MINUTES of the Joint Transportation Board held at the Council Chamber, Town Hall, Royal Tunbridge Wells, TN1 1RS on Monday 18 July 2016

PRESENT: Borough Councillors Bulman (Chairman), Backhouse, Lidstone, Simmons, Stanyer and Woodward
County Councillors Hoare, Holden and Oakford
Parish Councillor Mackonochie

OTHER MEMBERS PRESENT: Councillor McDermott

OFFICERS: Nick Baldwin (Senior Traffic Engineer), Earl Bourner (District Manager for Tunbridge Wells), David Candlin (Head of Economic Development), Michael Hardy (Schemes Project Engineer), Vicki Hubert (Strategic Transport Planner), Bartholomew Wren (Economic Development Officer) and Mark O'Callaghan (Democratic Services Officer)

APOLOGIES
TB1/16 Apologies for absence were received from County Councillors Davies, King and Scholes.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST
TB2/16 There were no disclosable pecuniary or other significant interests declared at the meeting.

NOTIFICATION OF VISITING MEMBERS WISHING TO SPEAK
TB3/16 There were no Visiting Members who had registered as wishing to speak.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING DATED 15 FEBRUARY 2016
TB4/16 Members reviewed the minutes. No amendments were proposed.

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the meeting dated 15 February 2016 be approved as a correct record.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING DATED 18 APRIL 2016
TB5/16 Members reviewed the minutes. No amendments were proposed.

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the meeting dated 18 April 2016 be approved as a correct record.

TUNBRIDGE WELLS TRACKER FOR JULY 2016
TB6/16 The Board considered the Tunbridge Wells Tracker for July 2016. Comments were made in respect of the Tracker Items as follows:

Tracker Item 1 – St. John’s Road: Cycle Route Improvements: Covered under agenda item 9.
Tracker Item 2 – Grosvenor Bridge Repairs:
No further update.

Tracker Item 3 – Crescent Road crossing refuge:
The Chairman advised that following correspondence with the County Cabinet Member, Councillor Balfour, funding had been secured for this item. Copies would be circulated to members.

Michael Hardy, Schemes Project Engineer, KCC, confirmed and added that the scheme would be commissioned to consultants for implementation by the end of the financial year. Councillor Bulman asked that officers liaise with Jane Fenwick of the Royal Tunbridge Wells Town Forum who represented residents in the area to ensure the best siting of the crossing.

Tracker Item 4 – Carrs Corner / Calverley Park Gardens:
Mrs Avey Bhatia had registered to speak on behalf of Calverley Park Gardens Residents’ Association.

Mrs Bhatia commented that the Residents’ Association had primarily been formed to address traffic issues which was making life unpleasant and dangerous. Calverley Park Gardens was a residential road with high pedestrian and cycle usage. The road was being used by an inappropriate number of fast-moving vehicles trying to avoid the Royal Oak traffic lights. Vehicles using this cut-through were contributing to dangerous conditions on the road and congestion around the junctions at either end. Heavy goods vehicles were damaging road infrastructure. The Residents’ Association would welcome signage at both ends of Calverley Park Gardens directing heavy good vehicles to use the main road as had been discussed with County Councillor Scholes following the previous meeting. Further work would be necessary to reduce the number of vehicles, it was imperative that Carrs Corner be redesigned taking account of all adjoining roads. There was an immediate need to reduced speeds, plans for widespread 20mph speed restrictions were welcomed and the Residents’ Association would welcome Calverley Park Gardens becoming an early adopter.

Councillor Bulman commented that Calverley Park Gardens was part of a wider issue which included the Royal Oak junction, any redirecting of traffic away from Calverley Park Gardens would have a knock on effect elsewhere.

Vicky Hubert, Strategic Transport Planner, KCC, commented that a survey had been undertaken in response to previous concerns of the JTB in relation to Carrs Corner and the wider area. The survey had allowed a model to be created that tested various alterations to the junction and adjoining roads. In each case the alternations had a significantly detrimental affect on the traffic flow on Pembury Road. Therefore, the decision had been taken to review the Royal Oak junction to see whether improvements could be made there. Improved traffic flow at the Royal Oak junction could relieve pressure on Calverley Park Gardens. It was expected that the review would be completed by August 2016.

