for Councillor Fort.

137. NOTIFICATION OF VISITING MEMBERS

The following Visiting Members were in attendance:

- Councillor Gooch to speak on item 11
- Councillor Ring to speak on items 12 and 14
- Mr Balfour and Councillor F. Wilson were in attendance as observers.

138. DISCLOSURES BY MEMBERS AND OFFICERS

There were no disclosures by Members or Officers.

139. DISCLOSURES OF LOBBYING

It was noted that all Members had been lobbied on item 14.

Councillors Bird, Burton and Cooke disclosed that they had been lobbied on item 12.

140. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON MONDAY 7 DECEMBER 2015

The democratic services officer advised the Board of an error in recording the name of a speaker.

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the meeting held on 7 December 2015 be approved as a correct record and signed subject to the following amendment:

At paragraph 131 on page 5, that the name Mr David Bates be removed, and Mr Donald Bates inserted.

141. PETITIONS (IF ANY)

There were no petitions.

142. QUESTIONS/STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Mr Bob Hinder stated that bikes and all-terrain vehicles were disturbing the Boxley Warren area, and attempts to tackle this had resulted in instances of anti-social behaviour. Mr Hinder requested reconsideration of the design of the current entrance.

Mr Carter arrived at 5.11 p.m.

Mr Donald Bates stated that the partial closure of Cranborne Avenue would not reduce the lengthening queues travelling north towards the town. Mr Bates raised concerns regarding the level of pollution in the Wheatsheaf area.

143. REPORT OF THE KCC HEAD OF TRANSPORTATION - VERBAL UPDATE ON PETITIONS SUBMITTED TO KENT HIGHWAY SERVICES

The Chairman had noted that the petitions received to the previous meeting regarding the closure of Cranborne Avenue would be addressed by item 14.

Kirstie Williams, KCC Mid Kent Highways Manager, provided an update on the petition regarding the junction of Old Tovil Road with Postley and Hayle Road. The Board was advised that Councillors Rob Bird and Dan Daley had agreed an investigation into crossing options funded by their combined grant, with an update on findings to be brought to the next meeting.

Tim Read, KCC Head of Highways and Transportation, provided an update on the petition regarding the proposed Leeds-Langley relief road. It was explained that the previous meeting of the Board had resolved to develop the justification for the relief road and sources of funding.

144. REPORT OF THE KCC HEAD OF TRANSPORTATION - JTB AGREEMENT VERBAL UPDATE

Kirstie Williams, Mid Kent Highways Manager, advised that consensus had not been reached across the JTBS regarding the issue of parish representative voting rights, and that the Board could move forward independently with its own arrangements.

It was noted that the Board would like to include two parish representatives, and that the agreement required updating as per Maidstone's governance change.

The Chairman advised the Board that the JTB agreement stated that, subject to procedural rules outlined in the agreement, the host Council's procedural rules would apply to JTB meetings as if they were Council committees. It was put forward that questions and statements from members of the public should therefore be administered as per the Council's procedures.

**RESOLVED:**

- 1) That a draft updated JTB agreement including the suggestions made be considered at the next meeting of the Board.
- 2) That a question or statement may only be asked if notice has been given by delivering it in writing (including by electronic mail) to the proper officer no later than close of the office one clear working day (ignoring the date of the meeting i.e. two days) before the day of the meeting.

145. REPORT OF KCC'S HEAD OF COUNTYWIDE IMPROVEMENTS - HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT SCHEMES

The report was for information only.

A Member made reference to the pedestrian crossing on Marden Road. It was requested that Ms Williams look into the matter and provide details to the Member.

Councillor Gooch spoke on the item as a visiting member.

**RESOLVED:** That the report be noted.

146. REPORT OF THE KCC HEAD OF HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION - REQUEST FOR A 18 TONNE WEIGHT LIMIT ON WILLINGTON STREET AND AN ALTERNATIVE REQUEST FOR POSITIVE SIGNING OF ALL MOTORWAY TRAFFIC TO USE WILLINGTON STREET

The report was for information only.

Councillor Ring spoke on the item as a visiting Member.

During discussion it was raised that the proposed Leeds-Langley Relief Road would provide a solution to the traffic on Willington Street in the long term.

**RESOLVED:** That the report be noted.

147. REPORT OF THE KCC HEAD OF HIGHWAYS, TRANSPORTATION AND WASTE - SAFE AND SENSIBLE STREET LIGHTING UPDATE

Rob Clarke, KCC LED Street Lighting Programme Manager, introduced the report detailing areas that had been identified for removal of street lighting.

Mr Clarke explained that:

- Street lights had been switched off in certain areas as a trial, and there had been minimal or no negative impact.
- The cost of maintenance, column replacement and running of the street lights would double the cost of removal.
- The aim was to remove the identified street lights before conversion of the current lanterns to LED (light emitting diode) took place.
- Conversion to LED would save money and reduce carbon emissions.