Councillor Lidstone commented that despite improved traffic flows there would still be an incentive for vehicles to avoid the lights controlled junction. He asked whether a no right turn onto Calverley Park Gardens for heavy goods vehicles had been considered. Ms Hubert confirmed that Calverley Park Gardens had not been modelled in isolation but when combined with other restrictions there was a detrimental effect on Pembury Road.
Councillor Bulman welcomed a review of the Royal Oak junction and signs confirming the correct route of the A264 but asked what could be done to ensure people were not using Calverley Park Gardens as a short cut. Mr Hardy advised that restrictions could theoretically be implemented but it would be a lengthy and expensive process, there was insufficient funding to start the investigation work. Councillor Bulman questioned what investigation would be required and commented that the intention of discouraging people from using Calverley Park Gardens was known. Mr Hardy noted that as a ‘B’ classified highway proper investigations would be needed to demonstrate that any restrictions would not be disproportionately detrimental to other routes. In response to further enquiries from Councillor Bulman, Mr Hardy advised that without the proper process any signs would only be advisory.

Councillor Stanyer commented that many people tended to follow Sat-Nav devices which direct vehicles along the quickest route. He doubted whether anything could be done to alter the routing. Councillor Lidstone advised that Calverley Park Gardens had been incorrectly labelled as the A264, whilst the mistake had been corrected the damage had been done and would take time for the correction to feed through.

Councillor Bulman asked why it was not possible to simply put no right turn from Pembury Road to Calverley Park Gardens. Mr Hardy explained that it could not be done without the investigatory evidence to demonstrate that it would not have a detrimental effect on traffic flow on Pembury Road. Such an investigation could cost up to £10,000.

Councillor Woodward sought to confirm that it was possible to investigate improvements to the Royal Oak junction which could help reduce use of Calverley Park Gardens. Councillor Bulman commented that any improvements to the junction would not stop people from taking the short cut. In summing up Councillor Bulman asked officers to consult with County Councillors to see what funding could be available to pursue the matter.

Parish Councillor Mackonochie added that ways of making the route unpalatable could be considered such as removing the parking restrictions. The increased parked vehicles would inevitably slow the traffic. Nick Baldwin, Senior Traffic Engineer, TWBC advised against such action which would have a detrimental effect on the cycle route.

**Tracker Item 5 – Hawkhurst Traffic Lights:**
Earl Bourner, District Manager for Tunbridge Wells, KCC, advised that the Cranbrook Road section of the junction had been resurfaced and the box junction removed. The new layout was now in place and would be monitored.

**Tracker Item 6 – Upper Grosvenor Road:**
Mr Hardy advised that investigations commenced the previous week. Unfortunately Southern Gas Networks were undertaking works in the area which would delay the start of the traffic surveys.

**Tracker Item 7 – Pedestrian crossings in Major York’s Road and Langton Road:**
Mr John Barber had registered to speak on behalf of Friends of the Tunbridge Wells and Rusthall Commons.
Mr Barber reminded members of the progress to date and noted that all indications so far had suggested the progression of the Major York’s Road crossing. The latest update showed that the works would no longer be competed due to funding being reallocated. A comparison was made to the Crescent Road crossing and he asked whether KCC’s decision was taken in the knowledge of County Councillor Scholes’ agreement to help fund the project. He sought clarification as to why the design works for the Langton Road crossing had been completed by KCC despite it being reported that both crossings were being progressed by the contractor Amey and also when KCC first became aware of the deviation from the documented position. Mr Barber commented that he was aware of concerns expressed by Greg Clark MP and questioned whether the Joint Transportation Board was receiving the timelines, quality and transparency of information necessary to perform its function. This state of affairs was indicative of a wider problem which needed review. The Major York’s crossing was an established local priority that should not be lost to ‘administrative fudging’ by KCC.

Mr Hardy was unable to comment on the reasons why but confirmed that funding for the Langton Road crossing and Major York’s Road crossing had been reallocated. They had been treated as separate projects and both had been reassessed at the last round of funding bids. There was a considerable cost in time and money in pursuing the necessary land negotiations, the Langton Road crossing had scored much more highly and was successful, Major York’s Road crossing was unsuccessful.

Councillor Backhouse was disappointed and advised members that he had had conversations with County Councillor Scholes who had expressed his intention to put his Members’ Grant towards the scheme. The crossing, having been previously reported as accepted, was widely expected in the local community and the decision to cancel would not be popular.

Councillor Stanyer commented that the manner in which this had been handled was disgraceful and the Board should not accept the explanation given. Councillor Bulman suggested that a letter be written to the County Cabinet Member, Councillor Balfour, in a similar vein as the letter regarding Crescent Road crossing. Members agreed.

RESOLVED – That, subject to the comments made during the debate, the Tunbridge Wells Tracker be noted.

TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS - OBJECTIONS RECEIVED

TB7/16 Proposals pertaining to Camden Park, The Shaw and The Meads were discussed.

Mary Ollett, resident of The Shaw, Royal Tunbridge Wells, had registered to speak.

Mrs Ollett had objected to the proposals on the basis that it would not address the problems caused by excessive numbers of AXA PPP employees parking in the area. Fifty houses on Camden Park, The Meads and The Shaw were all accessed via a single narrow road, effectively forming a large cul-de-sac. People were parking dangerously on bends and opposite driveways restricting visibility and access. On average fifty to seventy cars could be counted parked in the road and the situation had been exacerbated by the transfer of a further two hundred employees to the International House site.
The promised parking relief had not been delivered. The road entrance was only narrow so when there were cars parked it restricted access and blocked the road to delivery and emergency vehicles. Council owned car parks usually allowed a five metre turning area into spaces but with the cars parked opposite driveways there was only a two and a half metre turning area. The proposed restrictions on corners was welcomed but did not go far enough, there needed to be restrictions opposite driveways, designated passing places and controls on the number of AXA PPP employees not-parking in the designated places. Members were reminded that despite having planning permission for a multi-storey car park AXA PPP had been able to drop the plan on the basis that it could accommodate all extra vehicles within existing facilities, this had proven not to be true as surrounding roads had been overtaken by excessive vehicles.

Councillor Bulman supported the comments of Mrs Ollett and commented that he had had conversations with senior managers at AXA PPP. Whilst they were responsive to specific issues with individual vehicles parked dangerously there remained a wider issue of simply too many vehicles. Further restrictions would force AXA PPP to either accommodate more vehicles within its facilities or encourage alternatives including car-sharing or use of public transport.

Andie Haycock, resident of Camden Park, Royal Tunbridge Wells, had registered to speak.

Mrs Haycock supported the proposals as cars were being parked dangerously, particularly on corners and bends with seemingly little regard for safety on a residential road. AXA PPP had promised to sort out the parking issues when they expanded but the problems had only gotten worse. Working from home she regularly saw near misses, vehicles having to mount the pavements in order to pass and children having difficulty crossing the road between parked cars. Whilst AXA PPP would respond to complaints about specific vehicles – which was a daily occurrence – there was no blanket policy of holding number plates so they could not always ensure a vehicle was moved. There was a wider issue that would need addressing, these proposals should be the first step.

Norma Russell, resident of Camden Park, Royal Tunbridge Wells, had registered to speak.

Mrs Russell commented that the road was residential with a high number of pedestrians cutting through to the town centre and children going to Claremont School. The density of the parked cars meant that there was no longer clear sight lines along the road as had originally been designed. There was very poor visibility and accessibility, vehicles were often forced to drive on pavements to avoid oncoming vehicles. The road was no longer compliant with Kent Highways Design Guides which required a minimum junction visibility of thirty three metres, cars were parked on junctions and on blind bends causing an obstruction. A lorry, forced to drive on the pavement, caused thousands of pounds worth of damage to underground gas pipes and the escaping gas posed a serious risk of explosion. Children could often be seen jumping out of the way as cars drove on the pavements or reversing avoiding other traffic. Emergency vehicles could not access the area. By not implementing the restrictions the Council would be complicit in allowing people to contravene the highway code and endangering people.
Nick Baldwin, Senior Traffic Engineer, TWBC, commented that the Council was trying to address the issues raised by the speakers. Proposals had been advertised which lead to a number of objections being received on the basis that it would simply move the problem elsewhere. The recommendation in the report to drop the current proposals what not an intention to drop the issue entirely but to allow focus on a wider proposal that would require further consultation with residents. Waiting for further consultation would delay any action for several months but would have the benefit of implementing a more comprehensive scheme. Members were asked to note the objections received as part of the consultation and the views expressed by the speakers and give a view whether it would be preferable to wait or to take action sooner rather than later.