In response to questions it was stated that:

- The programme for conversion to LED across Kent would start in March and take up to fourteen months to complete. Maidstone would be within the last three of nine districts to be converted.
- New building developments would require street lighting to be reconsidered.

**RESOLVED:**

That the KCC Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport be recommended to remove the street lights identified in the report of the KCC LED Street Lighting Programme Manager.

For – 15      Against – 0      Abstain – 0

148. REPORT OF THE KCC HEAD OF TRANSPORTATION - A229 LOOSE ROAD CORRIDOR STUDY, MAIDSTONE

Councillor Sams left the meeting at 6.12 p.m. Councillor Gooch substituted for Councillor Sams.

Brendan Wright introduced the report outlining proposals arising from a review of the A229 corridor.

It was explained that removal of the Cranbourne Avenue egress and a partial conversion of Cranborne Avenue to one-way eastbound was expected to increase green time to 17 seconds, and allow an additional 340 vehicles through the junction per hour.

During discussion the following points were made:



- Members had received communication from members of the public objecting to the proposed removal of the Cranborne Avenue egress.
- Modelling should be undertaken to demonstrate the effect of the conversion of Cranborne Avenue on nearby roads.
- The measures proposed were interim not exhaustive, and could be brought forward quickly and cost effectively without impacting further measures.

**RESOLVED:**

That the following measures be approved:

1. Loose Road/Upper Stone Street/Sheals Crescent  
Proposed lane marking alterations.
2. Sheals Crescent to Armstrong Road  
Proposed alterations to lane allocations and pedestrian crossing arrangements.
3. Bus Stops  
Proposed relocation and removal of bus stops.

For – 15      Against – 0      Abstain - 0

**RESOLVED:**

That option three, the proposed removal of the Cranborne Avenue egress and partial conversion of Cranborne Avenue to one way eastbound, be dismissed.

For – 11      Against – 0      Abstain – 4

149. REPORT OF THE KCC HEAD OF TRANSPORTATION - RESULTS OF THE VISUM TRANSPORT MODELLING

Stephen Whittaker from AMEY provided a presentation on the results of recent VISUM transport modelling. The model projected up to a midpoint of 2022, this being the year of the Local Plan review, and worked on the assumption that 14,034 of the 18,560 independently assessed housing need would be in place by that midpoint.

In response to questions it was explained that:

- KCC had not worded or approved the Draft Integrated Transport Strategy, however officers at KCC and MBC had been in conversation regarding the contents of the Strategy.

- The modelling gave a broad network-wide picture, and demonstrated a level of impact on the highway network that would not be regarded as severe in the context of the National Planning Policy Framework.
- Four potential routes for the Leeds-Langley relief road had been identified, but no formal technical work or environmental studies had been undertaken.
- It was raised that the Draft Integrated Transport Strategy had been expected to come to a special meeting of the Board in January, but this did not occur as Officers and Members were in agreement that this would be too early for the relevant modelling to be completed.

The KCC Head of Transportation advised that an additional paragraph had not been included in the report as the authors had not anticipated the confusion the report would cause. A verbal update was provided as follows:

The modelling undertaken for the 2022 scenario provides Members with a broad network-wide picture in terms of average journey time increases above 2014 levels, and a framework upon which to base the transport strategy over that time period. Members should note that this does not mean that the impact of the 14,043 new dwellings will be the same across the whole network. It also does not mean that individual planning applications can now be considered as acceptable in highway terms, as these must continue to be assessed on their own merits.

For clarity, the position of KCC as Highway Authority as stated in July 2015 that allocating further growth in the south and south east sector of the town would have an unacceptably severe impact on the highway network remains valid. These sectors of the town are the most severely constrained by highway capacity and the most disproportionately affected by the Local Plan proposals for new housing.

As referred to in the report (page 47, paragraphs 4.4 and 5.2) a relief road connecting the A20 to the A274 around Leeds and Langley remains the most effective solution to congestion in this particular part of the town. However, there is a much greater degree of uncertainty concerning the funding and provision of this solution than with the package of local highway improvements in the other sectors of the town. This further emphasises the need for constraint in this area and makes the early completion of the necessary preparatory work for the scheme imperative in the period up to 2022.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the report be noted.

For – 15

Against – 0

Abstain - 0

2. That the Draft Integrated Transport Strategy be considered at the next available meeting of the Board after the conclusion of consultation.

For – 15      Against – 0      Abstain - 0

3. That the initial work on options for the Leeds Langley relief road, including potential routes, costings and research on funding, be brought to the meeting of the Board on 20 April 2016.

For – 15      Against – 0      Abstain - 0

150. INTEGRATED TRANSPORT STRATEGY: PUBLIC TRANSPORT PROGRESS

Paul Spooner, the interim Director of Planning and Development, introduced the report setting out the progress made on public transport interventions.