Councillor Stanyer asked for clarification on the nature of the objections to the proposals. Mr Baldwin advised that the majority of comments in objection were from residents further into the estate where parking was less of an issue who felt that by implementing restrictions at the entrance to the estate it would push parking issues further along. He noted that the estate was essentially a large cul-de-sac and the further into the estate you travel the less traffic there was and the bends were less severe. The Parking department took the view that the most critical areas were the junctions and bends at the entrance to the estate.

Councillor Bulman asked whether single yellow lines along the continuation of the roads had been considered. Mr Baldwin noted that it had been considered as part of a wider scheme. He advised that double yellow lines would apply to everyone at all times so should be used at key points such as junctions. Single yellow lines could be tailored to address all-day parking but would require further work to ensure they would be effective.

Councillor Bulman recognised that the wider problem of excessive cars would need to be addressed but saw no reason why the initial proposals to address the safety concerns should not go ahead. Councillor Woodward asked to clarify whether the single yellow lines would be part of the presented proposals. Mr Baldwin commented that if the Board recommended proceeding with the proposals the double yellow lines on the junctions could go ahead as they had already been advertised, any further restrictions such as single yellow lines would require further consultation. Councillor Bulman summarised that the proposals as presented should be implemented but officers should proceed with developing further proposals forthwith. Members agreed.

**Proposals pertaining to Byng Road were discussed.**

Mr Tony Blackman, resident of Byng Road, Royal Tunbridge Wells, had registered to speak.

Mr Backman noted that Byng Road had always been busy, particularly with traffic to three schools but parking had not been a problem until more recently. The number of parked cars had increased significantly over the past few years, cars were parking starting from the eastern end of the road closest to town to approximately half the length of the road. Many of the cars parked all day carried parking permits from other areas and were not present at weekends suggesting that they were commuters into town. Parking was now at the point where cars were parked on both sides of the road restricting access and on pavements and encroaching across driveways, this meant that
cars could not access driveways, footpaths were blocked particularly for parents with pushchairs trying to get to schools and the block pavement was being damaged. Twice a day it was particularly dangerous if travelling against the flow of school traffic as there were no passing places and the bend was now blind due to the number of parked cars. The proposed restrictions would help alleviate the worst of the problems. Concerns that parking may be displaced to other roads may be countered by the fact that parked cars currently extend half way along the road, therefore any vehicles from the southern side of the eastern end would likely be transferred to the northern side of the western end of the road, there may also be a self-imposed limit on the distance commuters may be prepared to walk if they are unable to park at the eastern end of the road. Members were asked to endorse the proposals but to monitor the situation in surrounding roads and be prepared to take action there if necessary.

Dr Dorothea Holman, chairman of the Boyne Park Residents’ Association, had registered to speak.

Dr Holman commented that there had been a steady increase in the number of commuters parking in the unrestricted residential roads. Parking at weekends was also increasing. The prospect of residents’ permit parking had not been popular several years ago but that position had changed and nearly half were now in favour, the Residents’ Association had requested further information on permit parking but were yet to receive a response. The proposed restrictions would lead to an increase in parking in neighbouring areas where there were already problems with inconsiderate and dangerous parking blocking driveways, parking on double yellow lines where they believe they will not be enforced and damaging the red-brick pavements. The problem was likely to get worse once the Royal Wells Park development was finished as there was insufficient parking for visitors and staff. The Council was failing to meet its stated policy to, “ensure the appropriate infrastructure and enhance quality of life” by a lack of coordinated policy and actions on parking. The Residents’ Association was not opposed to the proposal on Byng Road except that it should be part of a wider coordinated proposal and not piecemeal.

Councillor Bulman noted the request for a coordinated approach and asked what the Residents’ Association would like to see for the whole area. Dr Holman suggested a restriction to residents only during certain hours to prevent all-day commuter parking but retaining freedom at other times.

Dr Robert Banks, resident of Molyneux Park Road, Royal Tunbridge Wells, had registered to speak.

Many of the residents in the area had no off-street parking. A detailed explanation of his objections had been set out in a letter to Members. The letter included the results of a traffic survey conducted following the introduction of restrictions on the Common which resulted in an increase in the number of car parking in this area. The data showed that roads were at or nearing capacity during the day with significantly fewer vehicles during the evening. This supported the view that it was predominantly commuters and people working in town. A further survey had been carried out in Byng Road the results of which showed an increase in the number of vehicles parked and between 10-11am the road was very close to maximum capacity. The Council had previously been asked for residents’ parking but had commented that there would not be a strong case for on-street parking restrictions where most
had off-street parking and the likely outcome would be to simply move non-residents to neighbouring roads. However, the present proposals would have that effect. There was insufficient space on the northern side of Byng Road to take the displaced vehicles from the southern side, therefore it was inevitable that those vehicles would have to park elsewhere. A local residents’ questionnaire identified that parking, congestion and safety were major concerns and there should be a full and integrated plan for the whole area before the planned proposals for 2018 and before the proposals for Byng Road.

Mr Baldwin commented that the situation in Byng Road was not dissimilar to the proposals for Camden Park except that the problem was caused by general workers and commuters rather than one specific employer. The problems on Byng Road were long standing having been raised to the Council’s attention before the restrictions on the Common took effect. The difference between Byng Road and its neighbours was the narrowness of the road which caused cars to park blocking access and on pavements. He felt that more cars could be accommodated than had been suggested but acknowledged that there would be some displacement of vehicles to other roads. Whilst there was the intention to look at the wider area there was a particular need on Byng Road to take action on safety grounds.

Councillor Stanyer commented that he was not happy with an incomplete proposal. AXA PPP should be challenged over its failure to take responsibility for the large influx of its staff but there was also inadequate parking within the town centre that was impacting on residential roads. The Council had access to very inexpensive borrowing and should use it to provide for the needs of the town. It had recently been demonstrated with the civic complex proposals that a car park would pay for itself in relatively short order. People, quite reasonably, want to park near where they live and where they work. One of the solutions would be to build a new car park. In any case there needed to be a strategic approach to parking issues which the present proposal was not.

In response to a question from Councillor Woodward, Mr Baldwin advised that the Parking Strategy had been adopted in April 2016 and the Council was now working on the early stages of implementing a number of schemes. He added that the expansion of residents’ permit zones was one such scheme and the zone covering this areas was expected to be implemented in 2017 although there were several resource issues to overcome. As was the case with the Camden Park proposals there were safety issues on Byng Road that could be addressed now rather than having to wait.

Councillor Woodward asked whether the proposals for Byng Road conformed with the Parking Strategy. Mr Baldwin commented that the Strategy did not prescribe specific actions but endorsed restrictions that benefit residents and preserve traffic flow, the proposals were not contrary to the Parking Strategy.

Councillor Bulman questioned whether building more car parks was the answer and suggested that the people parking in residential roads did so to avoid paying for parking.

Councillor Lidstone asked whether the Parking Strategy had looked at the pricing structure of car parks to maximise the number of people who park in the town centre, revenue and encouraging people away from parking in residential areas.
Councillor Bulman summarised the options and pressed Members for their view. Councillor Woodward supported the proposals on the basis that it was better to try and do something than to do nothing. Councillor Stanyer reiterated his concerns that there needed to be more significant action to address the root of the problem. Noting the concerns, Members agreed the proposals.

Proposals pertaining to Culverden Down, Culverden Avenue and Reynolds Lane were discussed.

Mr Baldwin advised that the proposals had been amended since a number of objections had been raised. Although the objections had not been formally withdrawn it was believed that the revised proposals were now supported.

Councillor Bulman asked Members whether the recommendation in the report was endorsed. Members agreed.