Mr Spooner told the Board that:

- Work had been undertaken with public transport operators to improve the quality and frequency of services. Proposals from operators had included subsidies.
- There was a proposal to refresh the bus station in Maidstone which included its becoming self-financing. The Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Officers would liaise to arrange a date for further detail to come to the Board.

Concerns raised by the Board included the recent stopping of a Park and Ride service and fair pricing for public transport within the Borough.

**RESOLVED**: That the report be noted.

151. DURATION OF MEETING

5.02 p.m. to 8.09 p.m.



Maria Stasiak, Decision Officer  
Planning Casework Division  
Dept. for Communities and Local Government  
3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Fry Building  
2 Marsham Street  
London, SW1P 4DF

**BY EMAIL ONLY**

**Growth, Environment and Transport**

Room 1.62  
Sessions House  
MAIDSTONE  
Kent ME14 1XQ

Phone: 03000 415981  
Ask for: Barbara Cooper  
Email: [Barbara.Cooper@kent.gov.uk](mailto:Barbara.Cooper@kent.gov.uk)  
Ref: GT/BC/JAC  
Date: 21 July 2016

Dear Ms. Stasiak

**LAND AT BOUGHTON LANE, LOOSE, MAIDSTONE, KENT, ME15 9QL  
REF: APP/U2235/A/14/2227839**

I refer to your letter dated 19 June 2016, in which you invite new representations in relation to the Secretary of State's further consideration of the above planning application.

I write to set out the position of Kent County Council, in its capacity as Local Highway Authority, on account of a material change in circumstances since the planning appeal (ref: APP/U2235/A/2227839) was considered by the Secretary of State.

The County Council did not appear at the public local inquiry previously held from 7-10 July 2015 as no highway related objections had been raised to the proposed development<sup>1</sup>. The County Council, at that time, did not have the evidence available to substantiate the concerns raised regarding the worsening of congestion on the local highway network and had instead sought mitigation of impact through financial contributions towards improvements secured via S106 Agreement.

Following the closure of the inquiry, the findings of traffic modelling work jointly commissioned by the County Council and Maidstone Borough Council to inform the emerging Maidstone Local Plan became available. These were founded on a strategic VISUM transport model that was used to test options relating to the transport interventions that could be implemented alongside

---

<sup>1</sup> KCC Highways & Transportation consultation comments, 5 March 2014

planned housing and employment development. Several model runs were undertaken to simulate highway network conditions during peak periods and provide an understanding of the associated impacts on network performance, expressed as total travel distance and total travel time.

The first set of modelling results was presented to the Maidstone Joint Transportation Board (made up of both County Council and Borough Council members) in July 2015<sup>2</sup>. They highlighted how the quantum and spatial distribution of growth envisaged within the Local Plan could result in travel time increases of up to 38% by 2031 in the absence of effective mitigation. Although the scale of impact varied across individual routes, the A229 and A274 corridors in south and south east Maidstone were identified as being the worst affected by additional development traffic.

Since this evidence became available the County Council has raised strong objections to any emerging Local Plan allocation or speculative planning application for major development on the south and south eastern approaches to Maidstone town centre (i.e. the A229 and A274). This is on the basis that the **cumulative** impact of recently completed (or consented) development would have an **unacceptably severe impact** on the local highway network without there being sufficient certainty that strategic mitigation can be provided and funded.

Over the intervening period the County Council has strongly objected to planning applications for major residential development at land north of Bicknor Wood, Sutton Road (15/509251/OUT), land at Bicknor Farm, Sutton Road (14/506264/FULL and 16/503775/FULL) and land south of Sutton Road (15/509015/OUT).

This planning application for new residential development at Boughton Lane is predicted to result in up to 100 additional vehicle movements in the morning peak and up to 120 additional vehicle movements in the evening peak at the congested A229 Loose Road/Boughton Lane/Cripple Street junction<sup>3</sup>. This will worsen delays on the A229 corridor and there is no identified form of improvement that can demonstrably mitigate this impact.

A piecemeal approach that seeks to create further capacity at this junction in isolation is unlikely to be appropriate in view of the **cumulative** effects of additional traffic on congestion across the wider network.

On this basis the County Council, as local Highway Authority, now wishes to register its objection to this planning application on account of the **severe**

---

<sup>2</sup> Joint Transportation Board Agenda Item 10: Results of the VISUM Transport Modelling, 22 July 2015

<sup>3</sup> Table 4.9 Transport Assessment, December 2013

worsening of congestion and delay that would arise as a result of these additional vehicle movements.

The County Council regards this change of circumstances to be highly pertinent to any re-determination of the planning application, having regard to the weight that was afforded to traffic congestion in the Secretary of State's previous dismissal of the appeal<sup>4</sup>.

Yours sincerely,



**Barbara Cooper**

Corporate Director – Growth, Environment and Transport

Cc. Mr. R Jarman, Head of Planning and Development, Maidstone Borough Council

---

<sup>4</sup> Secretary of State Decision letter, 3 March 2016