RESOLVED – That the Board endorsed the following course of action for each site:

i. Camden Park – Implement the proposals as advertised
ii. Byng Road – Implement the proposals as advertised
iii. Culverden Down – Amend the proposals as advertised to allow on-street parking to continue to take place on the southern side of the road

WAITING RESTRICTIONS REVIEW - CRANBROOK AND HAWKhurst

TB8/16 Nick Baldwin, Senior Traffic Engineer, TWBC, introduced the report which included the following comments:

- The report was for information.
- Over a period of time a number of issues had been identified with parking restrictions in Hawkhurst and Cranbrook.
- The Council was reviewing each of the restrictions, as part of which the local Members and Parish Councils had been contacted for their views.
- There was a particular issue in Hawkhurst as a result of the new Waitrose and their proposed reduction in the size of the car park.

Councillor Bulman noted that the reduction in parking spaces was likely to be coupled with an increase in usage.

County Councillor Holden sough clarification whether the issues in Cranbrook involved a number of parking restrictions not being legal. Mr Baldwin acknowledged that at least one restriction did not appear to be subject to a Traffic Regulation Order. However, the issues mainly related to a small number of examples dating back to the 1960’s that involved the regulations not matching the conditions on the ground.

County Councillor Holden noted that he was working with the officers on this matter and wanted to ensure that the liberal implementation of restrictions in rural areas be maintained. He added that wherever possible the narrower yellow lines should be used in rural areas as they were less intrusive. Restrictions on Stone Street, Cranbrook, should be lifted to allow parking which would help support the local traders. Mr Baldwin confirmed that any
changes to the restrictions would be subject to consultation. Line painting had recently been quoted for but could not be done piecemeal, if narrow lines were desired the whole town would have to be done which would be expensive.

The Chairman, Councillor Bulman, invited further questions. There being none, Members were asked to note the report.

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

**A26 TONBRIDGE TO TUNBRIDGE WELLS - PROPOSED CYCLE ROUTE DESIGN**

TB9/16 Bartholomew Wren, Economic Development Officer, TWBC, introduced the report which included the following comments:

- The Council had secured funding from the West Kent Local Sustainable Transport Fund to prepare detailed plans to improve the A26 cycle route.
- The design approach was based upon the following criteria:
  - Sought to provide a safe, coherent comfortable and attractive route that conformed to established cycle route design principles;
  - Provided segregated space where achievable;
  - Where segregated space was not achievable consider reducing traffic speeds as a means of improving perceived safety;
  - Application of London Red Route principles which sought through design and enforcement to minimise stopping to maintain traffic flow and enhanced priority for cyclists;
  - Take account of up to date guidance and legislation; and
  - Use of land that was within the ownership of Kent Highways with the exception of revisions at Southborough Common.
- The proposals included the following key features:
  - Where width was available existing advisory cycle lanes would be widened to provide mandatory lanes of a minimum 1.5 metres wide;
  - Revised geometry at side junctions, most of which included raised tables that provide an enhanced flush crossing arrangement for pedestrians, raised tables also helped to reduce the speed of vehicular turning movements;
  - Inclusion of two bus stop by-pass features north of the junction with Culverden Park and Pennington Road, Southborough;
  - Provision of continuous red surfacing throughout the scheme and all cycle lanes with priority for cyclist across side junctions;
  - Removal of two short sections of on-street parking on the western side of the A26 between Southfield Road and Beltring Road and between Still Lane and Holden Road;
  - Introduction of 20 mph limit on the A26 between Pennington Road and Holden Park Road;
  - Removal of the southbound bus lane between the Hand and Sceptre and the junction at Yew Tree Road [later corrected to Pennington Road] to allow for cycle lanes in both directions;
Improvement of segregated provision at Mabledon to include the extension of shared use provision and cycle paths both north and south bound; and
Provision of new shared use link on Quarry Hill within Tonbridge and Malling Borough.

- The cycle route proposals would be subject to further stakeholder consultation in addition to the consultations as part of the statutory process related to revised Traffic Regulation Orders that would be required to implement the proposals.
- The programme for delivery was not yet finalised although it was expected that the cycle route would be delivered in stages as funding became available and work could be planned appropriately into the KCC Highway Works Programme.
- It was anticipated that funding may become available in the near future from the Kent Sustainable Improvements Programme to deliver a first phase of the route in the current financial year.
- There was £80,000 secured from Section 106 agreements for the upgrade of the section of the route between Culverden Park and Queens Road.
- Feedback and support was sought regarding the scope and detail of the plan so these could be finalised to support funding bids and development related funding negotiations.

Councillor Woodwood clarified that the red surfacing was used to delineate the cycle route and asked what would be done to help drivers understand what they meant. Mr Wren commented that red surfacing was already used on much of the A26 route so the proposals were an extension of that, the red surface was distinctive and wearing well. There was poor understanding of the difference between advisory and mandatory cycle lanes, mandatory lanes are identified by a solid white line. Further measures would need to be considered, such as rumble strips within the white line.

Councillor Bulman asked how cyclists would traverse the new traffic lights at Yew Tree Road, there was concern that the recent improvements were not as effective as hoped. Mr Wren acknowledged there were constraints to what could be done without adversely affecting the traffic flow. Proposals include an advanced stop line for cyclists in a southbound direction and a feed in lane between Yew Tree Road and the turning at Speldhurst Road.

In response to a request for clarification from Councillor Simmons, Mr Wren confirmed that the removal of the southbound bus lane would be between the Hand and Sceptre and the junction with Pennington Road. Councillor Simmons noted that there was a wide grass verge alongside the bus lane and asked why it was not being used instead. Mr Wren commented that the land was part of Southborough Common and there were various restrictions against encroachment. Initial discussions with Southborough Town Council had demonstrated a resistance to using the land. Councillor Simmonds asked whether Southborough Town Council had opposed the removal of the bus lane. Mr Wren advised that the matter was under discussion.

Councillor Simmons commented that he supported the proposals but there was a section of the route where he had concerns. The report showed that where specific infrastructure was not possible a reduction in speed should be considered, however, there was a section of the route at the top of Southborough Common where the infrastructure disappeared and the speed increased to 40 mph. The section of road was dangerous, particularly during
rush hour. The scheme was inconsistent as there were sections of the route where the provision was excellent, but there was a gap at arguably the most dangerous part of the route. Mr Wren commented that a continuous and consistent route was the ideal but there were constraints. The section of road between the top of Southborough Common and Mabledon was too narrow and there was a lack of viable Highway land without prohibitively expensive civil engineering works. A shared use cycle path was considered but the dangers to cyclists crossing the carriageway and the detriment to traffic flow were too great. Finally, a reduction in speeds would only be possible with expensive traffic calming measures, simply reducing the speed limit to 30mph would not be effective.

Councillor Bulman commented that it should not be difficult to extend the existing 30mph limit from the Hand and Sceptre to Mabledon. Mr Wren agreed but added that the advise from the consultants was that it would be ineffective without further measures. Vicki Hubert, Strategic Transport Planner, KCC, added that these concerns would feed into the consultation process. Ultimately it would be for the Borough Council to decide to what extent it was able to implement the proposals. Councillor Bulman asked that a report be brought to a future meeting of the Joint Transportation Board exploring the implications of options for this section of the route.

Councillor Stanyer questioned whether there was any purpose in continuing with the proposals if there was not to be a continuous route. Mr Wren commented that the proposals were a balance between the possible and the achievable and provided the best achievable solution. The route between the Royal Tunbridge Wells town centre and Southborough was itself a significant enhancement, the continuation of the route to provide an inter-urban link with Tonbridge would be even better and anything to assist would be welcomed. It could be argued that those with the strength and stamina to cycle from Tonbridge to Tunbridge Wells were likely to do so whether there was the infrastructure or not.

Councillor Simmons reiterated that the strategy identified several options, either there should be dedicated cycle paths or there should be consideration to reduce the speed limit, as had been done on other parts of the route. It would be inconsistent in the policy to not do so for the section between Southborough Common and Mabledon.

Councillor Bulman agreed that a 30 mph limit would appear to be a common-sense approach in that area and should be explored further at a future meeting. Furthermore, there must be a number of cyclists wishing to travel from Bidborough or Southborough who would benefit from improved cycle infrastructure therefore it would be better to do something than nothing.

Councillor Lidstone supported the comments of Councillor Bulman and added that this was far from a pointless exercise, the proposals were ambitious. As a cyclist; the features such as raised tables would be very welcome. Many of the local people spoken to suggested that they would like to cycle but had serious safety concerns, segregation of cycle paths would go a long way overcoming many of those concerns. He noted that the plans did not include much completely separate paths and asked what more could be done to segregate the cycle lanes. Mr Wren commented that many methods of segregation had been considered during the process of developing the plans. Option include raised humps known as ‘Armadillos’, these were not currently
supported by Kent County Council on safety grounds, another option was to use rumble strips within the white lines. Considerations were ongoing.

The Chairman, Councillor Bulman, brought the discussion to a conclusion and asked Members whether the recommendations were supported.

**RESOLVED** –

1. That a report be brought to a future meeting exploring implications for a 30mph limit between Southborough Common and Mabledon.

2. That the principle of the A26 cycle route proposals and the implementation be endorsed.

**HIGHWAY WORKS PROGRAMME**

**TB10/16**  
Earl Bourner, District Manager for Tunbridge Wells, KCC, advised that a number of schemes were progressing and the report was for information but invited any questions.

In response to a question from Councillor Bulman, Mr Bourner was unable to confirm a date for resurfacing the A26.

Councillor Simmons commented that surface repairs on Speldhurst Road were substandard and were deteriorating quickly, although the defects had been reported there was no indication of when the repair works would be carried out. Councillor Bulman added that surfacing on the whole Yew Tree Road / Speldhurst Road junction was unacceptable. Mr Bourner confirmed that there was a design fault on the section which had been resurfaced and the contractors would be rectifying the problem in the first week of August 2016.

The Chairman, Councillor Bulman, invited further questions and comments. There being none, Members were asked to note the report.

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

**TOPICS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS**

**TB11/16**  
The Board considered items for future meetings and comments were made in respect of the proposals as follows:

**30mph speed limit between Southborough Common and Mabledon:**  
Councillor Bulman noted the item from the earlier discussion for exploring implications for a 30mph limit between Southborough Common and Mabledon.

**CAU encroachment on the pavement:**  
Councillor Bulman advised Members that he had been asked to look into the potential encroachment of CAU on the pavement of Mount Pleasant Road. The circumstances would be investigated and brought to the Board as appropriate.

**Freight transport in Kent:**  
County Councillor Holden reminded Members that a matter was outstanding regarding a report examining the impact of excessive freight transport on rural
communities. Councillor Bulman questioned whether this was within the remit of the Joint Transportation Board. Earl Bourner, District Manager for Tunbridge Wells, KCC, advised that Kent County Council had the Freight Action Plan but anything further would require an investigation. County Councillor Holden commented that it had been agreed at a previous meeting and therefore a report should be underway. Councillor Bulman agreed to look into the matter. County Councillor Holden added that people had to contend with huge lorries the size of several buildings, the detriment to peoples lives should not simply be discarded in view of the economic benefits to the hauliers and there should be an opportunity to consider the issues further. A report was expected on the implications on people which could lead to consideration on what could be done, either in a small way or larger actions. Councillor Bulman commented that he would discuss with officers what was possible.

Councillor Woodward asked for details of the Freight Action Plan. Bartholomew Wren, Economic Development Officer, TWBC, commented that the plan had been prepared with a web-based mapping service called Kent Freight Gateway, these identified priority routes for freight. The data was also used in route mapping systems. County Councillor Holden wondered whether the automatic steering of freight across the county may be part of the problem, the report should be concerned with the effect that freight distribution was having on people’s quality of life.

St. John’s 20mph zone:
Councillor Lidstone asked whether there would be sufficient information for an update in respect of the 20mph zone in St John’s. Michael Hardy, Schemes Project Engineer, KCC, confirmed that it was expected to be in consultation stage by that time and a report would be prepared.

Speeding on the A26:
Councillor Simmons commented that a group of Southborough residents had concerns in respect of speeding on the A26 and sought permission to present to the next meeting. Members agreed. Councillor Bulman suggested that a petition would add weight to their campaign.

DATE OF NEXT MEETING

TB12/16 The next meeting of the Joint Transportation Board would be held on Monday 17 October 2016 commencing at 6pm.

NOTES:
County Councillor Holden arrived at 6.26pm during CAB6/16 (Tracker Item 7) County Councillor Oakford left the meeting at 6.37pm during CAB7/16 Councillor Backhouse left the meeting at 6.41pm during CAB7/16 The meeting concluded at 7.47 pm.